

Formal Methods for Java

Lecture 13: Dynamic Logic

Jochen Hoenicke



Software Engineering
Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg

June 14, 2017

- Theorem Prover
- Developed at University of Karlsruhe
- <http://www.key-project.org/>.
- Theory specialized for Java(Card).
- Can generate proof-obligations from JML specification.
- Underlying theory: Sequent Calculus + Dynamic Logic

Dynamic logic extends predicate logic by

- $[\alpha]\phi$
- $\langle\alpha\rangle\phi$

where α is a program and ϕ a sub-formula.

The meaning is as follows:

- $[\alpha]\phi$: after all terminating runs of program α formula ϕ holds.
- $\langle\alpha\rangle\phi$: after some terminating run of program α formula ϕ holds.

Comparison with Hoare Logic

The sequent $\phi \Longrightarrow [\alpha]\psi$ corresponds to partial correctness of the Hoare formula:

$$\{\phi\}\alpha\{\psi\}$$

If α is deterministic, $\phi \Longrightarrow \langle\alpha\rangle\psi$ corresponds to total correctness.

Examples

- $[\{\}] \phi \equiv \phi$
- $\langle \{\} \rangle \phi \equiv \phi$
- $[\mathbf{while(true)}\{\}] \phi \equiv \mathbf{true}$
- $\langle \mathbf{while(true)}\{\} \rangle \phi \equiv \mathbf{false}$
- $[x = x + 1;] x \geq 4 \equiv x + 1 \geq 4$
- $[x = t;] \phi \equiv \phi[t/x]$
- $[\alpha_1 \alpha_2] \phi \equiv [\alpha_1][\alpha_2] \phi$

How can we use equivalences in Sequent Calculus?

Add the rule
$$\frac{\Gamma[\psi/\phi] \Longrightarrow \Delta[\psi/\phi]}{\Gamma \Longrightarrow \Delta}, \text{ where } \phi \equiv \psi.$$

This is similar to [applyEq](#).

Dynamic Logic is Modal Logic

- $\langle \alpha \rangle \phi \equiv \neg [\alpha] \neg \phi$
- $[\alpha] \phi \equiv \neg \langle \alpha \rangle \neg \phi$

Furthermore:

- if ϕ is a tautology, so is $[\alpha] \phi$
- $[\alpha](\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow ([\alpha] \phi \rightarrow [\alpha] \psi)$

Remark: For deterministic programs also the reverse holds

$$([\alpha] \phi \rightarrow [\alpha] \psi) \rightarrow [\alpha](\phi \rightarrow \psi)$$

Termination and Deterministic Programs

How can we express that program α must terminate?

$$\langle \alpha \rangle \mathbf{true}$$

This can be used to relate $[\alpha]$ and $\langle \alpha \rangle$:

$$\langle \alpha \rangle \phi \equiv [\alpha] \phi \wedge \langle \alpha \rangle \mathbf{true}$$

The formula $\langle i = t; \alpha \rangle \phi$ is rewritten to

$$\{i := t\} \langle \alpha \rangle \phi$$

Formula $\{i := t\} \phi$ is true, iff

ϕ holds in a state, where the program variable i has the value denoted by the term t .

Here:

- i is a program variable (non-rigid function).
- t is a term (may contain logical variables).
- ϕ a formula

Simplifying Updates

If ϕ contains no modalities, then $\{x := t\}\phi$ is the substitution $\phi[t/x]$ (every occurrence of x is changed to t).

A double update $\{x_1 := t_1, x_2 := t_2\}\{x_1 := t'_1, x_3 := t'_3\}\phi$ is automatically rewritten to

$$\{x_1 := t'_1[t_1/x_1, t_2/x_2], x_2 := t_2, x_3 := t'_3[t_1/x_1, t_2/x_2]\}\phi$$

Example: $\langle\{i = j; j = i + 1\}\rangle i = j$

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle\{i = j; j = i + 1\}\rangle i = j \\ \equiv & \{i := j\}\{j := i+1\}i = j \\ \equiv & \{i := j, j := j + 1\}i = j \\ \equiv & j = j + 1 \\ \equiv & \mathbf{false} \end{aligned}$$

or alternatively

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle\{i = j; j = i + 1\}\rangle i = j \\ \equiv & \{i := j\}\{j := i+1\}i = j \\ \equiv & \{i := j\}i = i + 1 \\ \equiv & j = j + 1 \\ \equiv & \mathbf{false} \end{aligned}$$

Rules for Java Dynamic Logic

- $\langle\{i = j; \dots\}\rangle\phi$ is rewritten to:
 $\{i := j\}\langle\{\dots\}\rangle\phi$.
- $\langle\{i = j + k; \dots\}\rangle\phi$ is rewritten to:
 $\{i := j + k\}\langle\{\dots\}\rangle\phi$.
- $\langle\{i = j ++; \dots\}\rangle\phi$ is rewritten to:
 $\langle\{\mathbf{int} \ j_0; j_0 = j; j = j + 1; i = j_0; \dots\}\rangle\phi$.
- $\langle\{\mathbf{int} \ k; \dots\}\rangle\phi$ is rewritten to:
 $\langle\{\dots\}\rangle\phi$ and k is added as new program variable.

Proving Programs with Loops

Given a simple loop:

$$\langle \{ \mathbf{while}(n > 0) \ n--; \} \rangle n = 0$$

How can we prove that the loop terminates for all $n \geq 0$ and that $n = 0$ holds in the final state?

Method (1): Induction

To prove a property $\phi(x)$ for all $x \geq 0$ we can use induction:

- Show $\phi(0)$.
- Show $\phi(x) \implies \phi(x + 1)$ for all $x \geq 0$.

This proves that $\forall x (x \geq 0 \rightarrow \phi(x))$ holds.

The rule int_induction

The KeY-System has the rule `int_induction`

$$\frac{\Gamma \Longrightarrow \Delta, \phi(0) \quad \Gamma \Longrightarrow \Delta, \forall X (X \geq 0 \wedge \phi(X) \rightarrow \phi(X + 1)) \quad \Gamma, \forall X (X \geq 0 \rightarrow \phi(X)) \Longrightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Longrightarrow \Delta}$$

The three goals are:

- Base Case: $\Longrightarrow \phi(0)$
- Step Case: $\Longrightarrow \forall X (X \geq 0 \wedge \phi(X) \rightarrow \phi(X + 1))$
- Use Case: $\forall X (X \geq 0 \rightarrow \phi(X)) \Longrightarrow$

Method(2): Loop Invariants with Variants

Induction proofs are very difficult to perform for a loop

$$\langle \{ \mathbf{while}(COND) BODY; \dots \} \rangle \phi$$

The KeY-system supports special rules for while loops using invariants and variants.

The rule `while_invariant_with_variant_dec`

The rule `while_invariant_with_variant_dec` takes an invariant inv , a modifies set $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$ and a variant v . The following cases must be proven.

- Initially Valid: $\implies inv \wedge v \geq 0$
- Body Preserves Invariant:

$$\begin{aligned} \implies \{m_1 := x_1 \parallel \dots \parallel m_k := x_k\} (inv \wedge [\{b = COND;\}] b = \mathbf{true}) \\ \rightarrow \langle BODY \rangle inv \end{aligned}$$

- Use Case:

$$\begin{aligned} \implies \{m_1 := x_1 \parallel \dots \parallel m_k := x_k\} (inv \wedge [\{b = COND;\}] b = \mathbf{false}) \\ \rightarrow \langle \dots \rangle \phi \end{aligned}$$

- Termination:

$$\begin{aligned} \implies \{m_1 := x_1 \parallel \dots \parallel m_k := x_k\} (inv \wedge v \geq 0 \wedge [\{b = COND;\}] b = \mathbf{true}) \\ \rightarrow \{old := v\} \langle BODY \rangle v \leq old \wedge v \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Rigid vs. Non-Rigid Functions vs. Variables

KeY distinguishes the following symbols:

- Rigid Functions: These are functions that do not depend on the current state of the program.
 - $+, -, * : integer \times integers \rightarrow integer$ (mathematical operations)
 - $0, 1, \dots : integer, TRUE, FALSE : boolean$ (mathematical constants)
- Non-Rigid Functions: These are functions that depend on current state.
 - $\cdot[\cdot] : T \times int \rightarrow T$ (array access)
 - $\cdot.next : T \rightarrow T$ if `next` is a field of a class.
 - $i, j : T$ if `i, j` are program variables.
- Variables: These are logical variables that can be quantified. Variables may not appear in programs.
 - x, y, z

Example

$$\forall x. i = x \rightarrow \langle \{ \text{while}(i > 0) \{ i = i - 1; \} \} \rangle i = 0$$

- 0, 1, - are rigid functions.
- > is a rigid relation.
- i is a non-rigid function.
- x is a logical variable.

Quantification over i is not allowed and x must not appear in a program.

Builtin Rigid Functions

- $+, -, *, /, \%, jdiv, jmod$: operations on *integer*.
- $\dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, TRUE, FALSE, null$: constants.
- (A) for any type A : cast function.
- $A :: get$ gives the n -th object of type A .