

COMP3610/6361

Principles of Programming Languages

Peter Höfner

Aug 22, 2023

Section 13

IMP in Isabelle/HOL

Motivation/Disclaimer

- generic proof assistant
- express mathematical formulas in a formal language
- tools for proving those formulas in a logical calculus
- originally developed at the University of Cambridge and Technische Universität München
(now numerous contributions, including Australia)
- this is **neither a course about Isabelle nor a proper introduction to Isabelle**



Isabelle/HOL – Introduction

Isabelle/HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

Isabelle HOL has

- datatypes
- recursive functions
- logical operators
- ...

Isabelle/HOL is a programming language, too

- Higher-order means that functions are values, too

Isabelle/HOL – Terms (Expressions)

- **Functions**

- ▶ application: $f\ E$
call of function f with parameter E
- ▶ abstraction: $\lambda x.\ E$
function with parameter x (of some type) and result E ($\mathbf{fn}\ x : T_? \Rightarrow t$)
- ▶ Convention (as always) $f\ E_1\ E_2\ E_3 \equiv ((f\ E_1)\ E_2)\ E_3$

- **Basic syntax** (Isabelle)

$t ::=$	(t)
	a identifier (constant or variable)
	$t\ t$ function application
	$\lambda x.\ t$ function abstraction
	... syntactic sugar

- **Substitution** notation: $t[u/x]$

Isabelle/HOL – Types I

- **Basic syntax (Isabelle)**

$\tau ::= (\tau)$	
<code>bool</code> <code>int</code> <code>string</code> ...	base types
' <i>a</i> ' ' <i>b</i> ' ...	type variables
$\tau \Rightarrow \tau$	functions
$\tau \times \tau$	pairs
τ <code>list</code>	lists
τ <code>set</code>	sets
...	user-defined types

Convention: $\tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau_3 \equiv \tau_1 \Rightarrow (\tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau_3)$

- **Terms must be well-typed;** in particular

$$\frac{t :: \tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \quad u :: \tau_1}{t\ u :: \tau_2}$$

Isabelle/HOL – Types II

Type inference

- automatic
- function overloading possible
can prevent type inference
- **type annotation** $t :: \tau$ (for example $f\ (x :: \text{int})$)

Currying

- curried vs. tupled

$$f\ \tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau_3 \quad \text{vs} \quad f\ \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau_3$$

- use curried versions if possible
- advantage: allow *partial function application*

$$f\ a_1 \quad \text{where } a_1 :: \tau_1$$

Isabelle (Cheatsheet I)

Isabelle module = Theory (File structure)

Syntax:

```
theory MyTh
imports Th1, ..., Thn
begin
  (definitions, lemmas, theorems, proofs, ...)*
end
```

MyTh:

name of theory. Must live in file *MyTh.thy*

Th_i:

names of imported theories; imports are transitive

Usually:

```
imports Main
```

IMP – Syntax (recap)

Booleans $b \in \mathbb{B} = \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$

Integers (Values) $n \in \mathbb{Z} = \{\dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots\}$

Locations $l \in \mathbb{L} = \{l, l_0, l_1, l_2, \dots\}$

Operations $op ::= + \mid \geq$

Expressions

$E ::= n \mid b \mid E \ op \ E \mid$

$l := E \mid !l \mid$

if E **then** E **else** $E \mid$

skip $\mid E ; E \mid$

while E **do** E

IMP – Syntax (aexp and bexp)

Booleans $b \in \mathbb{B}$

Integers (Values) $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

Locations $l \in \mathbb{L} = \{l, l_0, l_1, l_2, \dots\}$

Operations $aop ::= +$

Expressions

$aexp ::= n \mid !l \mid aexp \ aop \ aexp$

$bexp ::= b \mid bexp \wedge bexp \mid aexp \geq aexp$

$com ::= \cancel{n} \mid \cancel{b} \mid \cancel{E \ op \ E} \mid$

$l ::= aexp \mid \cancel{!l} \mid$

IF $bexp$ THEN com ELSE com |

SKIP | $com \ ; \ com$ |

WHILE $bexp$ DO com

IMP – Syntax (Isabelle)

Booleans bool

Integers (Values) int

Locations string

Expressions

datatype aexp ::= N n | V l | Plus aexp aexp

datatype bexp ::= Bc bool | Not bexp |

And bexp bexp | LESS aexp aexp

datatype com ::= Assign loc aexp |

If bexp com com |

SKIP | Seq com com |

WWhile bexp com

IMP – Syntax (Isabelle)

LINK: /src/HOL/IMP

Isabelle (Cheatsheet II)

type_synonym	specify synonym for a type
datatype	define recursive (polymorphic) types
fun	define (simple, recursive) function (tries to prove exhaustiveness, non-overlappedness, and termination)
value	evaluate a term

Small-step semantics

- a configuration $\langle E, s \rangle$ can perform a step if there is a derivation tree
- vice versa the set of all transitions can be defined inductively
- it is an infinite set

IMP Semantics

(deref)	$\cancel{\langle l, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle n, s \rangle}$	if $l \in \text{dom}(s)$ and $s(l) = n$
(assign1)	$\langle l := n, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{skip}, s + \{l \mapsto n\} \rangle$	if $l \in \text{dom}(s)$
(assign2)	$\frac{\cancel{\langle E, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle E', s' \rangle}}{\langle l := E, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle l := E', s' \rangle}$	
(seq1)	$\langle \text{skip}; E_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle E_2, s \rangle$	
(seq2)	$\frac{\langle E_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle E'_1, s' \rangle}{\langle E_1; E_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle E_1; E_2, s' \rangle}$	
(if1)	$\langle \text{if true then } E_2 \text{ else } E_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle E_2, s \rangle$	
(if2)	$\langle \text{if false then } E_2 \text{ else } E_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle E_3, s \rangle$	
(if3)	$\frac{\cancel{\langle E_1, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle E'_1, s' \rangle}}{\cancel{\langle \text{if } E_1 \text{ then } E_2 \text{ else } E_3, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{if } E'_1 \text{ then } E_2 \text{ else } E_3, s' \rangle}}$	
(while)	$\langle \text{while } E_1 \text{ do } E_2, s \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{if } E_1 \text{ then } (E_2; \text{while } E_1 \text{ do } E_2) \text{ then skip, } s \rangle$	

IMP Semantics

(assign1)	$\langle l := n , s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \mathbf{skip} , s + \{l \mapsto n\} \rangle$	if $l \in \text{dom}(s)$
(seq1)	$\langle \mathbf{skip}; E_2 , s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle E_2 , s \rangle$	
(seq2)	$\frac{\langle E_1 , s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle E'_1 , s' \rangle}{\langle E_1; E_2 , s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle E'_1; E_2 , s' \rangle}$	
(if1)	$\langle \mathbf{if true then } E_2 \mathbf{ else } E_3 , s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle E_2 , s \rangle$	
(if2)	$\langle \mathbf{if false then } E_2 \mathbf{ else } E_3 , s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle E_3 , s \rangle$	
(while)	$\langle \mathbf{while } E_1 \mathbf{ do } E_2 , s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle \mathbf{if } E_1 \mathbf{ then } (E_2; \mathbf{while } E_1 \mathbf{ do } E_2) \mathbf{ then skip} , s \rangle$	

IMP Semantics (Isabelle)

LINK: /src/HOL/Small_Step

IMP – Examples

- If $E = (l_2 := 0; \mathbf{while} \,!l_1 \geq 1 \, \mathbf{do} \, (l_2 := \!l_2 + \!l_1; l_1 := \!l_1 + -1))$
 $s = \{l_1 \mapsto 3, l_2 \mapsto 0\}$
then $\langle E, s \rangle \longrightarrow^* ?$
- determinacy
- progress

Isabelle (Cheatsheet III)

inductive
print_theorems
find_theorems

apply (<rule/tactic>)

defines (smallest) inductive set
shows generated theorems
searches available theorems
by name and/or pattern
applies rule to proof goal
(simp, auto, blast, rule <name>)

Big-step semantics (in Isabelle/HOL)

Another View: Big-step Semantics

- we have seen a **small-step semantics**

$$\langle E, s \rangle \longrightarrow \langle E', s' \rangle$$

- alternatively, we could have looked at a **big-step semantics**

$$\langle E, s \rangle \Downarrow \langle E', s' \rangle$$

For example

$$\frac{}{\langle n, s \rangle \Downarrow \langle n, s \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle E_1, s \rangle \Downarrow \langle n_1, s' \rangle \quad \langle E_2, s' \rangle \Downarrow \langle n_2, s'' \rangle}{\langle E_1 + E_2, s \rangle \Downarrow \langle n, s'' \rangle} \quad (n = n_1 + n_2)$$

- no major difference for sequential programs
- small-step much better for modelling concurrency

Final State

- Isabelle's version of IMP has only one value: SKIP
- big-step semantics can be seen as relation

$$\langle E , s \rangle \implies s'$$

Semantics

(Skip)

$$\langle \text{SKIP} , s \rangle \implies s$$

(Assign)

$$\langle l := a , s \rangle \implies s + \{l \mapsto \text{aval } a \text{ } s\}$$

(Seq)

$$\frac{\langle E_1 , s \rangle \implies s' \quad \langle E_2 , s' \rangle \implies s''}{\langle E_1 ; E_2 , s \rangle \implies s''}$$

(IfT)

$$\frac{\text{bval } b \text{ } s = \text{true} \quad \langle E_1 , s \rangle \implies s'}{\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } E_1 \text{ else } E_2 , s \rangle \implies s'}$$

(IfF)

$$\frac{\text{bval } b \text{ } s = \text{false} \quad \langle E_2 , s \rangle \implies s'}{\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } E_1 \text{ else } E_2 , s \rangle \implies s'}$$

(WhileF)

$$\frac{\text{bval } b \text{ } s = \text{false}}{\langle \text{while } b \text{ do } E , s \rangle \implies s}$$

(WhileT)

$$\frac{\text{bval } b \text{ } s = \text{true} \quad \langle E , s \rangle \implies s' \quad \langle \text{while } b \text{ do } E , s' \rangle \implies s''}{\langle \text{while } b \text{ do } E , s \rangle \implies s''}$$

IMP Semantics (Isabelle)

LINK: /src/HOL/Big_Step

- inversion rules
- induction set up
- see Nipkow/Klein for more details and explanation

Are big and small-step semantics equivalent?

Isabelle (Cheatsheet IV)

Proof Styles/Proof ‘Tactics’

apply-style

apply rules (backwards)

ISAR

human readable proofs

sledgehammer

the ‘secret’ weapon

incorporating automated theorem provers

From Big to Small

Theorem

If $cs \Rightarrow s'$ then $cs \longrightarrow^ \langle SKIP, s' \rangle$.*

Proof by rule induction (on $cs \Rightarrow s'$).

In two cases a lemma is needed.

Lemma

If $\langle E, s \rangle \longrightarrow^ \langle E', s' \rangle$ then $\langle E ; E_2, s \rangle \longrightarrow^* \langle E' ; E_2, s' \rangle$.*

Proof by rule induction.

(generalisation of (seq2))

From Small to Big

Theorem

If $cs \rightarrow^ \langle \text{SKIP}, s' \rangle$ then $cs \Rightarrow s'$.*

Proof by rule induction (on $cs \rightarrow^ \langle \text{SKIP}, s' \rangle$).*

The induction step needs the following (interesting) lemma.

Lemma

If $cs \rightarrow cs'$ and $cs' \Rightarrow s$ then $cs \Rightarrow s$.

Proof by rule induction on $cs \rightarrow cs'$.

Equivalence

Corollary

$cs \longrightarrow^* \langle SKIP, s' \rangle$ if and only if $cs \Rightarrow s'$.

LINK: /src/HOL/Small_Step

But are they really equivalent?

- What about premature termination?
- What about (non) termination?

Lemma

1. $\text{final } \langle E, s \rangle$ if and only if $E = \text{SKIP}$.
 2. $\exists s. cs \Rightarrow s$ if and only if $\exists cs'. cs \longrightarrow^* cs' \wedge \text{final } cs'$.
- where $\text{final } cs \equiv (\neg \exists cs'. cs \rightarrow cs')$

Proof.

1. induction and rule inversion
2. $(\exists s. cs \Rightarrow s) \Leftrightarrow \exists s. cs \longrightarrow^* \langle \text{SKIP}, s \rangle$ (by big = small)
 $\qquad\qquad\qquad \Leftrightarrow \exists cs'. cs \longrightarrow^* cs' \wedge \text{final } cs'$ (by final = SKIP)



Typing

(almost straight-forward)

LINK: /src/HOL/Types

```
inductive btyping :: "tyenv ⇒ bexp ⇒ bool" (infix "⊤" 50)
```

where

```
B_ty: " $\Gamma \vdash Bc v$ " |
```

```
Not_ty: " $\Gamma \vdash b \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{Not } b$ " |
```

```
And_ty: " $\Gamma \vdash b1 \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash b2 \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{And } b1 b2$ " |
```

```
Less_ty: " $\Gamma \vdash a1 : \tau \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash a2 : \tau \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{Less } a1 a2$ "
```

```
inductive ctyping :: "tyenv ⇒ com ⇒ bool" (infix "⊤" 50)
```

where

```
Skip_ty: " $\Gamma \vdash \text{SKIP}$ " |
```

```
Assign_ty: " $\Gamma \vdash a : \Gamma(x) \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash x ::= a$ " |
```

```
Seq_ty: " $\Gamma \vdash c1 \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash c2 \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash c1 ; c2$ " |
```

```
If_ty: " $\Gamma \vdash b \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash c1 \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash c2 \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{IF } b \text{ THEN } c1 \text{ ELSE } c2$ " |
```

```
While_ty: " $\Gamma \vdash b \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash c \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash \text{WHILE } b \text{ DO } c$ "
```

References

- some slides based on slides by T. Nipkow (TU München)
- Nipkow, T. and Klein, G. (2014) Concrete Semantics. Springer
- Pierce, B. (2004) Types and Programming Languages. MIT Press
- G. Klein. Gerwin's Style Guide for Isabelle/HOL (Part 1 and 2)
<https://proofcraft.org/blog/isabelle-style.html>