

## 1 Semantics of IMP Revisited

### 1.1 Syntax of Commands

$$c ::= \text{skip} \mid x := a \mid c_0; c_1 \mid \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \mid \text{while } b \text{ do } c.$$

### 1.2 Big-Step Rules

(skip)	$\langle \text{skip}, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma$
(assignment)	$\frac{\langle a, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n}{\langle x := a, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma[n/x]}$
(sequential composition)	$\frac{\langle c_0, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \tau \quad \langle c_1, \tau \rangle \Downarrow \rho}{\langle c_0; c_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \rho}$
(conditional)	$\frac{\langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \text{true} \quad \langle c_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \tau}{\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \tau} \quad \frac{\langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \text{false} \quad \langle c_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \tau}{\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \tau}$
(while loop)	$\frac{\langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \text{false}}{\langle \text{while } b \text{ do } c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma} \quad \frac{\langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \text{true} \quad \langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \tau \quad \langle \text{while } b \text{ do } c, \tau \rangle \Downarrow \rho}{\langle \text{while } b \text{ do } c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \rho}$

### 1.3 Binary Relation Semantics

In the semantics of IMP, states  $\sigma, \tau, \dots$  are functions  $\mathbf{Var} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $\mathbf{St}$  denote the set of all states. For each program  $c$ , the big-step rules determine a binary input/output relation on  $\mathbf{St}$ , namely

$$\llbracket c \rrbracket \triangleq \{(\sigma, \tau) \mid \langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \tau\} \subseteq \mathbf{St} \times \mathbf{St}.$$

With this notation, we can express the big-step rules in terms of some basic operations on binary relations, namely *relational composition* ( $\circ$ ) and *reflexive transitive closure* ( $*$ ):

$$R \circ S \triangleq \{(\sigma, \rho) \mid \exists \tau (\sigma, \tau) \in R, (\tau, \rho) \in S\}$$

$$R^* \triangleq \bigcup_{n \geq 0} R^n = \{(\sigma, \tau) \mid \exists \sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_n \sigma = \sigma_0, \tau = \sigma_n, \text{ and } (\sigma_i, \sigma_{i+1}) \in R, 0 \leq i \leq n-1\},$$

where  $R^0 \triangleq \{(\sigma, \sigma) \mid \sigma \in \mathbf{St}\}$  and  $R^{n+1} \triangleq R \circ R^n$ . The big-step rules are equivalent to the following:

(skip)	$\llbracket \text{skip} \rrbracket = \{(\sigma, \sigma) \mid \sigma \in \mathbf{St}\}$
(assignment)	$\llbracket x := a \rrbracket = \{(\sigma, \sigma[n/x]) \mid \langle a, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n\}$
(sequential composition)	$\llbracket c_0; c_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket c_0 \rrbracket \circ \llbracket c_1 \rrbracket$
(conditional)	$\llbracket \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket b \rrbracket \circ \llbracket c_1 \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \neg b \rrbracket \circ \llbracket c_2 \rrbracket$
(while loop)	$\llbracket \text{while } b \text{ do } c \rrbracket = (\llbracket b \rrbracket \circ \llbracket c \rrbracket)^* \circ \llbracket \neg b \rrbracket,$

where in the conditional and while loop,

$$\llbracket b \rrbracket \triangleq \{(\sigma, \sigma) \mid \langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \text{true}\}$$

$$\llbracket \neg b \rrbracket \triangleq \{(\sigma, \sigma) \mid \langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \text{false}\} = \llbracket \text{skip} \rrbracket - \llbracket b \rrbracket.$$

In fact, this would have been a much more compact way to define them originally.

## 1.4 Semantics of Weakest Liberal Preconditions and Partial Correctness Assertions

We can now give a formal semantics for weakest liberal preconditions and Hoare partial correctness assertions. Let  $L$  denote the underlying logic (typically first-order logic). Write  $\sigma \models \varphi$  if the formula  $\varphi$  of  $L$  is true in state  $\sigma$ , and write  $\models \varphi$  if  $\varphi$  is true in all states. We wish to define what it means for a weakest liberal precondition assertion  $\text{wlp } c \psi$  to be true in a state  $\sigma$ , written  $\sigma \models \text{wlp } c \psi$ , and for a partial correctness assertion  $\{\varphi\}c\{\psi\}$  to be true, written  $\models \{\varphi\}c\{\psi\}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \models \text{wlp } c \psi &\stackrel{\Delta}{\iff} \forall \tau (\sigma, \tau) \in \llbracket c \rrbracket \Rightarrow \tau \models \psi \\ \models \{\varphi\}c\{\psi\} &\stackrel{\Delta}{\iff} \forall \sigma \sigma \models \varphi \Rightarrow \sigma \models \text{wlp } c \psi \\ &\iff \forall \sigma, \tau \sigma \models \varphi \wedge (\sigma, \tau) \in \llbracket c \rrbracket \Rightarrow \tau \models \psi. \end{aligned}$$

## 1.5 Soundness and Relative Completeness of Hoare Logic

Let us write  $\vdash \{\varphi\}c\{\psi\}$  to assert that  $\{\varphi\}c\{\psi\}$  is provable in Hoare logic. Then soundness and relative completeness of Hoare logic are captured in the following theorems. The relative completeness result is due to Cook.

**Theorem (soundness)**  $\vdash \{\varphi\}c\{\psi\} \Rightarrow \models \{\varphi\}c\{\psi\}$ .

**Theorem (relative completeness)** Assume that the underlying logic  $L$  is *expressive* in the sense that all weakest liberal preconditions are expressible in  $L$ ; that is, for each program  $c$  and formula  $\psi$  of  $L$ , there is a formula  $\psi'$  of  $L$  such that for all  $\sigma$ ,  $\sigma \models \psi'$  iff  $\sigma \models \text{wlp } c \psi$ . Then  $\models \{\varphi\}c\{\psi\} \Rightarrow \vdash \{\varphi\}c\{\psi\}$ , provided we are allowed to assume all true formulas of  $L$  as axioms.

*Proof sketch.* The proof is by structural induction on  $c$ . We will just sketch the proof for two cases, assignments and the while loop.

For an assignment  $x := a$ , suppose  $\models \{\varphi\}x := a\{\psi\}$ . Then  $\forall \sigma \sigma \models \varphi \Rightarrow \sigma \models \text{wlp } (x := a) \psi$ . But  $\text{wlp } (x := a) \psi = \psi\{a/x\}$ , so  $\forall \sigma \sigma \models \varphi \Rightarrow \sigma \models \psi\{a/x\}$ , therefore  $\models \varphi \rightarrow \psi\{a/x\}$ . We can thus assume  $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi\{a/x\}$ , since we are allowed to take true formulas of  $L$  as axioms. Then  $\vdash \{\psi\{a/x\}\}x := a\{\psi\}$  by the assignment rule of Hoare logic, thus  $\vdash \{\varphi\}x := a\{\psi\}$  by the weakening rule of Hoare logic.

Now for the while loop. Suppose  $\models \{\varphi\}\text{while } b \text{ do } c\{\psi\}$ . Then  $\forall \sigma \sigma \models \varphi \Rightarrow \sigma \models \text{wlp } (\text{while } b \text{ do } c) \psi$ . Since  $L$  is expressive,  $\text{wlp } (\text{while } b \text{ do } c) \psi$  is equivalent to a formula  $\rho$  of  $L$ , and  $\models \varphi \rightarrow \rho$ . Since the programs

$$\text{while } b \text{ do } c \quad \text{if } b \text{ then } (c; \text{while } b \text{ do } c) \text{ else skip}$$

are semantically equivalent, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &\iff \text{wlp } (\text{while } b \text{ do } c) \psi \\ &\iff \text{wlp } (\text{if } b \text{ then } (c; \text{while } b \text{ do } c) \text{ else skip}) \psi \\ &\iff (b \Rightarrow \text{wlp } c (\text{wlp } (\text{while } b \text{ do } c) \psi)) \wedge (\neg b \Rightarrow \text{wlp skip } \psi) \\ &\iff (b \Rightarrow \text{wlp } c \rho) \wedge (\neg b \Rightarrow \psi), \end{aligned}$$

thus  $\models \rho \wedge \neg b \rightarrow \psi$  and  $\models \rho \wedge b \rightarrow \text{wlp } c \rho$ . The latter says exactly that  $\models \{\rho \wedge b\}c\{\rho\}$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $\vdash \{\rho \wedge b\}c\{\rho\}$ , and by the fact that we may assume all true formulas of  $L$  as axioms,  $\vdash \varphi \rightarrow \rho$  and  $\vdash \rho \wedge \neg b \rightarrow \psi$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash \{\rho \wedge b\}c\{\rho\} &\Rightarrow \vdash \{\rho\}\text{while } b \text{ do } c\{\rho \wedge \neg b\} && \text{by the Hoare while rule} \\ &\Rightarrow \vdash \{\varphi\}\text{while } b \text{ do } c\{\psi\} && \text{by weakening.} \end{aligned}$$

□