

Software Verification and Testing

Lecture Notes: Z II

Sequences

idea: sequences are a fundamental **data structure** in Z. They are used for modelling stacks, queues or lists

implementation: sequences are finite functions from the natural numbers

further use: we will use sequences to learn about **inductive definitions** and **proofs by induction**

Sequences

intuition:

- sequences over some set A are functions $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$
- finite sequences over A are functions $f : 1 \dots n \rightarrow A$ for some n

formalisation:

- (first definition) $\text{seq } X ::= \{s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X \mid \exists n : \mathbb{N} \bullet \text{dom } s = 1 \dots n\}$
- but types can be sharpened

sequences in \mathbf{Z} : $\text{seq } X ::= \{s : \mathbb{N} \dashrightarrow X \mid \exists n : \mathbb{N} \bullet \text{dom } s = 1 \dots n\}$

notation: we write

- $\langle \rangle$ for the empty sequence
- $\langle s, h, e, f, f, i, e, l, d \rangle$ when we explicitly enumerate a sequence

Sequences

concatenation:

$$\frac{[X]}{_ \hat{_} : \text{seq } X \times \text{seq } X \rightarrow \text{seq } X}$$

$\forall s, t : \text{seq } X \bullet$

$$\#(s \hat{t}) = \#s + \#t$$

$$\forall i : 1 \dots \#s \bullet (s \hat{t}) i = s i$$

$$\forall j : 1 \dots \#t \bullet (s \hat{t}) (j + \#s) = t j$$

example: $\langle a, b, c \rangle \hat{\langle d, e, f, g \rangle} = \langle a, b, c, d, e, f, g \rangle$

Sequences

head:

$[X]$
$head : \text{seq } X \rightarrow X$

$\forall s : \text{seq } X \mid s \neq \langle \rangle \bullet head\ s = s\ 1$
--

example:

- $head\langle a, b, c \rangle = a$
- $head\langle \rangle$ is undefined

Sequences

tail:

$[X]$

$tail : seq X \rightarrow seq X$

$\forall s : seq X \mid s \neq \langle \rangle \bullet$

$\# tail s = \#s - 1$

$\forall i : 1 .. \#s - 1 \bullet (tail s) i = s (i + 1)$

example:

- $tail \langle a, b, c \rangle = \langle b, c \rangle$
- $tail \langle \rangle$ is undefined

Sequences

restriction: $_ \upharpoonright _ : \text{seq } X \times \mathbb{P} X \rightarrow \text{seq } X$ is more difficult to define [cf. Using Z]

here: we only provide intuition

example: $\langle a, b, x, n, x, b, x, n, b, a \rangle \upharpoonright \{a, n\} = \langle a, n, n, a \rangle$

Sequences

special case: injective sequences are repetition-free

theorem: sequence s is repetition-free iff $\#s = \#\text{ran}(s)$

Sequences

further operations:

- cons

$$\frac{[X]}{_ : _ : X \times \text{seq } X \rightarrow \text{seq } X}$$
$$\forall x : X \bullet \forall s : \text{seq } X \bullet$$
$$\#(x : s) = 1 + \#s$$
$$(x : s) 1 = x$$
$$\forall i : 2 .. \#s + 1 \bullet (x : s) i = s (i - 1)$$

- example: $a : \langle b, c \rangle = \langle a, b, c \rangle$

Sequences

further operations: (introduced by example)

- $front\langle a, b, c \rangle = \langle a, b \rangle$
- $last\langle a, b, c \rangle = c$

remark: a definition will be given as an exercise

Sequences

observation:

- cons looks more basic than concatenation; it builds a sequence stepwise from the empty sequence
- every sequence can be written as a term of the form $x_1 : (x_2 : \dots : (s_n : \langle \rangle) \dots)$
- so every sequence is either empty or a cons of some element and a sequence; but not both
- concatenation can be defined in terms of cons

$$\langle \rangle \hat{\ } s = s$$

$$(x : s) \hat{\ } t = x : (s \hat{\ } t)$$

- this has two steps
 1. the definition for the sequence constructor $\langle \rangle$
 2. the definition for the sequence constructor $:$ (cons)

Cons and Cat

property: $\langle x \rangle \hat{\ } s = (x : s)$

proof: $\langle x \rangle \hat{\ } s = (x : \langle \rangle) \hat{\ } s = x : (\langle \rangle \hat{\ } s) = (x : s)$

remark: therefore, obviously, cons can also be defined in terms of cat. . .

Inductive Definitions

a generalisation: the definition of $\hat{\ }^{\ } as a function on sequences can be generalised to arbitrary functions from sequences:$

inductive/recursive definitions: let c be a constant in set B and let $g : X \times B \rightarrow B$ be a function. Then the function $f : \text{seq } X \rightarrow B$ is uniquely defined by

$$f \langle \rangle = c \quad f (x : s) = g(x, f(s))$$

examples:

- length of a sequence $\# \langle \rangle = 0 \quad \#(x : s) = 1 + \#xs$
- reversion of a sequence $rev \langle \rangle = \langle \rangle \quad rev(x : s) = (rev s) \hat{\ } \langle x \rangle$

Inductive Definitions

remember: terms and formulae were also inductively defined

- first on some “atoms”, i.e., constants or atomic formulae
- then with respect to function symbols as term constructors and logical operation symbols as formula constructors

remark: also the natural numbers can be defined inductively using the constructors

- 0 and $s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$
- 4, e.g., is represented by the term $s(s(s(s(0))))$
- addition can be defined inductively as

$$n + 0 = n \quad n + s(m) = s(n + m)$$

Inductive Definitions

example: $s \upharpoonright \{x\}$ can be defined inductively by

$$\langle \rangle \upharpoonright \{x\} = \langle \rangle$$

$$(y : s) \upharpoonright \{x\} = \text{if } x = y \text{ then } y : (s \upharpoonright \{x\}) \text{ else } s \upharpoonright \{x\}$$

task: extend this definition to $s \upharpoonright \{x, y\}$

- why doesn't that work?
- how can we simulate this?

remark: this is not a specification, but an implementation problem. . .

Proofs by Induction

observation: many systems, data types and behaviours can be defined inductively

theorem: (principle of mathematical induction) Let $P(\cdot)$ be a property of natural numbers. If $P(0)$ holds and $P(m)$ implies $P(m + 1)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $P(n)$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

Proofs by Induction

example: $\sum_{i=1}^n i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$

proof:

- base case $\sum 0 = 0 = \frac{0 \cdot 1}{2}$
- induction hypothesis $\sum_{i=1}^k i = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}$
- induction step:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} i &= (k+1) + \sum_{i=1}^k i = (k+1) + \frac{k(k+1)}{2} \\ &= \frac{2(k+1) + k(k+1)}{2} = \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Proofs by Induction

theorem: (principle of structural induction) Let P be a property of sequences. If $P(\langle \rangle)$ holds and for all $x \in X$ and $s \in \text{seq } X$ $P(s)$ implies $P(x : s)$, then $P(s)$ holds for all $s \in \text{seq } X$

proof: by contradiction assume that $P(s)$ does not hold for all sequences s . Then there must be a minimal sequence t (wrt length) such that $\neg P(t)$ holds. t cannot be empty, since $P(\langle \rangle)$ holds. So $t = x : t'$. But then, by contraposition, $\neg P(t')$ also holds. This contradicts the minimality of t .

Proofs by Induction

example: $\#(s \wedge t) = \#s + \#t$.

proof:

- base case: $\#(\langle \rangle \wedge t) = \#t = 0 + \#t = \#\langle \rangle + \#t$
- induction hypothesis: $\#(s \wedge t) = \#s + \#t$
- induction step:

$$\begin{aligned}\#((x : s) \wedge t) &= \#(x : (s \wedge t)) \\ &= 1 + \#(s \wedge t) \\ &= 1 + \#s + \#t \\ &= \#(x : s) + \#t\end{aligned}$$

Proofs by Induction

example: $(s \wedge t) \wedge u = s \wedge (t \wedge u)$

proof:

- base case: $(\langle \rangle \wedge t) \wedge u = t \wedge u = \langle \rangle \wedge (t \wedge u)$
- induction hypothesis: $(s \wedge t) \wedge u = s \wedge (t \wedge u)$
- induction step:

$$\begin{aligned} ((x : s) \wedge t) \wedge u &= (x : (s \wedge t)) \wedge u \\ &= x : ((s \wedge t) \wedge u) \\ &= x : (s \wedge (t \wedge u)) \\ &= (x : s) \wedge (t \wedge u) \end{aligned}$$

Proofs by Induction

example: $\#s = \# \text{rev } s$

proof:

- base case: $\#\langle \rangle = 0 = \#\langle \rangle = \# \text{rev} \langle \rangle$
- induction hypothesis: $\#s = \# \text{rev } s$
- induction step:

$$\begin{aligned} \#(x : s) &= 1 + \#s \\ &= 1 + \# \text{rev } s \\ &= \# \text{rev } s + \#\langle x \rangle \\ &= \#(\text{rev } s \frown \langle x \rangle) \\ &= \# \text{rev}(x : s) \end{aligned}$$

Further properties

we have

$$\mathit{head}(x : s) = x$$

$$\mathit{tail}(x : s) = s$$

$$\mathit{last} s = \mathit{head} \mathit{rev} s$$

$$\mathit{front} s = \mathit{tail} \mathit{rev} s$$

Induction and Verification

observation: many functions/data-types can be inductively defined
(factorials, Fibonacci numbers, trees, formulae, . . .)

structural induction can be generalised from sequences to arbitrary
inductively defined expressions

example: show that every term is either bracket-free or contains an even number
of brackets. . .

induction and verification:

- reasoning about inductively defined properties requires inductive proofs
- inductive reasoning is often creative; assumptions must be strengthened or modified
- some properties cannot be proved in a straight way

Induction and Verification

theorem proving: a **theorem prover** is a tool that carries out mathematical proofs on a machine

- proofs in FOL can often be automated
- if the claim is a theorem of FOL, it can be detected
- if it is not a theorem, the prover may run forever

problem: induction is not part of FOL

solution: interactive theorem provers

- many simple inductive proofs can still be automated