Logical Verification 2021–2022 Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam Lecturer: dr. J. C. Blanchette



Final Exam Tuesday 21 December 2021, 08:30–11:15, RAI blok 09 6 questions, 90 points Answers may be given in English or Dutch

Proof Guidelines

We expect detailed, rigorous, mathematical proofs, but we do not ask you to write Lean proofs. You are welcome to use standard mathematical notation or Lean structured commands (e.g., assume, have, show, calc). You can also use tactical proofs (e.g., intro, apply), but then please indicate some of the intermediate goals, so that we can follow the chain of reasoning.

Major proof steps, including applications of induction and invocation of the induction hypothesis, must be stated explicitly. For each case of a proof by induction, you must list the **inductive hypotheses** assumed (if any) and the goal to be proved. Unless otherwise specified, minor proof steps corresponding to refl, simp, or linarith need not be justified if you think they are obvious, but you should say which key lemmas they depend on.

You should be explicit whenever you use a function definition or an introduction rule for an inductive predicate, especially for functions and predicates that are specific to an exam question.

Answer:

This version of the exam includes suggested answers, presented in blocks like this one. We present proofs in a textual style, but other styles (e.g., closer to Lean) are also allowed.

In Case of Ambiguities or Errors in an Exam Question

The staff present at the exam has the lecturer's phone number, in case of questions or issues concerning a specific exam question. Nevertheless, we strongly recommend that you work things out yourselves, stating explicitly any ambiguity or error and explaining how you interpret or repair the question. The more explicit you are, the easier it will be for the lecturers to grade the question afterwards.

Question 1. Connectives and quantifiers (6+9 points)

The following two subquestions are about basic mastery of logic. Please provide highly detailed proofs.

1a. Give a detailed proof of the following lemma about universal quantification and disjunction. Make sure to emphasize and clearly label every step corresponding to the introduction or elimination of connective.

lemma about_forall_and_or { α : Type} (p q : $\alpha \rightarrow$ Prop) : ($\forall x, p x$) \rightarrow ($\forall x, q x$) \rightarrow ($\forall x, p x \lor q x$)

Answer:

Assume $\forall x, p x \text{ and } \forall x, q x$. Fix a. To prove $p a \lor q a$, by the left introduction rule of \lor , it suffices to prove p a. This corresponds to $\forall x, p x$ instantiated with a.

1b. Prove the following one-point rule for existential quantification. In your proof, identify clearly which witness is supplied for the quantifier.

```
lemma exists.one_point_rule {\alpha : Type} {t : \alpha} {p : \alpha \rightarrow Prop} : (\exists x : \alpha, x = t \land p x) \leftrightarrow p t
```

Answer:

By \leftrightarrow -introduction, it suffices to show (1) $(\exists x : \alpha, x = t \land p x) \rightarrow p t$ and (2) $p t \rightarrow (\exists x : \alpha, x = t \land p x)$.

Let's start with (2). Assume p t. With the \exists -introduction rule, instantiate x with t, and then we must prove $t = t \land p t$. By \land -introduction, it suffices to prove t = t and p t. The first formula is an instance of reflexivity of = and the second formula corresponds to an assumption.

For (1), we assume $\exists x : \alpha, x = t \land p x$ and show p t. From the assumption, by \exists -elimination there exists a witness y such that y = t and p y. Using y = t, we rewrite p y into p t, as desired.

Question 2. Lambda-terms (5+5+7 points)

Consider the following inductive type representing untyped λ -terms:

```
inductive lam : Type
| var : string \rightarrow lam
| abs : string \rightarrow lam \rightarrow lam
| app : lam \rightarrow lam \rightarrow lam
```

where

- lam.var x represents the variable x;
- lam.abs x t represents the λ -abstraction λ x, t;
- lam.apptt' represents the application tt'.

2a. Implement the Lean function

def vars : lam \rightarrow set string

that returns the set of all variables that occur freely or bound within a λ -term. For example:

vars (lam.var x) = {x} vars (lam.abs x (lam.var y)) = {x, y}

You may assume that the type constructor set supports the familiar set operations.

Answer:

| (lam.var x) := {x} | (lam.abs x t) := {x} ∪ vars t | (lam.app t t') := vars t ∪ vars t'

2b. Implement the Lean function

def free_vars : lam \rightarrow set string

that returns the set of all *free* variables within a λ -term. A variable is free if it occurs outside the scope of any binder ranging over it. For example:

```
free_vars (lam.var x) = {x}
free_vars (lam.abs x (lam.var y)) = {y}
free_vars (lam.abs x (lam.app (lam.var x) (lam.var y))) = {y}
```

Answer:

```
| (lam.var x) := {x}
| (lam.abs x t) := free_vars t \ {x}
| (lam.app t t') := free_vars t ∪ free_vars t'
```

2c. Prove that free_vars is a subset of vars. Note that $A \subseteq B$ is defined as $\forall a, a \in A \rightarrow a \in B$.

```
lemma free_vars_subset_vars (t : lam) : free_vars t \subseteq vars t
```

Answer:

The proof is by structural induction on t.

Case var: The goal is free_vars (lam.var x) \subseteq vars (lam.var x). By definition, both sides simplify to {x}. Clearly, {x} \subseteq {x}.

Case abs: The goal is free_vars $(lam.abs x t) \subseteq vars (lam.abs x t)$. The induction hypothesis is free_vars t \subseteq vars t. Simplifying the goal using the definitions above, we get free_vars t $\{x\} \subseteq \{x\} \cup vars t$. Clearly, by basic properties of set operations, a sufficient condition for this to hold is if free_vars t $\subseteq vars t$, and this is the induction hypothesis.

Case app: The goal is free_vars (lam.app t t') \subseteq vars (lam.app t t'). The induction hypotheses are free_vars t \subseteq vars t and free_vars t' \subseteq vars t'. Simplifying the goal using the definitions above, we get free_vars t \cup free_vars t' \subseteq vars t \cup vars t'. Clearly, by basic properties of set operations, this follows from the induction hypotheses.

Question 3. A loopy language (8+8 points)

Consider the LOOPY programming language, which comprises three kinds of statements:

- output s prints the string s;
- choice S T nondeterministically executes either S or T;
- repeat S executes S a nondeterministic number of times, printing the concatenation (++) of zero or more strings.

In Lean, we can model the language's abstract syntax as follows:

```
inductive stmt : Type

| output : string \rightarrow stmt

| choice : stmt \rightarrow stmt \rightarrow stmt

| repeat : stmt \rightarrow stmt
```

3a. The big-step semantics for the LOOPY language relates programs S : stmt to possible outputs s : string.

Complete the following specification of a big-step semantics for the language by giving the missing derivation rules for choice and repeat.

```
\overbrace{\texttt{output } s \Longrightarrow s} \mathsf{OUTPUT}
```

Answer:

```
S \implies s
------ ChoiceLeft
choice S T \implies s
T \implies s
------ ChoiceRight
choice S T \implies s
------ ChoiceRight
choice S T \implies s
------ RepeatBase
repeat S \implies ""
S \implies s \quad repeat S \implies t
------ RepeatStep
repeat S \implies s ++ t
```

3b. Specify the same big-step semantics as an inductive predicate by completing the following Lean definition.

```
inductive big_step : stmt \rightarrow string \rightarrow Prop | output {s} : big_step (stmt.output s) s
```

Answer:

```
| choice_left {S T s} : big_step S s → big_step (stmt.choice S T) s
| choice_right {S T s} : big_step T s → big_step (stmt.choice S T) s
| repeat_base {S} : big_step (stmt.repeat S) ""
| repeat_step {S s s'} :
    big_step S s → big_step (stmt.repeat S) s' →
    big_step (stmt.repeat S) (s ++ s')
```

Question 4. The list monad (6+9 points)

The list monad is a monad that stores a list of values of type α . It corresponds to the Lean type constructor list.

4a. Complete the Lean definitions of the pure and bind operations:

```
def list.pure {\alpha : Type} : \alpha \rightarrow \text{list } \alpha
def list.bind {\alpha \ \beta : Type} : list \alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \text{list } \beta) \rightarrow \text{list } \beta
```

pure should create a singleton list. bind should apply its second argument to all the elements of the first argument and concatenate the resulting lists. Examples:

list.pure 7 = [7] list.bind [1, 2, 3] (λx , [x, 10 * x]) = [1, 10, 2, 20, 3, 30]

You may assume the following operator and functions are available, among others:

- ++ concatenates two lists;
- list.map applies its first argument elementwise to its second argument;
- list.flatten transforms a list of list into a flattened list formed by concatenating all the lists together.

Answer:

 λ a, [a]

 λ as f, list.flatten (list.map f as)

4b. Assume ma >>= f is syntactic sugar for list.bind ma f. Prove the first two monad laws:

```
lemma list.pure_bind {\alpha \ \beta : Type} (a : \alpha) (f : \alpha \rightarrow list \beta) :
(list.pure a >>= f) = f a
lemma list.bind_pure {\alpha : Type} (ma : list \alpha) :
(ma >>= list.pure) = ma
```

Your proofs should be step by step, with at most one rewrite rule or definition expansion per step, so that we can clearly see what happens.

You may assume reasonable lemmas about list.map and list.flatten. Please state them.

Answer:

For the first property:
 (list.pure a >>= f)
= ([a] >>= f) by definition of list.pure

- = list.flatten (list.map f [a]) by definition of list.bind
- = list.flatten [f a] by property of list.map
- = f a by property of list.flatten

For the second property: (ma >>= list.pure)

- = list.flatten (list.map list.pure ma) by definition of list.bind
- = list.flatten (list.map (λa , [a]) ma) by definition of list.pure
- = list.flatten (list.map (λa , [a]) ma) by definition of list.pure
- = ma by property list.flatten (list.map (λ a, [a]) as) = as, provable by induction

Question 5. The loopy language revisited (4+4+6 points)

5a. Implement the following repeat function in Lean. It takes a number n and a string s and returns the string obtained by concatenating n copies of s.

def repeat : $\mathbb{N} \to \texttt{string} \to \texttt{string}$

Answer:

| 0 _ := "" | (n + 1) s := s ++ repeat n s

5b. In mathematics, the Kleene star operator takes a string set A and returns the set of all the strings that are obtained by concatenating strings from A zero or more times. A natural way to model this in Lean is using an inductive predicate. Complete the following definition with the necessary introduction rules so that kleene_star A s is true if and only if string s is in the Kleene star of set A:

inductive kleene_star (A : set string) : string ightarrow Prop

Answer:

```
| empty : kleene_star ""
| step {s t} : s \in A \rightarrow kleene_star t \rightarrow kleene_star (s ++ t)
```

5c. Use the Kleene star to complete the following definition of the denotational semantics of the LOOPY language from question 3. The denotation of a LOOPY program should be the set of all strings it can output.

```
def denote : stmt \rightarrow set string
| (stmt.output s) := {s}
```

Recall that the Lean syntax for set comprehensions is $\{x \mid \varphi x\}$, where φx denotes some condition on x.

Answer:

| (stmt.choice S T) := denote S ∪ denote T
| (stmt.repeat S) := {s | kleene_star (denote S) s}

Question 6. Types and type classes (4+5+4 points)

6a. What are the types of the following expressions?

[1, 2, $(3 : \mathbb{Z})$] list \mathbb{N} list Sort 1

Answer:

```
list \mathbb Z Type Type \to Type (or Type u \to Type u) Sort 2
```

6b. The type class monoid of monoids is defined as follows in Lean:

```
class monoid (\alpha : Type) :=
(mul : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha)
(one : \alpha)
(mul_assoc : \forall a \ b \ c : \alpha, mul (mul a b) c = mul a (mul b c))
(one_mul : \forall a : \alpha, mul one a = a)
(mul_one : \forall a : \alpha, mul a one = a)
```

A list can be viewed as a monoid, with the empty list [] as one and list concatenation ++ as mul. Complete the following instantiation of list α as a monoid by providing a suitable definition of the five fields of the monoid. For each of the three properties, state the property to prove and very briefly explain why it holds.

```
instance string.monoid {\alpha : Type} : monoid (list \alpha) := { \cdots }
```

Answer:

```
{ mul := (++),
 one := [],
 mul_assoc :=
   the property is (a ++ b) ++ c = a ++ (b ++ c),
   i.e. associativity of append on lists, which holds
   (it can be proved by induction),
 mul_one :=
   the property is [] ++ a = a, which clearly holds
   (it is the first case of the definition of ++),
 one_mul :=
   the property is a ++ [] = a, which clearly holds
   (it can be proved by induction) }
```

6c. The type class group of groups is defined as follows in Lean:

class group (α : Type) := (mul : $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$) (one : α) (mul_assoc : \forall a b c : α , mul (mul a b) c = mul a (mul b c)) (one_mul : \forall a : α , mul one a = a) (mul_one : \forall a : α , mul a one = a) (inv : $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha$) (mul_left_inv : \forall a : α , mul (inv a) a = one)

Can the type list α be instantiated as a group, using the same definition for mul and one as in question 6b? Briefly explain your answer.

Answer:

No, this cannot be done, because there is no inverse xs for [a] such that [a] ++ xs = [].

The grade for the exam is the total amount of points divided by 10, plus 1.