

A Semantics for Lazy Assertions

Olaf Chitil

University of
Kent

25th January 2011

Assertions in Functional Languages

```
assert nats [4,2]    ~> [4,2]
assert nats [4,-2]  ~> exception
```

Assertion application is a partial identity.

```
assert :: Assertion t -> t -> t
nats   :: Num t => Assertion [t]
```

Note: Contract = Assertion + Blaming

Lazy Assertions ...

... work with non-strict functions and infinite data structures.

```
fibs :: [Integer]
fibs = assert nats (0 : 1 : zipWith (+) fibs (tail fibs))
```

Need to consider partial values:

```
assert nats (0:1:⊥)      ⇔ 0:1:⊥
assert nats (0:1:1:⊥)   ⇔ 0:1:1:⊥
assert nats (0:1:1:2:⊥) ⇔ 0:1:1:2:⊥
```

Any approximation of an acceptable value has to be accepted!

The Problem

```
let x = assert equal (True,False)
in (fst x, snd x)  $\rightsquigarrow$  exception
```

but

```
(fst (assert equal (True,False)),
  snd (assert equal (True,False)))  $\rightsquigarrow$  (True, False)
```

Because $(\text{True}, \perp) \sqsubseteq (\text{True}, \text{True})$
 $(\perp, \text{False}) \sqsubseteq (\text{False}, \text{False})$ have to be accepted.

The Problem

```
let x = assert equal (True,False)
in (fst x, snd x)   $\rightsquigarrow$   (True, error "...")  or
                             (error "...", False)
```

but

```
(fst (assert equal (True,False)),
  snd (assert equal (True,False)))   $\rightsquigarrow$   (True,
                                                    False)
```

Because $(\text{True}, \perp) \sqsubseteq (\text{True}, \text{True})$ and $(\perp, \text{False}) \sqsubseteq (\text{False}, \text{False})$ have to be accepted.

Hence: First define semantics, then derive an implementation.

Resulting Lazy Assertions: List of natural numbers

```
nats :: Assert [Integer]
nats = aList (pred (>=0))
```

```
aList :: Assert t -> Assert [t]
aList a = aNil <|> aCons a (aList a)
```

Resulting Lazy Assertions: Minimal list length

```
lengthAtLeast :: Int -> Assert [t]
lengthAtLeast 0      = aAny
lengthAtLeast (n+1) = aCons aAny (lengthAtLeast n)

initAverage :: [Int] -> Int
initAverage = assert (lengthAtLeast 5 |-> aAny) initAverage'

initAverage' xs = sum (take 5 xs) 'div' 5
```

Resulting Lazy Assertions: Logic Example

Data type for formulae:

```
data Form = Imp Form Form | And Form Form |  
          Or Form Form | Not Form | Atom Char
```

Assertions for conjunctive normal form:

```
conjNF, disj, lit, atom :: Assert Form
```

```
conjNF = aAnd conjNF conjNF <|> disj
```

```
disj = aOr disj disj <|> lit
```

```
lit = aNot atom <|> atom
```

```
atom = aAtom aAny
```

Conjunctive normal form with left-associated operators:

```
leftConjNF :: Assert Form
```

```
leftConjNF = conjNF <&> left
```


Axioms of Semantics

Write $\langle a \rangle : D \rightarrow D$ for semantics of **assert** a .

Domain D is directed complete partial order with \perp .

Definition

Acceptance set $\llbracket a \rrbracket := \{v \in D \mid \langle a \rangle v = v\} \subseteq D$.

Definition

a is **lazy assertion**, if

- 1 $\langle a \rangle : D \rightarrow D$ is a continuous function,
- 2 a is **trustworthy**, that is, $\langle a \rangle v \in \llbracket a \rrbracket$ for any value v ,
(equivalent: a is idempotent)
- 3 $\langle a \rangle$ is a **partial identity**, that is, $\langle a \rangle v \sqsubseteq v$ for any value v , and
- 4 $\llbracket a \rrbracket$ is a lower set.

Definition

A function $p : D \rightarrow D$ on a domain D is a **projection** if it is

- continuous,
- idempotent, and
- a partial identity.

Lemma

a is lazy assertion $\Leftrightarrow \langle a \rangle$ is projection and its image is a lower set

(cf. Findler & Blume, FLOPS 2006)

Definition

$$\downarrow\{v\} := \{v' \mid v' \sqsubseteq v\}$$

$$A_v := \downarrow\{v\} \cap A$$

Theorem

$\llbracket a \rrbracket_v$ is an ideal (lower & directed)

$$\langle a \rangle v = \bigsqcup \llbracket a \rrbracket_v$$

Definition

A set $A \subseteq D$ is a **lazy domain** if

- A is lower,
- A contains the least upper bound of any directed subset, and
- $A_v = \downarrow\{v\} \cap A$ is directed for all values $v \in D$.

Lemma

If a is a lazy assertion, then $\llbracket a \rrbracket$ is a lazy domain.

Theorem

If A is a lazy domain, then a with

$$\langle a \rangle v := \bigsqcup \llbracket a \rrbracket_v$$

is a lazy assertion with $\llbracket a \rrbracket = A$.

Definition

$$\llbracket \text{aNone} \rrbracket := \{\perp\}$$

$$\llbracket \text{aAny} \rrbracket := D$$

Derived assertion applications

$$\langle \text{aNone} \rangle v = \bigsqcup \llbracket \text{aNone} \rrbracket_v = \bigsqcup \downarrow\{v\} \cap \{\perp\} = \bigsqcup \{\perp\} = \perp$$

$$\langle \text{aAny} \rangle v = \bigsqcup \llbracket \text{aAny} \rrbracket_v = \bigsqcup \downarrow\{v\} \cap D = \bigsqcup \downarrow\{v\} = v$$

Definition

$$\llbracket a \langle \& \rangle b \rrbracket := \llbracket a \rrbracket \cap \llbracket b \rrbracket$$

Lemma Conjunction of assertions is commutative and associative and has the assertion **aAny** as neutral element.

Lemma (Conjunction equals two assertions)

$$\langle a \langle \& \rangle b \rangle v = \langle a \rangle (\langle b \rangle v)$$

Assertion Combinators: Disjunction

Not $\llbracket a \vee b \rrbracket := \llbracket a \rrbracket \cup \llbracket b \rrbracket$

because $\llbracket a \vee b \rrbracket_v = (\downarrow\{v\} \cap \llbracket a \rrbracket) \cup (\downarrow\{v\} \cap \llbracket b \rrbracket)$ not directed.

Definition

$$\llbracket a \langle | \rangle b \rrbracket := \bigcap \{ Y \mid \llbracket a \rrbracket \cup \llbracket b \rrbracket \subseteq Y, Y \text{ lazy domain} \}$$

Attention!

$$D = \{\perp, (\perp, \perp), (\text{True}, \perp), (\text{False}, \perp), \dots, (\text{False}, \text{False})\}$$

$$\llbracket \text{fstTrue} \rrbracket = D \setminus \{(\text{False}, \perp), (\text{False}, \text{True}), (\text{False}, \text{False})\}$$

$$\llbracket \text{fstTrue} \langle | \rangle \text{sndTrue} \rrbracket = D$$

$$\llbracket (\text{fstTrue} \langle \& \rangle \text{sndTrue}) \langle | \rangle (\text{fstFalse} \langle \& \rangle \text{sndFalse}) \rrbracket = D$$

Lemma Disjunction of assertions is commutative and associative and has the assertion `aNone` as neutral element.

Bounded Distributive Lattice of Assertions

Lemma (Absorption laws)

$$a \langle \& \rangle (a \langle | \rangle b) = a$$

$$a \langle | \rangle (a \langle \& \rangle b) = a$$

Lemma (Distributive laws)

$$a \langle | \rangle (b \langle \& \rangle c) = (a \langle | \rangle b) \langle \& \rangle (a \langle | \rangle c)$$

$$a \langle \& \rangle (b \langle | \rangle c) = (a \langle \& \rangle b) \langle | \rangle (a \langle \& \rangle c)$$

Theorem Lazy assertions form a bounded distributive lattice with meet $\langle \& \rangle$, join $\langle | \rangle$, least element \mathbf{aNone} and greatest element \mathbf{aAny} . The ordering is the subset-relationship on acceptance sets.

Corollary (Idempotency laws)

$$a \langle \& \rangle a = a$$

$$a \langle | \rangle a = a$$

No Negation

Let $\llbracket a \rrbracket := \{\perp, (\perp, \perp)\}$

$a \ll \neg a = \mathbf{aNone}$ implies $\llbracket a \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \neg a \rrbracket = \{\perp\}$.

$\llbracket \neg a \rrbracket$ must be a lower set.

So $\llbracket \neg a \rrbracket = \{\perp\}$.

But then $\llbracket a \ll \neg a \rrbracket = \llbracket a \rrbracket$.

Contradiction to $a \ll \neg a = \mathbf{aAny}$.

Deriving an Implementation: Primitive Data Types

Flat domain, i.e., $v \sqsubset w$ implies $v = \perp$.

Definition (Acceptance set of predicate assertion)

$$\llbracket \phi \rrbracket := \{\perp\} \cup \{v \mid \phi v = \text{True}\}$$

Derive application of assertion predicate:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi \rangle v &= \bigsqcup \downarrow \{v\} \cap \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \\ &= \bigsqcup \{\perp, v\} \cap (\{\perp\} \cup \{w \mid \phi w = \text{True}\}) \\ &= \bigsqcup \{\perp\} \cup (\text{if } \phi v \text{ then } \{v\} \text{ else } \{\}) \\ &= \text{if } \phi v \text{ then } v \text{ else } \perp \end{aligned}$$

Note: $\{\perp\} \cup \{v \mid \phi v \neq \text{False}\}$ as acceptance set is un-implementable.

Primitive Data Types: Conjunction & Disjunction

Expected definitions:

$$\phi \langle \& \rangle \psi := \lambda x. \phi x \wedge \psi x$$

$$\phi \langle | \rangle \psi := \lambda x. \phi x \vee \psi x$$

Verify they work:

$$\llbracket \phi \langle \& \rangle \psi \rrbracket = \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \psi \rrbracket = \{v \mid \phi v \wedge \psi v\}$$

$$\llbracket \phi \langle | \rangle \psi \rrbracket = \bigcap \{X \mid \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \subseteq X, X \text{ lazy domain}\}$$

$$= \bigcap \{X \mid \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \subseteq X\}$$

$$= \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \psi \rrbracket = \{v \mid \phi v \vee \psi v\}$$

Negation is possible:

$$\neg \phi := \lambda x. \neg(\phi x)$$

Deriving an Implementation: Algebraic Data Types

Definition (Acceptance set for pattern assertion)

$$\llbracket C \ a_1 \dots a_n \rrbracket := \{\perp\} \cup \{C \ v_1 \dots v_n \mid v_1 \in \llbracket a_1 \rrbracket \dots v_n \in \llbracket a_n \rrbracket\}$$

Lemma (Conjunction of constructor assertions)

$$\begin{aligned} (C \ a_1 \dots a_n) \langle \& \rangle (C \ b_1 \dots b_n) &= C \ (a_1 \langle \& \rangle b_1) \dots (a_n \langle \& \rangle b_n) \\ (C \ a_1 \dots a_n) \langle \& \rangle (C' \ b_1 \dots b_n) &= \text{pNone} \qquad \text{if } C \neq C' \end{aligned}$$

Lemma (Disjunction of constructor assertions)

$$(C \ a_1 \dots a_n) \langle | \rangle (C \ b_1 \dots b_n) = C \ (a_1 \langle | \rangle b_1) \dots (a_n \langle | \rangle b_n)$$

Also if $C \neq C'$, then

$$\llbracket (C \ a_1 \dots a_n) \langle | \rangle (C' \ b_1 \dots b_n) \rrbracket = \llbracket C \ a_1 \dots a_n \rrbracket \cup \llbracket C' \ b_1 \dots b_n \rrbracket$$

Assertion Representation and Application

Representation of constructor assertion

$$C_1 \bar{a}_1 \langle | \rangle C_2 \bar{a}_2 \langle | \rangle \dots \langle | \rangle C_m \bar{a}_m$$

where $\{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ is subset of all data constructors of the type.

Application of a constructor assertion

$$\langle C_1 \bar{a}_1 \langle | \rangle \dots \langle | \rangle C_m \bar{a}_m \rangle (C \bar{v}) = \begin{cases} C (\langle \bar{a}_j \rangle \bar{v}) & \text{if } C = C_j \\ \perp & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
$$\langle C_1 \bar{a}_1 \langle | \rangle \dots \langle | \rangle C_m \bar{a}_m \rangle \perp = \perp$$

Algebraic Data Types

Conjunction

$$\begin{aligned} & (C_{i_1} \bar{a}_{i_1} \langle | \rangle \dots \langle | \rangle C_{i_m} \bar{a}_{i_m}) \langle \& \rangle (C_{j_1} \bar{b}_{j_1} \langle | \rangle \dots \langle | \rangle C_{j_l} \bar{b}_{j_l}) \\ = & C_{k_1} (\bar{a}_{k_1} \langle \& \rangle \bar{b}_{k_1}) \langle | \rangle \dots \langle | \rangle C_{k_o} (\bar{a}_{k_o} \langle \& \rangle \bar{b}_{k_o}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\{k_1, \dots, k_o\} = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \cap \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$

Disjunction

$$\begin{aligned} & (C_{i_1} \bar{a}_{i_1} \langle | \rangle \dots \langle | \rangle C_{i_m} \bar{a}_{i_m}) \langle | \rangle (C_{j_1} \bar{b}_{j_1} \langle | \rangle \dots \langle | \rangle C_{j_l} \bar{b}_{j_l}) \\ = & C_{k_1} \bar{z}_{k_1} \langle | \rangle \dots \langle | \rangle C_{k_o} \bar{z}_{k_o} \end{aligned}$$

where $\{k_1, \dots, k_o\} = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$

$$z_{k_s} = \begin{cases} \bar{a}_{k_s} \langle | \rangle \bar{b}_{k_s} & \text{if } k_s \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \cap \{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \\ \bar{a}_{k_s} & \text{if } k_s \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \setminus \{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \\ \bar{b}_{k_s} & \text{if } k_s \in \{j_1, \dots, j_l\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \end{cases}$$

What about Function Types?

Function Assertion $a \mapsto b$

Standard definition of assertion application:

$$\langle a \mapsto b \rangle \delta = \lambda x. \langle b \rangle (\delta(\langle a \rangle x))$$

But

$$\llbracket a \mapsto b \rrbracket = \{ \delta \mid \langle b \rangle \circ \delta \circ \langle a \rangle = \delta \}$$

is **not a lower set!** However,

$$\{ \delta \mid \forall v \in \llbracket a \rrbracket. \delta v \in \llbracket b \rrbracket \}$$

is a lazy domain.

Need two acceptance sets, for argument and context.

(cf. Findler & Blume, FLOPS 2006)

Semantics

- Only few axioms: functional, trustworthy, partial identity, lower set.
- Acceptance sets $\llbracket a \rrbracket$ are lazy domains, subdomains.
- Algebra of assertions: bounded distributive lattice.

Lazy Assertions

- Derived as library from semantics.
- Laziness restricts expressibility!
- Pattern assertions similar to algebraic data types; subtypes!
- Pattern assertions are efficient.

Future

- Assertions to express non-strictness properties.
- (Dependent?) function assertion semantics.

Example: Normalisation of $\langle \& \rangle$

Formula in conjunctive normal form with left-associated binary operators:

```
conjNF = aAnd conjNF conjNF <|> aOr disj disj <|> aNot atom <|>
        aAtom aAny
```

```
left = aImp left noImp <|> aAnd left noAnd <|> aOr left noOr <|>
       aNot left <|> aAtom aAny
```

Combined:

```
leftConjNF = conjNF <&> left
            = aAnd (conjNF <&> left) (conjNF <&> noAnd) <|>
              aOr (disj <&> left) (disj <&> noOr) <|>
              aNot (atom <&> left) <|>
              aAtom (aAny <&> aAny)
```