

Machines Reasoning About Machines

Part 2

How to Model Machines and Prove Theorems about Code

J Strother Moore
Department of Computer Sciences
University of Texas at Austin

M1

An M1 *state* consists of:

- program counter (pc)
- local variables (locals)
- push down stack (stack)
- program to run (program)

ICONST 23 \Leftarrow *pc*

ILOAD 1

IADD

ISTORE 1

...

0 [17 12]
pc *locals*

stack

program

ICONST 23

ILOAD 1 $\Leftarrow pc$

IADD

ISTORE 1

...

1 [17 12]
pc *locals*

23
stack

program

2 [17 12]
pc *locals*

12
23
stack

ICONST 23
ILOAD 1
IADD $\Leftarrow pc$
ISTORE 1
...
program

ICONST 23

ILOAD 1

IADD

ISTORE 1 $\Leftarrow pc$

...

3 [17 12]
pc *locals*

35
stack

program

4 [17 35]
pc *locals*

stack

ICONST 23

ILOAD 1

IADD

ISTORE 1

... \Leftarrow *pc*

program

```
ICONST 23
ILOAD 1
IADD
ISTORE 1
...
```

4	[17 35]		
<i>pc</i>	<i>locals</i>	<i>stack</i>	<i>program</i>

If *locals*[1] is the variable *a*, then this is the compiled code for “*a* := 23+*a*;

Consider g

```
(defun g (n a)
  (if (zp n)
      a
      (g (- n 1) (* n a))))
```

The M1 Program

local 0 1

var name *n* *a*

```
(defconst *g*  
  ' ((ICONST 1)  
    (ISTORE 1)    ; a := 1  
    ...))
```

```
local      0    1
var name   n   a
```

```
; loop
  (ILOAD 0)
  (IFEQ 10)      ; if n=0 goto end
  (ILOAD 0)
  (ILOAD 1)
  (IMUL)
  (ISTORE 1)     ; a := n * a
  . . .
```

local 0 1
var name *n* *a*

(ILOAD 0)

(ICONST 1)

(ISUB)

(ISTORE 0) ; $n := n-1$

(GOTO -10) ; goto loop

; end

(ILOAD 1)

(HALT))) ; ‘return’ a

The Plan

Formalize M1 states and other basic utilities

Formalize the semantics of each instruction

Formalize the “fetch-execute” cycle

Formalizing M1

```
(defun make-state (pc locals stack program)
  (cons pc
        (cons locals
              (cons stack
                    (cons program
                          nil))))))
```

Formalizing M1

```
(defun make-state (pc locals stack program)
  (list pc locals stack program))
```

Formalizing M1

```
(defun make-state (pc locals stack program)
  (list pc locals stack program))
```

```
(defun pc (s) (nth 0 s))
```

```
(defun locals (s) (nth 1 s))
```

```
(defun stack (s) (nth 2 s))
```

```
(defun program (s) (nth 3 s))
```



```
(defun opcode (inst) (nth 0 inst))  
(defun arg1   (inst) (nth 1 inst))  
(defun arg2   (inst) (nth 2 inst))
```

```
(opcode '(ICONST 23)) ⇒ ICONST  
(arg1  '(ICONST 23)) ⇒ 23
```

```
(defun push (x stk) (cons x stk))
```

```
(defun top (stk) (car stk))
```

```
(defun pop (stk) (cdr stk))
```

```
(push 3 '(2 1)) ⇒ (3 2 1)
```

```
(top '(3 2 1)) ⇒ 3
```

```
(pop '(3 2 1)) ⇒ (2 1)
```

Aside We might:

```
(defthm top-push
  (equal (top (push e stk)) e))
```

```
(defthm pop-push
  (equal (pop (push e stk)) stk))
```

```
(in-theory (disable top pop push))
```

to hide the representation of stacks.

```
(defun do-inst (inst s)
  (if (equal (opcode inst) 'ICONST)
      (execute-ICONST inst s)
      (if (equal (opcode inst) 'ILOAD)
          (execute-ILOAD inst s)
          (if (equal (opcode inst) 'ISTORE)
              (execute-ISTORE inst s)
              (if (equal (opcode inst) 'IADD)
                  (execute-IADD inst s)
                  ...)))))
```

```
(defun execute-ICONST (inst s)
  (make-state (+ 1 (pc s))
              (locals s)
              (push (arg1 inst) (stack s))
              (program s)))
```

```
(defun execute-ILOAD (inst s)
  (make-state (+ 1 (pc s))
              (locals s)
              (push (nth (arg1 inst)
                        (locals s))
                    (stack s))
              (program s)))
```

```
(defun execute-ISTORE (inst s)
  (make-state (+ 1 (pc s))
              (update-nth (arg1 inst)
                          (top (stack s))
                          (locals s))
              (pop (stack s))
              (program s)))
```

```
(defun update-nth (n v x)
  (if (zp n)
      (cons v (cdr x))
      (cons (car x)
            (update-nth (- n 1) v (cdr x)))))
```

```
(update-nth 1 35 '(17 12)) ⇒ (17 35)
```



```
(defun execute-IMUL (inst s)
  (make-state (+ 1 (pc s))
    (locals s)
    (push (* (top (pop (stack s)))
             (top (stack s)))
          (pop (pop (stack s))))
    (program s)))
```

```
(defun execute-IFEQ (inst s)
  (make-state (if (equal (top (stack s)) 0)
                  (+ (arg1 inst) (pc s))
                  (+ 1 (pc s)))
              (locals s)
              (pop (stack s))
              (program s)))
```

```
(defun do-inst (inst s)
  (if (equal (opcode inst) 'ICONST)
      (execute-ICONST inst s)
      (if (equal (opcode inst) 'ILOAD)
          (execute-ILOAD inst s)
          (if (equal (opcode inst) 'ISTORE)
              (execute-ISTORE inst s)
              (if (equal (opcode inst) 'IADD)
                  (execute-IADD inst s)
                  ...)))))
```

```
(defun next-inst (s)
  (nth (pc s) (program s)))
```

```
(defun step (s)
  (do-inst (next-inst s) s))
```

```
(defun run (sched s)
  (if (endp sched)
      s
      (run (cdr sched) (step s))))
```

Sched is a “schedule” telling us how many steps to take.

Only its length matters.

Aside

In more sophisticated models, `sched` is a list of “thread identifiers” and tells us which thread to step next.

It may also specify “inputs” that arrive on a chip’s pins at that cycle.

It may also specify “non-deterministic” decisions for that cycle.

```
(defun run (sched s)
  (if (endp sched)
      s
      (run (cdr sched)
           (step s))))
```

```
(defun run (sched s)
  (if (endp sched)
      s
      (run (cdr sched)
           (step (car sched) s))))
```


Terminating Computations

When is a state halted?

```
(defun haltedp (s)
  (equal (step s) s))
```

How long does it take a program to halt?

```

' ((ICONST 1)      ; 0
  (ISTORE 1)      ; 1   a := 1
  (ILOAD 0)       ; 2   loop
  (IFEQ 10)       ; 3   if n=0 go end
  (ILOAD 0)       ; 4
  (ILOAD 1)       ; 5
  (IMUL)          ; 6
  (ISTORE 1)      ; 7   a := n*a
  (ILOAD 0)       ; 8
  (ICONST 1)      ; 9
  (ISUB)          ; 10
  (ISTORE 0)      ; 11  n := n-1
  (GOTO -10)      ; 12  go loop
  (ILOAD 1)       ; 13  end
  (HALT)))        ; 14  'return' a

```

```

' ( (ICONST 1)      ; 0
    (ISTORE 1)     ; 1   a := 1
    (ILOAD 0)      ; 2   loop
    (IFEQ 10)      ; 3   if n=0 go end
    (ILOAD 0)      ; 4
    (ILOAD 1)      ; 5
    (IMUL)         ; 6
    (ISTORE 1)     ; 7   a := n*a
    (ILOAD 0)      ; 8
    (ICONST 1)     ; 9
    (ISUB)         ; 10
    (ISTORE 0)     ; 11  n := n-1
    (GOTO -10)     ; 12  go loop
    (ILOAD 1)      ; 13  end
    (HALT)))       ; 14  'return' a

```

```

' ((ICONST 1)      ; 0
   (ISTORE 1)     ; 1   a := 1
   (ILOAD 0)      ; 2   loop
   (IFEQ 10)      ; 3   if n=0 go end
   (ILOAD 0)      ; 4
   (ILOAD 1)      ; 5
   (IMUL)         ; 6
   (ISTORE 1)     ; 7   a := n*a
   (ILOAD 0)      ; 8
   (ICONST 1)     ; 9
   (ISUB)         ; 10
   (ISTORE 0)     ; 11  n := n-1
   (GOTO -10)     ; 12  go loop
   (ILOAD 1)      ; 13  end
   (HALT)))      ; 14  'return' a

```

```

' ((ICONST 1)      ; 0
   (ISTORE 1)     ; 1   a := 1
   (ILOAD 0)      ; 2   loop
   (IFEQ 10)      ; 3   if n=0 go end
   (ILOAD 0)      ; 4
   (ILOAD 1)      ; 5
   (IMUL)         ; 6
   (ISTORE 1)     ; 7   a := n*a
   (ILOAD 0)      ; 8
   (ICONST 1)     ; 9
   (ISUB)         ; 10
   (ISTORE 0)     ; 11  n := n-1
   (GOTO -10)     ; 12  go loop
   (ILOAD 1)      ; 13  end
   (HALT)))      ; 14  'return' a

```

A Schedule for g

```
(defun g-sched (n)
  (ap (repeat 'TICK 2)
      (g-loop-sched n)))
```

```
(defun g-loop-sched (n)
  (if (zp n)
      (repeat 'TICK 3)
      (ap (repeat 'TICK 11)
          (g-loop-sched (- n 1)))))
```

Running g

```
(defun test-g (n)
  (top
    (stack
      (run (g-sched n)
            (make-state 0 (list n 0) nil *g*)))))
```

`(test-g 5) ⇒ 120`

Demo 1

M1 inherits a lot of power from ACL2.

We're executing about 360,000 instructions/sec on this laptop.

But how does M1 compare to the JVM?

Sun JVM Specification

ILOAD

Operation

Load `int` from local variable

Format (2 bytes)

ILOAD *index*

Form

21 (0x15)

Operand Stack

... \Rightarrow ..., value

Description

The *index* is an unsigned byte that must be an index into the local variable array of the current frame. The local variable at *index* must contain an `int`. The value of the local variable at *index* is pushed onto the operand stack.

Sun JVM Specification

ILOAD

Operation

Load `int` from local variable

Format (2 bytes)

ILOAD *index*

Form

21 (0x15)

Operand Stack

... \Rightarrow ..., value

Sun JVM Specification

ILOAD *typed!*

Operation

Load int from local variable

Format (2 bytes)

ILOAD *index*

Form

21 (0x15)

Operand Stack

... \Rightarrow ..., value

Sun JVM Specification

ILOAD

Operation *32-bit arithmetic!*

Load **int** from local variable

Format (2 bytes)

ILOAD *index*

Form

21 (0x15)

Operand Stack

... \Rightarrow ..., value

Sun JVM Specification

ILOAD

Operation

Load int from local variable

Format (2 bytes) *instruction stream*

ILOAD index is unparsed bytes

Form

21 (0x15)

Operand Stack

... \Rightarrow ..., value

Description *threads and method calls!*

The *index* is an unsigned byte that must be an index into the local variable array of the **current frame**. The local variable at *index* must contain an `int`. The value of the local variable at *index* is pushed onto the operand stack.

Comparison with the JVM

- specification style is very similar
- functionality is similar but the JVM is much richer
- M1 is missing procedure call (activation stack), Objects (heap), threads (thread table and monitors), and Exceptions
- M1 is missing class loading and verification

It is possible to “grow” M1 into a complete JVM. *But we don't have time to deal with them here!*

A High Level Language

It is easy to write a compiler from a simple language of `while` and assignments to M1 code.

We could verify that the compiler is correct.

But we don't have time to explore these issues here!

First Conclusion

Three advantages of operational semantics:

- relatively easy to formalize idiosyncratic custom languages
- easy to relate to implementation or an informal specification
- formal models are executable (highly desired by “customers”)

Our Next Goal

Learn how to prove M1 code correct.

Fact 1

Given an operational semantics, *symbolic execution* of code is just substitution-of-equals-for-equals, i.e., rewriting.

```

' ((ICONST 1) ; 0
  (ISTORE 1) ; 1 a := 1
  (ILOAD 0) ; 2 loop
  (IFLE 10) ; 3 if n=0 go end
  (ILOAD 0) ; 4
  (ILOAD 1) ; 5
  (IMUL) ; 6
  (ISTORE 1) ; 7 a := n*a
  (ILOAD 0) ; 8
  (ICONST 1) ; 9
  (ISUB) ; 10
  (ISTORE 0) ; 11 n := n-1
  (GOTO -10) ; 12 go loop
  (ILOAD 1) ; 13 end
  (HALT))) ; 14 'return' a

```

```

' ((ICONST 1) ; 0
  (ISTORE 1) ; 1 a := 1
  (ILOAD 0) ; 2 loop
  (IFLE 10) ; 3 if n=0 go end
  (ILOAD 0) ; 4 ← pc
  (ILOAD 1) ; 5
  (IMUL) ; 6
  (ISTORE 1) ; 7 a := n*a
  (ILOAD 0) ; 8
  (ICONST 1) ; 9
  (ISUB) ; 10
  (ISTORE 0) ; 11 n := n-1
  (GOTO -10) ; 12 go loop
  (ILOAD 1) ; 13 end
  (HALT))) ; 14 'return' a

```



```
(run (repeat 'TICK 9)
      (make-state 4      ;  $\Leftarrow$  pc
        (list n a)
        stk
        *g*))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 8)
      (step (make-state 4
                  (list n a)
                  stk
                  *g*)))))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 8)
      (step (make-state 4 ;  $\Rightarrow$  (ILOAD 0)
             (list n a)
             stk
             *g*)))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 8)
      (execute-ILOAD '(ILOAD 0)
                      (make-state 4
                                  (list n a)
                                  stk
                                  *g*)))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 8)
      (make-state 5
                  (list n a)
                  (push n stk)
                  *g*)))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 8)
      (make-state 5 ;  $\Rightarrow$  (ILOAD 1)
        (list n a)
        (push n stk)
        *g*))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 7)
      (make-state 6 ;  $\Rightarrow$  (IMUL)
        (list n a)
        (push a (push n stk))
        *g*))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 6)
      (make-state 7 ;  $\Rightarrow$  (ISTORE 1)
        (list n a)
        (push (* n a) stk)
        *g*))
```


=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 5)
      (make-state 8 ;  $\Rightarrow$  (ILOAD 0)
        (list n (* n a))
          stk
            *g*)))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 4)
      (make-state 9 ;  $\Rightarrow$  (ICONST 1)
        (list n (* n a))
        (push n stk)
        *g*))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 3)
      (make-state 10 ;  $\Rightarrow$  (ISUB)
        (list n (* n a))
        (push 1 (push n stk))
        *g*))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 2)
      (make-state 11 ;  $\Rightarrow$  (ISTORE 0)
        (list n (* n a))
        (push (- n 1) stk)
        *g*))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 1)
      (make-state 12 ;  $\Rightarrow$  (GOTO -10)
        (list (- n 1) (* n a))
          stk
          *g*)))
```

=

```
(run (repeat 'TICK 0)
      (make-state 2
                  (list (- n 1) (* n a))
                  stk
                  *g*))
```

=

```
(run nil  
  (make-state 2  
    (list (- n 1) (* n a))  
    stk  
    *g*))
```

=

```
(make-state 2  
          (list (- n 1) (* n a))  
          stk  
          *g*)
```


Demo 2

Theorem?

Provided n and a are natural numbers,

```
(equal (run (repeat 'TICK 9)
            (make-state 4
                        (list n a)
                        stk
                        *g*)))
      ???)
```

Fact 2

Concatenation (ap) (of schedules) is just *sequential composition*.

Theorem. `run-ap`
(equal (run (ap a b) s)
 (run b (run a s))))

Demo 3

Aside

Note that a virtue of having an operational semantics expressed in a formal logic is that we can prove theorems *about the semantics*, independent of any particular *program*.

Having proved run-ap, whenever the system encounters:

$$(\text{run } (\text{ap } \alpha \beta) \sigma)$$

it will replace it by

$$(\text{run } \beta (\text{run } \alpha \sigma))$$

I.e., decompose theorems with complicated schedules (created by ap) into symbolic runs of the pieces.

To Prove Code Correct

Proceed in two steps:

- Step 1: code implements algorithm – innermost loop first
- Step 2: algorithm implements specification

Step 2 doesn't involve code or the operational semantics.

Demo 4

Aside

We have *completely* characterized the effects of executing **g**.

- it is possible to prove partial correctness (“if **g** is halted then ...”)
- it is possible to prove correctness without characterizing every effect

- in security contexts, knowing every effect is often *very important*

Corollaries

Provided n is a natural number,

- $*g*$ “returns” ($! n$)
- $*g*$ halts after $(len (g-sched n))$ steps

It is also possible to prove that $*g*$ *never halts* if $n < 0$.

Second Conclusion

It is possible to reason mechanically about code under an operational semantics.

It is relatively easy to build a verification system for a custom language using a general-purpose theorem prover.

With care, this approach can be scaled to more complex models. Recall M6.

Next Time

How to drive ACL2.