Maude MSOS Tool

Fabricio Chalub and Christiano Braga

frosario@ic.uff.br / cbraga@ic.uff.br

Universidade Federal Fluminense

Outline

- Quick introduction to SOS and MSOS
- \bullet Overview of MSOS-SL and Maude MSOS Tool
- Rewriting logic
- \bullet MSOS-SL
- \bullet Example of formal verification with MMT
- •Behind the scenes
- \bullet Developments and future work

Modularity in operational semantics (i)

- SOS = structural operational semantics, also known as small-step operational semantics
- • Some practical problems with SOS: retracting previousrules.

Semantics of \bullet with an environment (ρ)

$$
\rho \vdash e_0 \to e'_0
$$
\n
$$
\rho \vdash e_0 \bullet e_1 \to e'_0 \bullet e_1
$$

Semantics of \bullet with an environment (ρ) and a store $(\sigma,\sigma^{\prime}% ,\sigma^{\prime})$)

$$
\frac{\rho \vdash \langle e_0, \sigma \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_0, \sigma' \rangle}{\rho \vdash \langle e_0 \bullet e_1, \sigma \rangle \rightarrow \langle e'_0 \bullet e_1, \sigma' \rangle}
$$

Modularity in operational semantics (ii)

Mosses' MSOS solves the modularity problem in structuraloperational semantics.

• Transition labels carry the semantic information associatedwith the computation.

$$
e_0 \xrightarrow{-x \to e'_0}
$$

$$
e_0 \bullet e_1 \xrightarrow{-x \to e'_0} e_1
$$

• Record components are environments, stores, etc., and areaccess using indices.

$$
e - {\rho = \rho_1[\rho_0], \ldots} \rightarrow e'
$$

 $\mathrm{let}\ \rho_0\ \mathrm{in}\ e\ \mathrm{end} -\{\rho=\rho_1,\ldots\}$ \rightarrow 0 in e end $-$ { $\rho = \rho_1, \ldots$ }→ let ρ_0 $_0$ in e $^\prime$ end

Maude MSOS Tool and MSOS-SL

MSOS-SL: the MSOS specification language, ^a conservativeextension of Maude system modules.

MSOS-Tool: the MSOS-SL executable environment, written inMaude.

With the Maude MSOS Tool it is possible to give formallyverifiable specifications for programming languages.

Maude and Rewriting Logic (RWL)

- A logical framework which can represent in ^a natural waymany different logics, languages, operational formalisms,and models of computation;
- Parameterized by an equational logic, membership equational logic;
- Specifications in rewriting logic are executable withCafeOBJ, ELAN, and Maude;
- Formal verification tools available in Maude: model checker, breadth-first search, theorem prover, Church-Rosser checker, and termination checker;

MSOS-SL

The ${\sf MSOS\text{-}SL}$ semantics of a language ${\cal L}$ has three distinct parts:

- syntax definition: where we specify the(abstract/concrete) syntax of $\cal L$
- •label declaration: where we specify the label composition.
- • dynamic rules: where the dynamics of the languageconstructions are specified.

MSOS-SL modules

MSOS-SL modules are written as:

```
(msos MODULE is [...] sosm)
```
MSOS-SL modules include other modules by the including keyword, such as:

- (msos A is
- including B .
- including C .

[...]sosm)

Order-sorted logic is able to represent ^a context-free grammar(Goguen et al.)

The syntax definition in $\mathsf{MSOS}\text{-}\mathsf{SL}$ is given in the algebraic way:

- Sorts are the counterpart of non-terminals.
- Term constructors are the counterpart of terminals.

(Infinite sets of terminals are, of course, represented by terms of some sort. For example, the natural numbers in Peano notation $s(s(s(s(0))))$, of sort Nat. Maude conveniently converts the Peano notation into decimal numbers.)

- Syntax definition uses the Maude constructions: sort, subsort, op (for the declaration of operators).
- Let us specify ^a simple ML-like let-in-end, as in:

 $let val x = 10 in x end$

The let expression has two distinct parts: the declaration of bindings and the <mark>expression</mark> to be executed.

$$
Exp ::= \textbf{let } \langle Dec \rangle \textbf{ in } \langle Exp \rangle \textbf{ end}
$$

 $\langle Dec \rangle$ and $\langle Exp \rangle$ will become sorts, and the <code>let-in-end</code> will became an operator.

We create ^a sort Exp for expressions and Dec for declarations in general.

```
sorts Dec Exp .
```
- A let expression is declared as follows:
- op let in end : Dec Exp -> Exp [ctor] .

ctor means that this operation is not ^a function, but ^aconstructor of terms. prec is the precedence we may assign tothis operator.

Mixfix syntax (underscores).

Identifiers are terms of the sort <mark>Id</mark>.

```
sort Id .
```
Declarations are defined as bindings from identifiers toconstants, obtained from the evaluation of expressions.

op val_ : ValueBind -> Dec [ctor].

Bindings are expressed as:

op= : Id Exp -> ValueBind [ctor] .

We declare the sort Value of the values expressible in our language. Since ^a value is also an expression, we have tosubsort Value to Exp. subsort Value < Exp .

By subsorting Nat to Value we make the naturals ^a primitive value of our programming language.

```
sort Value .subsort Nat < Value .We may now write:
op x : - Id .
let val x = 100 in x end.
```
We may give equational attributes to operators, such as associativity, commutativity and identity to further enhance oursyntax definition.

op $_,$: Exp Exp \rightarrow Exp [ctor assoc prec 100].

assoc indicates that this operation is associative prec indicates the precedence level of this operation

More complex constructions are possible using <mark>frozen</mark> arguments, gather patterns (for example to createleft-associative constructions), evaluation strategies (for example to create lazy-evaluation operations), and so on.

MSOS-SL: label declaration

Label indices are declared using the following keywords:

```
\mathtt{read-only} i : \tau .
\texttt{read-write} \hspace{0.2cm} i \hspace{0.2cm} : \hspace{0.2cm} \tau \hspace{0.2cm} .write-only i : \tau (e, bop) .
```
 i is the index name, and τ the sort of the values indexed by $i,$ referred to as *components*.

For WO indices, we must describe the monoid: identity element (e) and binary operation $(\mathrm{bop}).$

read-only env : Env .write-only out : Output (nil, append) .

MSOS-SL: components

Components are also specified as algebraic data types. In this example Env is the sort of environments, and BVal is the sort of "bindable values", along with associated operations.

sorts Env BVal .

```
op -U_: Env Env \rightarrow Env .
op find : Env Ide -> [BVal] .op - > : Ide BVal - Env [ctor].
op \frac{\pi}{2} : Env Env \rightarrow Env .
...
```
Writing [BVal] as the image sort of find makes this ^a partial function.

MSOS-SL: transitions

MSOS transitions are declared with syntax ctr, as follows:

ctr γ = α => γ $^\prime$ if \langle \langle \langle \rangle \langle \rangle .

 γ is the value-added syntax tree. α is the label expression.

Unconditional transitions: tr γ = α => γ $^{\prime}$.

Unobservable transitions: γ ==> γ $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$

 $\langle condition \rangle$: consists of a conjunction of transitions, written in the general form $\gamma = \alpha \implies \gamma$ conditions from Maude system modules. $^{\prime}$, together with the usual

MSOS-SL: label expressions

Labels are formed by a set of *fields* of the form $(i \; : \; C)$.

The sort IndexSet is defined as ^a subsort of ^a Label. This opens the possibility to create *label expressions* as in MSOS.

{(env : rho), (st : sigma), (st' : sigma'), IS},the variable IS, of sort IndexSet, matches against anyunspecified component.

Unobservable labels are identity labels of the sort ILabel, ^asubsort of Label, and their subsets are of the sort IIndexSet, ^a subsort of IndexSet.

MSOS-SL: transitions

As an example, let us give the semantics of the let expressiondefined earlier:

var X : Label . var IS : IndexSet var v : Value . vars D D' : Dec . vars E1 E'1 E2 E'2 : Exp . vars b rho rho' : Env .

ctr let D in $E2$ end = $X \Rightarrow$ let D' in $E2$ end if $D = X \Rightarrow D'$.

ctr let b in E end ={(env : rho), IS}=> let b in E' endif rho' := rho // b /\ E ={(env : rho'), IS}=> E'.

tr let b in v end $==$ v .

Syntax definition

```
sorts Prog Procs .op cml_ : Procs -> Prog [ctor] .op _||_ : Procs Procs -> Procs [ctor comm assoc] .op proc : PIde Exp -> Procs [ctor] .ops spawn channel send recv : -> Value [ctor] .The use of comm and assoc create an equivalent of a multiset.
```
Label declaration

```
read-write pides : PIdes .write-only create : Create (nilc, appendc) .read-write chans : Channels .write-only offer : Offers (nilo, appendo) .
```
Transition rulesctr (spawn f) ⁼ {(create' : C), (pides : PDS),(pides' : PDS'), IIS} => PIif $PI := newPIde$ (PDS) \wedge PDS' := $addPIde$ (PDS, PI) \wedge ^C := new-create (proc (PI, (f empty-tuple))) .ctr proc $(PI1, E1) = {(create' : nilc)}, IS$ => proc (PI1, E'1) || ^Pif E1 ={(create' : C), IS}=> E'1 /\ P := get1 (C) . ctr P1 || $P2 = X \implies P'1$ || $P2$ if $P1 = X \implies P'1$

```
Transition rulesctr channel empty-tuple={ (chans : chs), (chans' : chs'), IIS}=> chif ch := newChannel (chs) / \sqrt{ }chs' := addChannel (chs, ch) .
```

```
op snd : Channel Value -> Offer [ctor] .op rcv : Channel -> Offer [ctor] .
```

```
ctr send tuple (ch, v) = {(offer' : 0), IIS} = >empty-tupleif 0 := new-offer (snd (ch, v)).
```

```
op recv-ph : Channel -> Value [ctor] .
```
Maude MSOS Tool – p.22/30

ctr recovered at \mathcal{L} , or only if \mathcal{L} is a recovered at \mathcal{L} . In the corporation of c

```
Transition rulesctr P1 || P2 ={(offer' : nilo), IIS}=>P'1 || update-recv (P'2, v)if P1 ={(offer' : 01), IIS}=> P'1 /\

P2 ={(offer' : O2), IIS}=> P'2 /\o1 := get-offer (01) / \sqrt{2}o2 := get-offer (02) / \sqrt{2}agree (o1, o2) /\sqrt{ }v := \text{agree-value} (o1, o2).
```

```
ctr cml P = \{ (offer' : nilo), IS \} = > cnl P'if P = \{ (offer' : 0), IS \} = > P' / \cup 0 = nilo.
```
Formal verification. This search must find two final states (concurrent access to ^a memory location).(search exec (let val x "=" (ref $$(1))$ in spawn (fn y "=>" (x ":=" \$(2))) ;spawn (fn y "=>" $(x ":=" $(3)))$ end) \Rightarrow ! $C:Conf$.

```
Solution 1C:Conf \leftarrow \leftarrow cm1(proc(pide(0), pide(2))|
                       proc(pide(1),empty-tuple)||proc(pide(2),empty-tuple)),\{ \ldots (\text{st} : \langle [[\text{loc}(1),\text{$\$}(3)]] \rangle) \} >
```

```
Solution 2C:Conf \leftarrow \leftarrow \text{cm1}(proc(pide(0),side(2))||proc(pide(1),empty-tuple)||proc(pide(2),empty-tuple)),\{ \ldots (\text{st} : \langle [[\text{loc}(1),\text{$\$}(2)]] \rangle) \} >
```
No more solutions.

Formal verification. Concurrent sending / receiving. (search exec (let val ^c "=" channel !()in (spawn (fn x "=>" send $(c, $(10))$; spawn (fn ^x "=>" send !(c, \$(11))) ;recv c)end) \Rightarrow ! $C:Conf$.

```
Again, two final outcomes possible.Solution 1C:Conf \leftarrow \leftarrow \text{cm1}()proc(pide(0),$(10)) ||proc(pide(1),empty-tuple) ||
proc(pide(2), let ... in send tuple(chn(1),$(11) end),\{ \ldots \} >Solution 2C:Conf \leftarrow \leftarrow \text{cm1}()proc(pide(0),$(11)) ||proc(pide(1),let ... in send tuple(chn(1),$(10)) end)||proc(pide(2), empty-tuple)),{...} >
```
Implementing Maude MSOS Tool

Braga and Meseguer created Modular Rewriting Semantics (MRS), ^a novel method for the modular specification ofprogramming language semantics and defined (and proved correct) ^a mapping from MSOS to MRS. The work is based onthe joint work of Braga, Hæusler, Meseguer, and Mosses.

The Maude MSOS Tool was implemented based on thismapping and also by extending Full Maude, ^a Maude application that makes heavy use of Maude's reflectivecapabilities to create executable environments for languages, logics, etc.

Developments and future work

- MSOS-SL and MSDF
- Continuations
- Incremental MSOS specification