


CSI - A Calculus for Information Systems (2023/24)

Class 1 — About FM

Global picture


Concerning software 'engineering':



Formal methods provide an answer to the question mark above.

Global picture

Concerning software 'engineering':



Credits: Zhenjiang Hu, NII, Tokyo JP

Have you ever used a FM?

Of course you have! Check this:

A problem

*My three children
were born at a 3 year
interval rate.*

*Altogether, they are
as old as me. I am 48.
How old are they?*

A model

$$x + (x + 3) + (x + 6) = 48$$

— maths description of the problem.

Some calculations

$$3x + 9 = 48$$

$$\equiv \quad \{ \text{"al-djabr" rule} \}$$

$$3x = 48 - 9$$

$$\equiv \quad \{ \text{"al-hatt" rule} \}$$

$$x = 16 - 3$$

The solution

$$x = 13$$

$$x + 3 = 16$$

$$x + 6 = 19$$

Have you ever used a FM?

Of course you have! Check this:

A problem

*My three children
were born at a 3 year
interval rate.*

*Altogether, they are
as old as me. I am 48.*

How old are they?

A model

$$x + (x + 3) + (x + 6) = 48$$

— maths description of the problem.

Some calculations

$$3x + 9 = 48$$

$$\equiv \quad \{ \text{"al-djabr" rule} \}$$

$$3x = 48 - 9$$

$$\equiv \quad \{ \text{"al-hatt" rule} \}$$

$$x = 16 - 3$$

The solution

$$x = 13$$

$$x + 3 = 16$$

$$x + 6 = 19$$

Have you ever used a FM?

Of course you have! Check this:

A problem

*My three children
were born at a 3 year
interval rate.*

*Altogether, they are
as old as me. I am 48.
How old are they?*

A model

$$x + (x + 3) + (x + 6) = 48$$

— maths description of the problem.

Some calculations

$$3x + 9 = 48$$

$$\equiv \quad \{ \text{"al-djabr" rule} \}$$

$$3x = 48 - 9$$

$$\equiv \quad \{ \text{"al-hatt" rule} \}$$

$$x = 16 - 3$$

The solution

$$x = 13$$

$$x + 3 = 16$$

$$x + 6 = 19$$

Have you ever used a FM?

Of course you have! Check this:

A problem

*My three children
were born at a 3 year
interval rate.*

*Altogether, they are
as old as me. I am 48.
How old are they?*

A model

$$x + (x + 3) + (x + 6) = 48$$

— maths description of the problem.

Some calculations

$$3x + 9 = 48$$

$$\equiv \quad \{ \text{"al-djabr" rule} \}$$

$$3x = 48 - 9$$

$$\equiv \quad \{ \text{"al-hatt" rule} \}$$

$$x = 16 - 3$$

The solution

$$x = 13$$


$$x + 3 = 16$$

$$x + 6 = 19$$

Have you ever used a FM?

"Al-djabr" rule ? "al-hatt" rule ?

al-djabr

$$x - \textcircled{z} \leq y \equiv x \leq y + \textcircled{z}$$


al-hatt

$$x * \textcircled{z} \leq y \equiv x \leq y * \textcircled{z^{-1}} \quad (z > 0)$$


These rules that you have used so many times were discovered by Persian mathematicians, notably by Al-Huwarizmi (9c AD).

NB: "algebra" stems from "al-djabr" and "algarismo" from Al-Huwarizmi.

Software problems

Now, suppose the **problem** was

Please write a program to list the students of my class ordered by their marks.

Is there a mathematical **model** for this problem?

Yes, of course there is — see aside:

$$\text{sort} \subseteq \frac{\text{bag}}{\text{bag}} \cap \frac{\text{true}}{\text{sorted}}$$

where

sorted = ... marks ...

bag =

But,

- what do $X \cap Y$, $\frac{f}{g}$... mean here?
- Is there an “**algebra**” for such symbols?

Yes — Wait and see :-)

Software problems

Now, suppose the **problem** was

*Please write a
program to list the
students of my class
ordered by their
marks.*

Is there a mathematical
model for this problem?

Yes, of course there is — see
aside:

$$\text{sort} \subseteq \frac{\text{bag}}{\text{bag}} \cap \frac{\text{true}}{\text{sorted}}$$

where

sorted = ... marks ...

bag =

But,

- what do $X \cap Y$, $\frac{f}{g}$... mean here?
- Is there an “**algebra**” for such symbols?

Yes — Wait and see :-)

Software problems

Now, suppose the **problem** was

*Please write a
program to list the
students of my class
ordered by their
marks.*

Is there a mathematical
model for this problem?

Yes, of course there is — see
aside:

$$\text{sort} \subseteq \frac{\text{bag}}{\text{bag}} \cap \frac{\text{true}}{\text{sorted}}$$

where

sorted = ... marks ...

bag =

But,

- what do $X \cap Y$, $\frac{f}{g}$... mean here?
- Is there an “**algebra**” for such symbols?

Yes — Wait and see :-)

Software problems

Now, suppose the **problem** was

*Please write a
program to list the
students of my class
ordered by their
marks.*

Is there a mathematical
model for this problem?

Yes, of course there is — see
aside:

$$\text{sort} \subseteq \frac{\text{bag}}{\text{bag}} \cap \frac{\text{true}}{\text{sorted}}$$

where

sorted = ... marks ...


bag =

But,


- what do $X \cap Y$, $\frac{f}{g}$... mean here?
- Is there an “**algebra**” for such symbols?

Yes — Wait and see :-)


FM — scientific software design



FM — simplified life-cycle



Notation matters!



*Are you sure there isn't a simpler means of writing
'The Pharaoh had 10,000 soldiers?'*

Credits: Cliff B. Jones 1980 [2]

Well-known FM notations / tools / resources

Just a sample, as there are many — follow the links (in alphabetic order):

Notations:

- Alloy
- B-Method
- JML
- mCRL2
- SPARK-Ada
- TLA+
- VDM
- Z


Tools:

- Alloy 4
- Coq
- Frama-C
- NuSMV
- Overture

Resources:

- Formal Methods Europe
- Formal Methods wiki (Oxford)

60+ years ago (1958-)



Hoare Logic — “turning point” (1968)

Floyd-Hoare logic for **program correctness** dates back to 1968:

Summary.

This paper illustrates the manner in which the axiomatic method may be applied to the rigorous definition of a programming language. It deals with the dynamic aspects of the behaviour of a program, which is an aspect considered to be most far removed from traditional mathematics. However, it appears that the axiomatic method not only shows how programming is closely related to traditional branches of logic and mathematics, but also formalises the techniques which may be used to prove the correctness of a program over its intended area of application.

(ADB/IFIP/1164;1456)

Inv/pre/post

Starting where (pure) **functions** stop:

```
[Prelude> :{  
[Prelude| get :: [a] -> (a, [a])  
[Prelude| get x = (head x, tail x)  
[Prelude| :}  
[Prelude>  
[Prelude> get [1..10]  
(1,[2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10])  
[Prelude> get [1]  
(1,[])  
[Prelude> get []  
(*** Exception: Prelude.head: empty list
```


Inv/pre/post

Error handling...

```
[Prelude> get [] = Nothing ; get x = Just (head x, tail x)
[Prelude> get []
Nothing
[Prelude> get [1]
Just (1, [])
[Prelude> :t get
get :: [a] -> Maybe (a, [a])
Prelude>
```

Inv/pre/post

Pre-conditions?

```
get :: [a] -> (a, [a])  
pre x = x /= []  
get x = (head x, tail x)
```

Not everything is a **list**, a **tree** or a **stream**...

```
get :: {a} -> (a, {a})  
pre x = x /= {}  
get x = let a = choice x  
        in (a, x - {a})
```

Inv/pre/post

pre...? choice...?

- Non-determinism
- Parallelism
- Abstraction

Inv/pre/post

pre...? choice...?

- Non-determinism
- Parallelism
- Abstraction


Functions not enough!

Solution?

Relations (*which extend functions*)



Is “everything” a relation?



How to “dematerialize” them?

Software is pre-science — **formal** but not fully **calculational**

Software is too diverse — many approaches, lack of unity






Software is too wide a concept — from assembly to quantum programming

Can you think of a **unified** theory able to express and reason about software *in general*?


Put in another way:

Is there a “lingua franca” for the software sciences?

Check the pictures...





Check the pictures



(Wikipedia: **Pride and Prejudice**, by Jane Austin, 1813.)

Check the pictures



Check the pictures

Which **graphical** device have you found **common** to **all** pictures?



Arrows everywhere

Arrows! Thus we identify a (graphical) ingredient **common** to describing (several) **different** fields of human activity.

For this ingredient to be able to support a **generic** theory of systems, mind the remarks:

- We need a **generic** notation able to cope with very distinct problem domains, e.g. **process** theory versus **database** theory, for instance.
- Notation is not enough — we need to **reason** and **calculate** about software.
- Semantics-rich **diagram** representations are welcome.
- System description may have a **quantitative** side too.

Class 2 — Going Relational

Relation algebra

In previous courses you may have used **predicate logic**, **finite automata**, **grammars** etc to capture the meaning of real-life problems.

Question:

*Is there a unified formalism for **formal modelling**?*

Relation algebra

Historically, predicate logic was **not** the first to be proposed:


- Augustus de Morgan (1806-71) — recall *de Morgan* laws — proposed a **Logic of Relations** as early as 1867.
- Predicate logic appeared later.



Perhaps de Morgan was right in the first place: in real life, “everything is a **relation**” ...

Everything is a relation...

... as diagram



shows. (Wikipedia: **Pride and Prejudice**, by Jane Austen, 1813.)


Arrow notation for relations

The picture is a collection of **relations** — vulg. a **semantic network** — elsewhere known as a (binary) **relational system**.

However, in spite of the use of **arrows** in the picture (aside) not many people would write

$mother_of : People \rightarrow People$

as the **type** of **relation**
 $mother_of$.



Pairs

Consider assertions

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \leq & \pi \\ \text{Catherine} & \text{isMotherOf} & \text{Anne} \\ 3 & = (1+) & 2 \end{array}$$

They are statements of fact concerning various kinds of object — real numbers, people, natural numbers, etc

They involve **two** such objects, that is, **pairs**

$$\begin{array}{c} (0, \pi) \\ (\text{Catherine}, \text{Anne}) \\ (3, 2) \end{array}$$

respectively.

Sets of pairs

So, we might have written instead:

$$\begin{aligned}(0, \pi) &\in \leqslant \\ (\text{Catherine}, \text{Anne}) &\in \textit{isMotherOf} \\ (3, 2) &\in (1+)\end{aligned}$$

What are (\leqslant) , *isMotherOf*, $(1+)$?

- they could be regarded as **sets of pairs**
- better: they should be regarded as **binary relations**.

Therefore,

- **orders** — eg. (\leqslant) — are special cases of relations
- **functions** — eg. $\textit{succ} = (1+)$ — are special cases of relations.

Binary Relations

Binary relations are typed:

Arrow notation. Arrow $A \xrightarrow{R} B$ denotes a binary relation from A (source) to B (target).

A, B are types.

Writing

$$B \xleftarrow{R} A$$

means the same as

$$A \xrightarrow{R} B .$$

Notation

Infix notation

*The usual infix notation used in natural language — eg. **Catherine isMotherOf Anne** — and in maths — eg.*

$0 \leq \pi$ — extends to arbitrary $B \xleftarrow{R} A$: we write


$b R a$

to denote that $(b, a) \in R$.

Binary relations are matrices

Binary relations can be regarded as Boolean **matrices**, eg.

Relation R :



Matrix M :

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0


In this case $A = B = \{1..11\}$. Relations $A \xleftarrow{R} A$ over a single type are also referred to as (directed) **graphs**.

Alloy: where “everything is a relation”

Declaring binary
relation $A \xrightarrow{R} B$
is **Alloy** (aside).

Alloy is a tool
designed at MIT
(<http://alloy.mit.edu/alloy>)

We shall be using
Alloy [1] in this
course.



The screenshot shows the Alloy Analyzer 4.1.10 application window. The title bar reads "Alloy Analyzer 4.1.10". Below the title bar is a menu bar with icons and labels for "New", "Open", "Reload", "Save", "Execute", and "Show". The main area is a code editor with the following text:

```
-- Declaring R: A-> B in Alloy  
  
sig B {}  
  
sig A { R : B }  
  
-- Checking that R exists  
  
run { some R }
```

At the bottom of the window, a status bar indicates "Line 10, Column 16 [modified]".

Functions are relations

Lowercase letters (or identifiers starting by one such letter) will denote special relations known as **functions**, eg. f , g , succ , etc.

We regard **function** $f : A \longrightarrow B$ as the binary relation which relates b to a iff $b = f\ a$. So,

$$b\ f\ a \text{ literally means } b = f\ a \quad (1)$$


Therefore, we generalize

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{c} B \xleftarrow{f} A \\ b = f\ a \end{array}} \quad \text{to} \quad \boxed{\begin{array}{c} B \xleftarrow{R} A \\ b\ R\ a \end{array}}$$

Exercise

Taken from PROPOSITIONES AD ACUENDOS IUUENES (“Problems to Sharpen the Young”), by abbot Alcuin of York († 804):

XVIII. PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO.
*Homo quidam debebat ultra fluuium transferre lupum,
 capram, et fasciculum cauli. Et non potuit aliam nauem
 inuenire, nisi quae duos tantum ex ipsis ferre ualebat.
 Praeceptum itaque ei fuerat, ut omnia haec ultra illaesa
 omnino transferret. Dicat, qui potest, quomodo eis
 illaesis transire potuit?*



Exercise

XVIII. FOX, GOOSE AND BAG OF BEANS PUZZLE. *A farmer goes to market and purchases a fox, a goose, and a bag of beans. On his way home, the farmer comes to a river bank and hires a boat. But in crossing the river by boat, the farmer could carry only himself and a single one of his purchases - the fox, the goose or the bag of beans. (If left alone, the fox would eat the goose, and the goose would eat the beans.) Can the farmer carry himself and his purchases to the far bank of the river, leaving each purchase intact?*

Identify the main **types** and **relations** involved in the puzzle and draw them in a diagram.

Home work



- How would you address this problem?
- Try and write an Alloy for it (sig's only)

NB: You can seek help from ChatGPT — but please be critical...

```
1  abstract sig Item {}
2  one sig Fox, Goose, Beans extends Item {}
3
4  abstract sig Location {}
5  one sig InitialBank, FarBank extends Location {}
6
7  sig Boat {
8      passengers: set Item
9  }
10
11 // Predicates to define the constraints
12 pred farmerCanCross[boat: Boat] {
13     // Farmer must be on the boat
14     Fox in boat.passengers or Goose in boat.passengers or Beans in boat.passengers
15 }
16
17 pred foxAndGooseSafe[boat: Boat] {
18     // Fox and Goose cannot be left alone together
19     Fox in boat.passengers implies not (Goose in boat.passengers)
20 }
```

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Data types:

$$\textit{Being} = \{\textit{Farmer}, \textit{Fox}, \textit{Goose}, \textit{Beans}\} \quad (2)$$


$$\textit{Bank} = \{\textit{Left}, \textit{Right}\} \quad (3)$$

Relations:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \textit{Being} & \xrightarrow{\textit{Eats}} & \textit{Being} \\ & \downarrow \textit{where} & \\ & \textit{Bank} & \xrightarrow{\textit{cross}} \textit{Bank} \end{array} \quad (4)$$

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Specification source written in Alloy:




The screenshot shows the Alloy Analyzer 4.1.10 window. The title bar reads "Alloy Analyzer 4.1.10". The menu bar includes "New", "Open", "Reload", "Save", "Execute", and "Show". The main text area contains the following Alloy specification:

```
abstract sig Being {  
  Eats : Being,  
  where : Bank  
}  
  
one sig Fox, Goose, Beans, Farmer extends Being {}  
  
abstract sig Bank { cross: Bank }  
  
one sig Left, Right extends Bank {}  
  
-- Checking  
  
run { some Eats && some where }
```

The status bar at the bottom indicates "Line 13, Column 12 [modified]".


PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Diagram of specification (model) given by Alloy:



PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Diagram of instance of the model given by Alloy:



Silly instance, why? — specification too **loose**...

Composition

Recall **function composition** (aside).

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 B & \xleftarrow{f} & A & \xleftarrow{g} & C \\
 & \searrow & & \swarrow & \\
 & & f \cdot g & &
 \end{array} \quad (5)$$


We extend $f \cdot g$ to relational composition $R \cdot S$ in the obvious way:

$$b = f(g \ c)$$

$$b(R \cdot S)c \equiv \langle \exists a :: b R a \wedge a S c \rangle$$

Composition

That is:



$$b(R \cdot S)c \equiv \langle \exists a :: b R a \wedge a S c \rangle \quad (6)$$

Example: $Uncle = Brother \cdot Parent$, that expands to

$$u \text{ Uncle } c \equiv \langle \exists p :: u \text{ Brother } p \wedge p \text{ Parent } c \rangle$$

Note how this rule *removes* \exists when applied from right to left.

Notation $R \cdot S$ is said to be **point-free** (no variables, or points).

Check generalization

Back to functions, (6) becomes¹

$$\begin{aligned}
 b(f \cdot g)c &\equiv \langle \exists a :: b f a \wedge a g c \rangle \\
 &\equiv \{ a g c \text{ means } a = g c (1) \} \\
 &\quad \langle \exists a :: b f a \wedge a = g c \rangle \\
 &\equiv \{ \exists\text{-trading (184)} ; b f a \text{ means } b = f a (1) \} \\
 &\quad \langle \exists a : a = g c : b = f a \rangle \\
 &\equiv \{ \exists\text{-one point rule (188)} \} \\
 &\quad b = f(g c)
 \end{aligned}$$

So, we easily recover what we had before (5).

¹Check the appendix on predicate calculus.

Relation inclusion

Relation inclusion generalizes function equality:

Equality *on functions*

$$f = g \equiv \langle \forall a :: f\ a = g\ a \rangle \quad (7)$$

generalizes to **inclusion** *on relations*:

$$R \subseteq S \equiv \langle \forall b, a : b\ R\ a : b\ S\ a \rangle \quad (8)$$

(read $R \subseteq S$ as “ R is at most S ”).

Inclusion is **typed**:

For $R \subseteq S$ to hold both R and S need to be of the same **type**,
say $B \xleftarrow{R,S} A$.

Relation inclusion

$R \subseteq S$ is a partial order, that is, it is

reflexive,

$$id \subseteq R \tag{9}$$

transitive

$$R \subseteq S \wedge S \subseteq Q \Rightarrow R \subseteq Q \tag{10}$$

and **antisymmetric**:

$$R \subseteq S \wedge S \subseteq R \equiv R = S \tag{11}$$

Therefore:

$$R = S \equiv \langle \forall b, a :: b R a \equiv b S a \rangle \tag{12}$$

Special relations

Every type $B \longleftarrow A$ has its

- **bottom** relation $B \xleftarrow{\perp} A$, which is such that, for all b, a ,
 $b \perp a \equiv \text{FALSE}$
- **topmost** relation $B \xleftarrow{\top} A$, which is such that, for all b, a ,
 $b \top a \equiv \text{TRUE}$

Every type $A \longleftarrow A$ has the

- **identity** relation $A \xleftarrow{id} A$ which is nothing but function
 $id\ a = a$ (13)

Clearly, for every R ,

$$\perp \subseteq R \subseteq \top \quad (14)$$

Relational equality

Both (12) and (11) establish **relation equality**, resp. in PW/PF fashion.

Rule (11) is also called “ping-pong” or **cyclic inclusion**, often taking the format

$$\begin{array}{c}
 R \\
 \subseteq \quad \{ \text{...} \} \\
 S \\
 \subseteq \quad \{ \text{...} \} \\
 R \\
 :: \quad \{ \text{“ping-pong” (11)} \} \\
 R = S
 \end{array}$$

Indirect relation equality

Most often we prefer an *indirect* way of proving relation equality:

Indirect equality rules:

$$R = S \equiv \langle \forall X :: (X \subseteq R \equiv X \subseteq S) \rangle \quad (15)$$

$$\equiv \langle \forall X :: (R \subseteq X \equiv S \subseteq X) \rangle \quad (16)$$

Compare with eg. equality of sets in discrete maths:

$$A = B \equiv \langle \forall a :: a \in A \equiv a \in B \rangle$$

Indirect relation equality


The typical layout is e.g. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} X \subseteq R \\ \equiv \{ \dots \} \\ X \subseteq \dots \\ \equiv \{ \dots \} \\ X \subseteq S \\ \vdots \{ \text{indirect equality (15)} \} \\ R = S \\ \square \end{array} \right.$

Diagrams

Assertions of the form $X \subseteq Y$ where X and Y are relation compositions can be represented graphically by square-shaped diagrams, see the following exercise.

Exercise 1: Let $a S n$ mean: “student a is assigned number n ”. Using (6) and (8), check that assertion


$S \cdot \geq \subseteq T \cdot S$ depicted by diagram



means that numbers are assigned to students sequentially. \square

Diagrams (“magic squares”)

Pointfree:



$$S \cdot R \subseteq P \cdot Q$$

Pointwise:

$$\begin{array}{c} \exists \\ \vdots \\ S \cdot R \\ \vdots \\ \forall \end{array} \begin{array}{c} a \\ \vdots \\ b \end{array} \Rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ P \cdot Q \\ \vdots \\ b \end{array} \begin{array}{c} d \\ \vdots \\ c \end{array}$$

Exercises

Exercise 2: Use (6) and (8) and predicate calculus to show that

$$R \cdot id = R = id \cdot R \quad (17)$$

$$R \cdot \perp = \perp = \perp \cdot R \quad (18)$$

hold and that composition is associative:

$$R \cdot (S \cdot T) = (R \cdot S) \cdot T \quad (19)$$

□

Exercise 3: Use (7), (8) and predicate calculus to show that

$$f \subseteq g \equiv f = g$$

holds (moral: for functions, inclusion and equality coincide). □

(**NB:** see the appendix for a compact set of rules of the predicate calculus.)

Converses

Every relation $B \xleftarrow{R} A$ has a **converse** $B \xrightarrow{R^\circ} A$ which is such that, for all a, b ,

$$a(R^\circ)b \equiv b R a \quad (20)$$

Note that converse commutes with composition

$$(R \cdot S)^\circ = S^\circ \cdot R^\circ \quad (21)$$

and with itself:

$$(R^\circ)^\circ = R \quad (22)$$


Converse captures the **passive voice**: *Catherine eats the apple* — $R = (\text{eats})$ — is the same as *the apple is eaten by Catherine* — $R^\circ = (\text{is eaten by})$.

Function converses

Function converses f°, g° etc. always exist (as **relations**) and enjoy the following (very useful!) property,

$$(f \ b)R(g \ a) \equiv b(f^\circ \cdot R \cdot g)a \quad (23)$$

cf. diagram:



Therefore (tell why):

$$b(f^\circ \cdot g)a \equiv f \ b = g \ a \quad (24)$$

Let us see an example of using these rules.

Class 3 — The “Zoo” of Binary Relations

PF-transform at work

Transforming a well-known PW-formula into PF notation:

f is **injective**

$\equiv \{ \text{recall definition from discrete maths} \}$

$\langle \forall y, x : (f\ y) = (f\ x) : y = x \rangle$

$\equiv \{ (24) \text{ for } f = g \}$

$\langle \forall y, x : y(f^\circ \cdot f)x : y = x \rangle$

$\equiv \{ (23) \text{ for } R = f = g = id \}$

$\langle \forall y, x : y(f^\circ \cdot f)x : y(id)x \rangle$

$\equiv \{ \text{go pointfree (8) i.e. drop } y, x \}$

$f^\circ \cdot f \subseteq id$

The other way round

Now check what $id \subseteq f \cdot f^\circ$ means:

$$id \subseteq f \cdot f^\circ$$

$$\equiv \{ \text{relational inclusion (8)} \}$$

$$\langle \forall y, x : y(id)x : y(f \cdot f^\circ)x \rangle$$

$$\equiv \{ \text{identity relation ; composition (6)} \}$$

$$\langle \forall y, x : y = x : \langle \exists z :: y f z \wedge z f^\circ x \rangle \rangle$$

$$\equiv \{ \text{\(\forall\)-one point (187) ; converse (20)} \}$$

$$\langle \forall x :: \langle \exists z :: x f z \wedge x f z \rangle \rangle$$

$$\equiv \{ \text{trivia ; function } f \}$$

$$\langle \forall x :: \langle \exists z :: x = f z \rangle \rangle$$

$$\equiv \{ \text{recalling definition from maths} \}$$

f is **surjective**

Why *id* (really) matters



Terminology:

- Say R is reflexive iff $id \subseteq R$
pointwise: $\langle \forall a :: a R a \rangle$ (check as homework);
- Say R is coreflexive (or *diagonal*) iff $R \subseteq id$
pointwise: $\langle \forall b, a : b R a : b = a \rangle$ (check as homework).

Define, for $B \xleftarrow{R} A$:

Kernel of R	Image of R
$A \xleftarrow{\ker R} A$ $\ker R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R^\circ \cdot R$	$B \xleftarrow{\text{img } R} B$ $\text{img } R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cdot R^\circ$

Alloy: checking for coreflexive relations



Kernels of functions

Meaning of $\ker f$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & a'(\ker f)a \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{substitution} \} \\
 & a'(f^\circ \cdot f)a \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{rule (24)} \} \\
 & f a' = f a
 \end{aligned}$$

In words: $a'(\ker f)a$ means a' and a “have the same f -image”.

Exercise 4: Let K be a nonempty data domain, $k \in K$ and \underline{k} be the “everywhere k ” function:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \underline{k} & : A \longrightarrow K \\
 \underline{k} a & = k
 \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$


Compute which relations are defined by the following expressions:

$$\ker \underline{k}, \quad \underline{b} \cdot \underline{c}^\circ, \quad \text{img } \underline{k} \quad (26)$$

□

Binary relation taxonomy

Topmost criteria:



Definitions:

	<i>Reflexive</i>	<i>Coreflexive</i>
$\ker R$	<i>entire R</i>	<i>injective R</i>
$\text{img } R$	<i>surjective R</i>	<i>simple R</i>

(27)


Facts:

$$\ker (R^\circ) = \text{img } R \quad (28)$$

$$\text{img } (R^\circ) = \ker R \quad (29)$$

Binary relation taxonomy

The whole picture:



Exercise 5: Resort to (28,29) and (27) to prove the following rules of thumb:

- converse of **injective** is **simple** (and vice-versa)
- converse of **entire** is **surjective** (and vice-versa)




The same in Alloy

A lone \rightarrow B	A \rightarrow some B	A \rightarrow lone B	A some \rightarrow B
injective	entire	simple	surjective
A lone \rightarrow some B	A \rightarrow one B	A some \rightarrow lone B	
representation	function	abstraction	
A lone \rightarrow one B		A some \rightarrow one B	
injection		surjection	
A one \rightarrow one B			
bijection			


(Courtesy of Alcino Cunha.)

Exercises


Exercise 6: Label the items (uniquely) in these drawings²




General
Function



Injective
Not surjective



Surjective
Not injective



Bijjective
(injective and
surjective)

and compute, in each case, the **kernel** and the **image** of each relation.
Why are all these relations **functions**? ☐

²Credits: <http://www.matematikaria.com/unit/injective-surjective-bijective.html>.

Exercises

Exercise 7: Prove the following fact

A relation f is a bijection iff its converse f° is a function (31)

by completing:


$$\begin{aligned}
 & f \text{ and } f^\circ \text{ are functions} \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \dots \} \\
 & (id \subseteq \ker f \wedge \text{img } f \subseteq id) \wedge (id \subseteq \ker (f^\circ) \wedge \text{img } (f^\circ) \subseteq id) \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \dots \} \\
 & \vdots \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \dots \} \\
 & f \text{ is a bijection}
 \end{aligned}$$



Taxonomy using matrices

Recall that binary relations can be regarded as Boolean **matrices**, eg.

Relation R :



Matrix M :

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

Taxonomy using matrices

- **entire** — at least one 1 in every column (32)
- **surjective** — at least one 1 in every row (33)
- **simple** — at most one 1 in every column (34)
- **injective** — at most one 1 in every row (35)
- **bijective** — exactly one 1 in every column and every row. (36)

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Exercise 8: Let relation $Bank \xrightarrow{cross} Bank$ (4) be defined by:

Left cross Right
Right cross Left

It therefore is a bijection. Why? \square

Exercise 9: Check which of the following properties,

simple, entire,
injective,
surjective,
reflexive,
coreflexive

<i>Eats</i>	<i>Fox</i>	<i>Goose</i>	<i>Beans</i>	<i>Farmer</i>
<i>Fox</i>	0	1	0	0
<i>Goose</i>	0	0	1	0
<i>Beans</i>	0	0	0	0
<i>Farmer</i>	0	0	0	0

hold for relation *Eats* (4) above (“food chain” $Fox > Goose > Beans$).

\square

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Exercise 10: Relation $\textit{where} : \textit{Being} \rightarrow \textit{Bank}$ should obey the following constraints:

- *everyone is somewhere in a bank*
- *no one can be in both banks at the same time.*

Express such constraints in relational terms. Conclude that \textit{where} should be a **function**. \square


Exercise 11: There are only two **constant** functions (25) in the type $\textit{Being} \longrightarrow \textit{Bank}$ of \textit{where} . Identify them and explain their role in the puzzle. \square

Exercise 12: Two functions f and g are bijections iff $f^\circ = g$, recall (31). Convert $f^\circ = g$ to point-wise notation and check its meaning. \square

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Adding detail to the previous **Alloy** model (aside)

(More about Alloy syntax and semantics later.)



```

/Users/jno/work/barq.als

New Open Reload Save Execute Show

abstract sig Being {
  Eats : set Being,    -- Eats is a relation
  where : one Bank     -- where is a function
}

one sig Fox, Goose, Beans, Farmer extends Being {}

abstract sig Bank { cross: one Bank } -- cross is a function

one sig Left, Right extends Bank {}

fact {
  Eats = Fox -> Goose + Goose -> Beans
  cross = Left -> Right + Right -> Left -- a bijection
}

-- Checking

run {}
  
```

Line 20, Column 7 [modified]

Functions in one slide

Recapitulating: a **function** f is a binary relation such that

Pointwise	Pointfree	
“Left” Uniqueness		
$b \, f \, a \wedge b' \, f \, a \Rightarrow b = b'$	$\text{img } f \subseteq \text{id}$	(f is simple)
Leibniz principle		
$a = a' \Rightarrow f \, a = f \, a'$	$\text{id} \subseteq \text{ker } f$	(f is entire)

NB: Following a widespread convention, functions will be denoted by lowercase characters (eg. f , g , ϕ) or identifiers starting with lowercase characters, and function application will be denoted by juxtaposition, eg. $f \, a$ instead of $f(a)$.

Functions, relationally

(The following properties of any function f are **extremely** useful.)

Shunting rules:

$$f \cdot R \subseteq S \equiv R \subseteq f^\circ \cdot S \quad (37)$$

$$R \cdot f^\circ \subseteq S \equiv R \subseteq S \cdot f \quad (38)$$

Equality rule:

$$f \subseteq g \equiv f = g \equiv f \supseteq g \quad (39)$$

Rule (39) follows from (37,38) by “cyclic inclusion” (next slide).


Proof of functional equality rule (39)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f \subseteq g \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{identity} \} \\
 & f \cdot \text{id} \subseteq g \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{shunting on } f \} \\
 & \text{id} \subseteq f^\circ \cdot g \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{shunting on } g \} \\
 & \text{id} \cdot g^\circ \subseteq f^\circ \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{converses; identity} \} \\
 & g \subseteq f
 \end{aligned}$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f = g \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{cyclic inclusion (11)} \} \\
 & f \subseteq g \wedge g \subseteq f \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{aside} \} \\
 & f \subseteq g \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{aside} \} \\
 & g \subseteq f \\
 & \square
 \end{aligned}$$

Dividing functions

$$\frac{f}{g} = g^\circ \cdot f \quad cf. \quad (40)$$


Exercise 13: Check the properties:

$$\frac{f}{id} = f \quad (41)$$

$$\frac{f}{f} = \ker f \quad (43)$$

$$\frac{f \cdot h}{g \cdot k} = k^\circ \cdot \frac{f}{g} \cdot h \quad (42)$$

$$\left(\frac{f}{g}\right)^\circ = \frac{g}{f} \quad (44)$$

□

Exercise 14: Infer $id \subseteq \ker f$ (f is total) and $\text{img } f \subseteq id$ (f is simple) from the shunting rules (37) or (38). □

Dividing functions

By (23) we have:

$$b \frac{f}{g} a \equiv g b = f a \quad (45)$$

How useful is this? Think of the following sentence:

Mary lives where John was born.

By (45), this can be expressed by a division:

$$\text{Mary} \frac{\text{birthplace}}{\text{residence}} \text{John} \equiv \text{residence Mary} = \text{birthplace John}$$

In general,

$$b \frac{f}{g} a \text{ means "the } g \text{ of } b \text{ is the } f \text{ of } a \text{".}$$

Endo-relations

A relation $A \xrightarrow{R} A$ whose input and output types coincide is called an

endo-relation.

This special case of relation is gifted with an extra **taxonomy** and many **applications**.

We have already seen them: $\ker R$ and $\text{img } R$ are **endo-relations**.

Graphs, orders, the identity, equivalences and so on are all **endo-relations** as well.

Taxonomy of endo-relations

Besides

$$\text{reflexive:} \quad \text{iff } id \subseteq R \quad (46)$$

$$\text{coreflexive:} \quad \text{iff } R \subseteq id \quad (47)$$

an endo-relation $A \xleftarrow{R} A$ can be

$$\text{transitive:} \quad \text{iff } R \cdot R \subseteq R \quad (48)$$

$$\text{symmetric:} \quad \text{iff } R \subseteq R^\circ (\equiv R = R^\circ) \quad (49)$$

$$\text{anti-symmetric:} \quad \text{iff } R \cap R^\circ \subseteq id \quad (50)$$

$$\text{irreflexive:} \quad \text{iff } R \cap id = \perp$$

$$\text{connected:} \quad \text{iff } R \cup R^\circ = \top \quad (51)$$


where, in general, for R, S of the same type:

$$b (R \cap S) a \equiv b R a \wedge b S a \quad (52)$$

$$b (R \cup S) a \equiv b R a \vee b S a \quad (53)$$

Taxonomy of endo-relations

Combining these criteria, endo-relations $A \xleftarrow{R} A$ can further be classified as



Taxonomy of endo-relations

In summary:

- **Preorders** are reflexive and transitive orders.
Example: $\text{age } y \leq \text{age } x$.
- **Partial** orders are anti-symmetric preorders
Example: $y \subseteq x$ where x and y are sets.
- **Linear** orders are connected partial orders
Example: $y \leq x$ in \mathbb{N}
- **Equivalences** are symmetric preorders
Example: $\text{age } y = \text{age } x$.³
- **Pers** are partial equivalences
Example: $y \text{ IsBrotherOf } x$.

³Kernels of functions are always equivalence relations, see exercise 21.

Exercises

Exercise 15: Consider the relation

$b R a \equiv$ *team b is playing against team a at the moment*

Is this relation: reflexive? irreflexive? transitive? anti-symmetric?
symmetric? connected? ☐

Exercise 16: Check which of the following properties,

transitive, symmetric, anti-symmetric, connected

hold for the relation *Eats* of exercise 9. ☐

Exercises

Exercise 17: A relation R is said to be **co-transitive** or **dense** iff the following holds:


$$\langle \forall b, a : b R a : \langle \exists c : b R c : c R a \rangle \rangle \quad (54)$$

Write the formula above in PF notation. Find a relation (eg. over numbers) which is co-transitive and another which is not. \square

Exercise 18: Expand criteria (48) to (51) to pointwise notation. \square

Exercises

Exercise 19: The teams (T) of a football league play games (G) at home or away, and every game takes place in some date:




Moreover, (a) No team can play two games on the same date; (b) All teams play against each other but not against themselves; (c) For each home game there is another game away involving the same two teams. Show that

$$id \subseteq \frac{\text{away}}{\text{home}} \cdot \frac{\text{away}}{\text{home}} \quad (55)$$

captures one of the requirements above (which?) and that (55) amounts to forcing $\text{home} \cdot \text{away}^\circ$ to be symmetric. \square

Formalizing ER diagrams


So-called “**Entity-Relationship**” (ER) diagrams are commonly used to capture relational information, e.g.⁴



ER-diagrams can be **formalized** in $A \xrightarrow{R} B$ notation, see e.g. the following relational algebra (RA) diagram.

⁴Credits: <https://dba.stackexchange.com/questions>.

Exercise



(56)

Exercise 20: Looking at diagram (56),

- Specify the property: *mentors of students necessarily are among their teachers.*
- Specify the relation R between students and teachers such that $t R s$ means: *t is the mentor of s and also teaches one of her/his courses.*



Class 4 — Meet and Join

Meet and join

Recall **meet** (intersection) and **join** (union), introduced by (52) and (53), respectively.

They lift pointwise conjunction and disjunction, respectively, to the pointfree level.

Their meaning is nicely captured by the following **universal** properties:


$$X \subseteq R \cap S \equiv X \subseteq R \wedge X \subseteq S \quad (57)$$

$$R \cup S \subseteq X \equiv R \subseteq X \wedge S \subseteq X \quad (58)$$

NB: recall the generic notions of **greatest lower bound** and **least upper bound**, respectively.

In summary

Type $B \longleftarrow A$ forms a lattice:



“top”

join, lub (“least upper bound”)

meet, glb (“greatest lower bound”)

“bottom”

How universal properties help

Using (57) i.e.

$$X \subseteq R \cap S \equiv \left\{ \begin{array}{l} X \subseteq R \\ X \subseteq S \end{array} \right.$$

as example, similarly for (58).

Cancellation

$(X := R \cap S)$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} R \cap S \subseteq R \\ R \cap S \subseteq S \end{array} \right. \quad (59)$$

$R \cap T = R$ why? Use
indirect equality

$$X \subseteq R \cap T \equiv \{ \text{universal property} \}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} X \subseteq R \\ X \subseteq T \end{array} \right.$$

$$\equiv \{ T \text{ is above anything} \}$$

$$X \subseteq R$$

$$\therefore \{ \text{indirect equality} \}$$

$$R \cap T = R$$

How universal properties help

Meet and join have other expected properties, e.g.

associativity

$$(R \sqcap S) \sqcap Q = R \sqcap (S \sqcap Q)$$

again proved aside by indirect equality.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & X \subseteq (R \sqcap S) \sqcap Q \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \sqcap\text{-universal (57) twice} \} \\
 & (X \subseteq R \wedge X \subseteq S) \wedge X \subseteq Q \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \wedge \text{ is associative} \} \\
 & X \subseteq R \wedge (X \subseteq S \wedge X \subseteq Q) \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \sqcap\text{-universal (57) twice} \} \\
 & X \subseteq R \sqcap (S \sqcap Q) \\
 \therefore & \quad \{ \text{indirection (15)} \} \\
 & (R \sqcap S) \sqcap Q = R \sqcap (S \sqcap Q) \\
 & \square
 \end{aligned}$$

Distributivity

As we will prove later, **composition** distributes over **union**

$$R \cdot (S \cup Q) = (R \cdot S) \cup (R \cdot Q) \quad (60)$$

$$(S \cup Q) \cdot R = (S \cdot R) \cup (Q \cdot R) \quad (61)$$

while distributivity over **intersection** is side-conditioned:

$$(S \cap Q) \cdot R = (S \cdot R) \cap (Q \cdot R) \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} Q \cdot \text{img } R \subseteq Q \\ \vee \\ S \cdot \text{img } R \subseteq S \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

$$R \cdot (Q \cap S) = (R \cdot Q) \cap (R \cdot S) \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} (\ker R) \cdot Q \subseteq Q \\ \vee \\ (\ker R) \cdot S \subseteq S \end{cases} \quad (63)$$

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Back to our running example, we specify:

Being at the same bank:

$$\text{SameBank} = \ker \text{where} = \frac{\text{where}}{\text{where}}$$

Risk of somebody eating somebody else:

$$\text{CanEat} = \text{SameBank} \cap \text{Eats}$$

Then

"Starvation" is ensured by Farmer present at the same bank:

$$\text{CanEat} \subseteq \text{SameBank} \cdot \underline{\text{Farmer}} \quad (64)$$

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

By (37), “starvation” property (64) converts to:

$$\textit{where} \cdot \textit{CanEat} \subseteq \textit{where} \cdot \underline{\textit{Farmer}}$$

In this version, (64) can be depicted as a ‘magic square’:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \textit{Being} & \xleftarrow{\textit{CanEat}} & \textit{Being} \\
 \textit{where} \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow \underline{\textit{Farmer}} \\
 \textit{Bank} & \xleftarrow{\textit{where}} & \textit{Being}
 \end{array} \tag{65}$$

This “reads” in a nice way:

where (somebody) *CanEat* (somebody else) (that’s)
where (the) *Farmer* (is).

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Properties which —
such as (65) — are
desirable and must
always hold are
called **invariants**.

See aside the
'starvation'
invariant (65)
written in **Alloy**.

```

abstract sig Being {
  Eats : set Being,           -- Eats is a relation
  where : one Bank,          -- where is a function
  CanEat, SameBank: set Being -- both are relations
}

one sig Fox, Goose, Beans, Farmer extends Being {}

abstract sig Bank { cross: one Bank } -- cross is a function

one sig Left, Right extends Bank {}

fact {
  Eats      = Fox -> Goose + Goose -> Beans
  cross     = Left -> Right + Right -> Left -- a bijection
  SameBank  = where . ~where               -- an equivalence relation
  CanEat    = SameBank & Eats
}

-- Finding instances satisfying the invariant

run { CanEat . where in (Being->Farmer) . where }


```

Line 21, Column 47 [modified]

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Carefully observe
instance of such an
invariant (aside):


- *SameBank* is an **equivalence** — exactly the **kernel** of *where*
- *Eats* is simple but not transitive
- *cross* is a **bijection**
- *CanEat* is empty
- etc



PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Another instance of the same invariant, in which:

- *CanEat* is **not** empty (*Fox* can eat *Goose*!)
- but *Farmer* is on the same bank :-)



Why is *SameBank* an equivalence?

Recall that *SameBank* = *ker where*. Then *SameBank* is an **equivalence relation** by the exercise below.

Exercise 21: Knowing that property

$$f \cdot f^\circ \cdot f = f \tag{66}$$

holds for every function f , prove that $\ker f = \frac{f}{f}$ (43) is an **equivalence relation**. \square

Equivalence relations expressed in this way are captured in natural language by the textual pattern


$a(\ker f)b$ means “ a and b have the same f ”

which is very common in requirements.

Class 5a – Exploring “magic squares”

'Magic square' patterns

Recall




$$S \cdot R \subseteq P \cdot Q$$

... i.e. the pointwise:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \exists \\
 \begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & a & & d & & \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
 S & \cdot & R & \Rightarrow & P & \cdot & Q \\
 \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\
 \forall & b & c & & b & & c
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$


“D. Acácia grocery”



Find “magic square” for property:

Coupons cannot be used beyond their expiry date.

“D. Acácia grocery”




Find “magic square” for property:

Coupons can only be used by clients who own them.

'Magic square' patterns

Now consider the special case



$$f \cdot (\sqsubseteq) \subseteq (\sqsubseteq) \cdot f$$

where (\sqsubseteq) and (\sqsubseteq) are preorders.

'Magic square' patterns

Do we need...

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \exists \\
 \vdots \\
 f \cdot (\sqsubseteq) \\
 \vdots \\
 \forall \quad b
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 \vdots \\
 \vdots \\
 a'
 \end{array}
 \Rightarrow
 \begin{array}{c}
 b' \\
 \vdots \\
 (\leq) \cdot f \\
 \vdots \\
 b
 \end{array}
 \quad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \vdots \\
 a'
 \end{array}$$

as before?

‘Magic square’ patterns

No — for **functions** things are much easier:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f \cdot (\sqsubseteq) \subseteq (\leqslant) \cdot f \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ (37) \} \\
 & (\sqsubseteq) \subseteq f^\circ \cdot (\leqslant) \cdot f \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ (23) \} \\
 & \langle \forall a, a' : a \sqsubseteq a' : f\ a \leqslant f\ a' \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$


In summary,

$$f \cdot (\sqsubseteq) \subseteq (\leqslant) \cdot f \tag{67}$$

states that f is a **monotonic** function.

'Magic square' patterns

Now consider yet another special case:



$$f \subseteq (\leq) \cdot g$$

Likewise, $f \subseteq (\leq) \cdot g$ will unfold to

$$\langle \forall a :: f\ a \leq g\ a \rangle$$

meaning that

f is **pointwise-smaller** than g wrt. (\leq) .

'Magic square' patterns

Now consider yet another special case:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{id} & A \\
 f \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow g \\
 B & \xleftarrow{(\leq)} & B
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 f \subseteq (\leq) \cdot g$$


Likewise, $f \subseteq (\leq) \cdot g$ will unfold to

$$\langle \forall a :: f\ a \leq g\ a \rangle$$

meaning that

f is **pointwise-smaller** than g wrt. (\leq) .

$$f \leqslant g$$



Usual abbreviation: $f \leqslant g \equiv f \subseteq (\leqslant) \cdot g$.

Relational patterns: the pre-order $f^\circ \cdot (\leq) \cdot f$

Given a **preorder** (\leq) , a function f function taking values on the carrier set of (\leq) , define

$$(\leq_f) = f^\circ \cdot (\leq) \cdot f$$

It is easy to show that:

$$b \leq_f a \equiv (f\ b) \leq (f\ a)$$

That is, we compare **objects** a and b with respect to their **attribute** f .

Exercise 22:

1. Show that (\leq_f) is a **preorder**.
2. Show that (\leq_f) is not (in general) a total order even in the case (\leq) is so.



Exercises

Exercise 23: As generalization of exercise 1, draw the most general “magic square” that accommodates relational assertion:

$$M \cdot R^\circ \subseteq T \cdot M \quad (68)$$

□

Exercise 24: Type the following relational assertions

$$M \cdot N^\circ \subseteq \perp \quad (69)$$

$$M \cdot N^\circ \subseteq id \quad (70)$$

$$M^\circ \cdot T \cdot N \subseteq > \quad (71)$$

and check their pointwise meaning. Confirm your intuitions by repeating this exercise in Alloy. □

Exercises

Exercise 25: Let $bag : A^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^A$ be the function that, given a finite sequence (list) indicates the number of occurrences of its elements, for instance,

$$bag [a, b, a, c] a = 2$$

$$bag [a, b, a, c] b = 1$$

$$bag [a, b, a, c] c = 1$$

Let $ordered : A^* \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ be the obvious predicate assuming a **total** order predefined in A . Finally, let $true = \underline{True}$. Having defined

$$S = \frac{bag}{bag} \cap \frac{true}{ordered} \tag{72}$$

identify the type of S and, going pointwise and simplifying, tell which operation is specified by S . \square

Exercises

Exercise 26: Prove the **union simplicity** rule:

$$M \cup N \text{ is simple} \quad \equiv \quad M, N \text{ are simple and } M \cdot N^\circ \subseteq id \quad (73)$$

□

Exercise 27: Derive from (73) the corresponding rule for **injective** relations. □

Exercise 28: Explain in your own words the following equalities:

$$1 \xleftarrow{\top} 1 = 1 \xleftarrow{!} 1 = id \quad (74)$$

□

Class 5b – Monotone reasoning

Monotonicity

All relational combinators studied so far are \subseteq -**monotonic**, namely:

$$R \subseteq S \Rightarrow R^\circ \subseteq S^\circ \quad (75)$$

$$R \subseteq S \wedge U \subseteq V \Rightarrow R \cdot U \subseteq S \cdot V \quad (76)$$

$$R \subseteq S \wedge U \subseteq V \Rightarrow R \cap U \subseteq S \cap V \quad (77)$$

$$R \subseteq S \wedge U \subseteq V \Rightarrow R \cup U \subseteq S \cup V \quad (78)$$

etc hold.

Transitivity, recall:

$$R \subseteq S \wedge S \subseteq Q \Rightarrow R \subseteq Q$$

Proofs by \subseteq -transitivity

Wishing to prove $R \subseteq S$, the following rules are of help by relying on a “mid-point” M (analogy with interval arithmetics):

- Rule A: **lowering the upper side**

$$R \subseteq S$$

$$\Leftarrow \quad \{ \textcolor{blue}{M \subseteq S \text{ is known ; transitivity of } \subseteq \text{ (10)}} \}$$

$$R \subseteq M$$

and then proceed with $R \subseteq M$.

Proofs by \subseteq -transitivity

- Rule B: **raising the lower side**

$$R \subseteq S$$

$$\Leftarrow \quad \{ \textcolor{blue}{R} \subseteq \textcolor{blue}{M} \text{ is known; transitivity of } \subseteq \}$$

$$\textcolor{blue}{M} \subseteq S$$

and then proceed with $\textcolor{blue}{M} \subseteq S$.

Example

Composition of simple $A \xrightarrow{S} B$ and $B \xrightarrow{R} C$ is simple:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{img}(R \cdot S) \subseteq id \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \} \\
 & R \cdot S \cdot S^\circ \cdot R^\circ \subseteq id \\
 \Leftarrow & \quad \{ S \text{ is simple, } S \cdot S^\circ \subseteq id; \text{ rule B} \} \\
 & R \cdot R^\circ \subseteq id \\
 \Leftarrow & \quad \{ R \text{ is simple, } R \cdot R^\circ \subseteq id; \text{ rule B} \} \\
 & id \subseteq id \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ R \subseteq R \text{ always holds} \} \\
 & true
 \end{aligned}$$

Example

Proof of shunting rule (37):

$$\begin{aligned} & R \subseteq f^\circ \cdot S \\ \Leftrightarrow & \quad \{ \text{id} \subseteq f^\circ \cdot f ; \text{raising the lower-side} \} \\ & f^\circ \cdot f \cdot R \subseteq f^\circ \cdot S \\ \Leftrightarrow & \quad \{ \text{monotonicity of } (f^\circ \cdot) \} \\ & f \cdot R \subseteq S \\ \Leftrightarrow & \quad \{ f \cdot f^\circ \subseteq \text{id} ; \text{lowering the upper-side} \} \\ & f \cdot R \subseteq f \cdot f^\circ \cdot S \\ \Leftrightarrow & \quad \{ \text{monotonicity of } (f \cdot) \} \\ & R \subseteq f^\circ \cdot S \end{aligned}$$

Thus the equivalence in (37) is established by circular implication.

Exercises (monotonicity and transitivity)

Exercise 29: Prove the following rules of thumb:

- **smaller** than injective (simple) is injective (simple)
- **larger** than entire (surjective) is entire (surjective)
- $R \cap S$ is injective (simple) provided one of R or S is so
- $R \cup S$ is entire (surjective) provided one of R or S is so.



Exercise 30: Prove that relational **composition** preserves **all** relational classes in the taxonomy of (30). □

Meaning of $f \cdot r = id$

On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} f \cdot r &= id \\ \equiv \quad &\{ \text{equality of functions} \} \\ f \cdot r &\subseteq id \\ \equiv \quad &\{ \text{shunting} \} \\ r &\subseteq f^\circ \end{aligned}$$

Since f is simple:

- f° is injective
- and so is r , because “smaller than injective is injective”.

Meaning of $f \cdot r = id$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & f \cdot r = id \\ \equiv & \quad \{ \text{equality of functions} \} \\ & id \subseteq f \cdot r \\ \equiv & \quad \{ \text{shunting} \} \\ & r^\circ \subseteq f \end{aligned}$$

Since r is entire:

- r° is surjective
- and so is f because “larger that surjective is surjective”.

Meaning of $f \cdot r = id$

We conclude that

f is **surjective** and r is **injective** wherever $f \cdot r = id$ holds.

Since both are functions, we furthermore conclude that

f is an **abstraction** and r is a **representation**

Exercise 31: Why are π_1 and π_2 **surjective** and i_1 and i_2 **injective**?
Why are isomorphisms **bijections**? \square

Converse magic squares

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{R} & C \\
 P \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow Q \\
 B & \xleftarrow{S} & D
 \end{array}
 \quad \equiv \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{P^\circ} & B \\
 R^\circ \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow S^\circ \\
 C & \xleftarrow{Q^\circ} & D
 \end{array}
 \quad (79)$$

Magic square compositionality

Magic squares compose, not only **horizontally**

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{R} & C & \xleftarrow{R'} & C' \\
 \downarrow P & \subseteq & \downarrow Q & \subseteq & \downarrow Q' \\
 B & \xleftarrow{S} & D & \xleftarrow{S'} & D'
 \end{array}
 \Rightarrow
 \begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{R \cdot R'} & C' & & \\
 \downarrow P & \subseteq & \downarrow Q' & & \\
 B' & \xleftarrow{S \cdot S'} & D' & &
 \end{array}
 \quad (80)$$

Magic square compositionality

... but also **vertically**:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{R} & C \\
 P \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow Q \\
 B & \xleftarrow{S} & D \\
 P' \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow Q' \\
 B' & \xleftarrow{S'} & D'
 \end{array}
 & \Rightarrow &
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{R} & C \\
 P' \cdot P \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow Q' \cdot Q \\
 B' & \xleftarrow{S'} & D'
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \quad (81)$$

Exercise 32: Prove (80) and (81). \square

Exercise 33: Use (81) to prove that the composition of monotonic functions is a monotonic function. \square

Class 6 — Pairs and sums

Relational pairing

Recall:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{\pi_1} & A \times B & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & B \\
 & \searrow f & \uparrow \langle f, g \rangle & \nearrow g & \\
 & & C & &
 \end{array}
 \quad \langle f, g \rangle c = (f c, g c) \quad (82)$$

Clearly:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (a, b) &= \langle f, g \rangle c \\
 &\equiv \{ \langle f, g \rangle c = (f c, g c) \text{ (82) ; equality of pairs } \} \\
 &\quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a = f c \\ b = g c \end{array} \right. \\
 &\equiv \{ y = f x \equiv y f x \} \\
 &\quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a f c \\ b g c \end{array} \right.
 \end{aligned}$$

Relational pairing

That is:

$$(a, b) \langle f, g \rangle c \equiv a f c \wedge b g c$$

This suggests the generalization

$$(a, b) \langle R, S \rangle c \equiv a R c \wedge b S c \quad (83)$$

from which one immediately derives the ('Kronecker') **product**:

$$R \times S = \langle R \cdot \pi_1, S \cdot \pi_2 \rangle \quad (84)$$

(84) unfolds to the pointwise:

$$(b, d)(R \times S)(a, c) \equiv b R a \wedge d S c \quad (85)$$

Relational pairing example (in matrix layout)

Example — given relations

$$\text{where}^\circ = \begin{array}{c|cc} & \text{Left} & \text{Right} \\ \hline \text{Fox} & 1 & 0 \\ \text{Goose} & 0 & 1 \\ \text{Beans} & 0 & 1 \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cross} = \begin{array}{c|cc} & \text{Left} & \text{Right} \\ \hline \text{Left} & 0 & 1 \\ \text{Right} & 1 & 0 \end{array}$$

pairing them up evaluates to:

$$\langle \text{where}^\circ, \text{cross} \rangle = \begin{array}{c|cc} & \text{Left} & \text{Right} \\ \hline (\text{Fox}, \text{Left}) & 0 & 0 \\ (\text{Fox}, \text{Right}) & 1 & 0 \\ (\text{Goose}, \text{Left}) & 0 & 1 \\ (\text{Goose}, \text{Right}) & 0 & 0 \\ (\text{Beans}, \text{Left}) & 0 & 1 \\ (\text{Beans}, \text{Right}) & 0 & 0 \end{array}$$

Exercises

Exercise 34: Show that

$$(b, c) \langle R, S \rangle a \equiv b R a \wedge c S a$$

PF-transforms to:

$$\langle R, S \rangle = \pi_1^\circ \cdot R \cap \pi_2^\circ \cdot S \quad (86)$$

Then infer universal property

$$X \subseteq \langle R, S \rangle \equiv \pi_1 \cdot X \subseteq R \wedge \pi_2 \cdot X \subseteq S \quad (87)$$

from (86) via indirect equality (15). \square

Exercise 35: What can you say about (87) in case X , R and S are functions? \square

Exercises

Exercise 36: Unconditional distribution laws

$$(P \cap Q) \cdot S = (P \cdot S) \cap (Q \cdot S)$$

$$R \cdot (P \cap Q) = (R \cdot P) \cap (R \cdot Q)$$

will hold provide one of R or S is simple and the other injective. Tell which (justifying). \square

Exercise 37: Derive from

$$\langle R, S \rangle^\circ \cdot \langle X, Y \rangle = (R^\circ \cdot X) \cap (S^\circ \cdot Y) \quad (88)$$

the following properties:


$$\square \quad \ker \langle R, S \rangle = \ker R \cap \ker S \quad (89)$$

Injectivity preorder

$\ker R = R^\circ \cdot R$ measures the level of **injectivity** of R according to the preorder (\leq) defined by

$$R \leq S \equiv \ker S \subseteq \ker R \quad (90)$$

telling that R is *less injective* or *more defined* (entire) than S — for instance:



Injectivity preorder

Restricted to *functions*, (\leq) is *universally* bounded by

$$! \leq f \leq id$$


Also easy to show:

$$id \leq f \equiv f \text{ is injective} \quad (91)$$

Exercise 38: Let f and g be the two functions depicted on the right.

Check the assertions:

1. $f \leq g$
2. $g \leq f$
3. Both hold
4. None holds.




The specification pattern $h \leq \langle f, g \rangle$

As illustration of the use of this ordering in **formal specification**, suppose one writes

$$room \leq \langle lect, slot \rangle$$

in the context of the data model



where *TD* abbreviates time and date.

The specification pattern $h \leq \langle f, g \rangle$

What are we telling about this model by writing

$$room \leq \langle lect, slot \rangle?$$

Unfolding it:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & room \leq \langle lect, slot \rangle \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ (90) \} \\
 & \ker \langle lect, slot \rangle \subseteq \ker room \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ (89) ; (43) \} \\
 & \frac{lect}{lect} \cap \frac{slot}{slot} \subseteq \frac{room}{room} \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{going pointwise, for all } c_1, c_2 \in Class \} \\
 & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} lect\ c_1 = lect\ c_2 \\ slot\ c_1 = slot\ c_2 \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow room\ c_1 = room\ c_2
 \end{aligned}$$

The specification pattern $h \leq \langle f, g \rangle$

That is, $room \leq \langle lect, slot \rangle$ imposes that

a given lecturer cannot be in two different rooms at the same time.

(Think of c_1 and c_2 as classes shared by different courses, possibly of different degrees.)

In the standard terminology of database theory this is called a **functional dependency**, meaning that:


- $room$ is **dependent** on $lect$ and $slot$, i.e.
- $lect$ and $slot$ **determine** $room$.

Generalization: the “agenda design pattern”

Nobody can be in different places at the same time

$$where \leq \langle who, when \rangle$$

in the context of the generic data model:



Exercise 39: Do $who \leq \langle where, when \rangle$ and $when \leq \langle who, where \rangle$ express reasonable facts? ☐

The specification pattern $h \leq \langle f, g \rangle$

Let $h := id$ in this pattern:

*Two functions f and g are said to be **complementary** wherever $id \leq \langle f, g \rangle$.*

For instance:

π_1 and π_2 are complementary since $\langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle = id$ by \times -reflection.

Informal interpretation:

Non-injective f and g compensate each other's lack of injectivity so that their pairing is **injective**.

Universal property

$$\langle R, S \rangle \leqslant X \quad \equiv \quad R \leqslant X \wedge S \leqslant X \quad (92)$$

Cancellation of (92) means that *pairing* always *increases injectivity*:

$$R \leqslant \langle R, S \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad S \leqslant \langle R, S \rangle. \quad (93)$$

(93) unfolds to $\ker \langle R, S \rangle \subseteq (\ker R) \cap (\ker S)$, confirming (89).

Injectivity **shunting law**:

$$R \cdot g \leqslant S \quad \equiv \quad R \leqslant S \cdot g^\circ \quad (94)$$

Exercise 40: $\langle R, id \rangle$ is always *injective* — why? \square

Relation pairing continued

The **fusion**-law of relation pairing requires a side condition:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle R, S \rangle \cdot T &= \langle R \cdot T, S \cdot T \rangle \\ &\Leftarrow R \cdot (\text{img } T) \subseteq R \vee S \cdot (\text{img } T) \subseteq S\end{aligned}\tag{95}$$

The **absorption** law

$$(R \times S) \cdot \langle P, Q \rangle = \langle R \cdot P, S \cdot Q \rangle\tag{96}$$

holds unconditionally.

Exercises

Exercise 41: Recalling (31), prove that

$$\text{swap} = \langle \pi_2, \pi_1 \rangle \quad (97)$$

is a bijection. (Assume property $(R \cap S)^\circ = R^\circ \cap S^\circ$.) \square

Exercise 42: Derive from the laws of pairing studied thus far the following facts about relational product:

$$\text{id} \times \text{id} = \text{id} \quad (98)$$

$$(R \times S) \cdot (P \times Q) = (R \cdot P) \times (S \cdot Q) \quad (99)$$

\square

Exercise 43: Show that (95) holds. Suggestion: recall (62). From this infer that no side-condition is required for T simple. \square

Relational sums

Example (Haskell):

```
data X = Boo Bool | Err String
```

PF-transforms to

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 Bool & \xrightarrow{i_1} & Bool + String & \xleftarrow{i_2} & String \\
 & \searrow \text{Boo} & \downarrow [Boo, Err] & \swarrow \text{Err} & \\
 & & X & &
 \end{array} \quad (100)$$

where

$$[R, S] = (R \cdot i_1^\circ) \cup (S \cdot i_2^\circ) \quad \text{cf.} \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{i_1} & A + B & \xleftarrow{i_2} & B \\ & \searrow R & \downarrow [R, S] & \swarrow S & \\ & & C & & \end{array}$$

Dually: $R + S = [i_1 \cdot R, i_2 \cdot S]$

Relational sums

From $[R, S] = (R \cdot i_1^\circ) \cup (S \cdot i_2^\circ)$ above one easily infers, by indirect equality,

$$[R, S] \subseteq X \equiv R \subseteq X \cdot i_1 \wedge S \subseteq X \cdot i_2$$

(check this).

It turns out that inclusion can be strengthened to equality, and therefore **relational coproducts** have exactly the same properties as functional ones, stemming from the universal property:

$$[R, S] = X \equiv R = X \cdot i_1 \wedge S = X \cdot i_2 \quad (101)$$

Thus $[i_1, i_2] = id$ — solve (101) for R and S when $X = id$, etc etc.

Divide and conquer

The property for sums (coproducts) corresponding to (88) for products is:

$$[R, S] \cdot [T, U]^{\circ} = (R \cdot T^{\circ}) \cup (S \cdot U^{\circ}) \quad (102)$$

NB: This *divide-and-conquer* rule is essential to **parallelizing** relation composition by **block** decomposition.

Exercise 44: Show that:

$$\text{img } [R, S] = \text{img } R \cup \text{img } S \quad (103)$$

$$\text{img } i_1 \cup \text{img } i_2 = \text{id} \quad (104)$$



Exercises

Exercise 45: The type declaration

data *Maybe* *a* = **Nothing** | **Just** *a*

in Haskell corresponds, as is known, to the declaration of the isomorphism:

$\text{in} : 1 + A \rightarrow \text{Maybe } A$
 $\text{in} = [\underline{\text{Nothing}}, \text{Just}]$

Show that the relation

$R = i_1 \cdot \underline{\text{Nothing}}^\circ \cup i_2 \cdot \text{Just}^\circ$

is a function. \square

Exercises

Exercise 46: Consider the following definition of a relation

$$A \xleftarrow{R} A^*,$$

$$R \cdot \text{in} = [\perp, \pi_1 \cup R \cdot \pi_2]$$

where

$$\text{in} = [\text{nil}, \text{cons}] \tag{105}$$

$$\text{nil} _ = [] \tag{106}$$

$$\text{cons} (h, t) = h : t \tag{107}$$

(a) Rely on the co-product laws to derive (formally) the *pointwise* definition of R .


(b) Based on this, spell out the meaning of $a R x$ in your own words. \square

+ meets ×

The exchange law

$$[\langle R, S \rangle, \langle T, V \rangle] = \langle [R, T], [S, V] \rangle \quad (108)$$

holds for all relations as in diagram




and the **fusion** law

$$\langle R, S \rangle \cdot f = \langle R \cdot f, S \cdot f \rangle \quad (109)$$

also holds, where f is a function. (Why?)

Exercise 47: Relying on both (101) and (109) prove (108). \square

On key-value (KV) data models



On key-value data models

Simple relations abstract what is currently known as the **key-value-pair (KV)** data model in modern databases

E.g. Hbase, Amazon DynamoDB etc

In each such relation $K \xrightarrow{S} V$, K is said to be the **key** and V the **value**.


No-SQL, columnar *database trend*.

Example above:

$$\underbrace{\text{PartitionKey} \times \text{SortKey}}_K \rightarrow \underbrace{\text{Type} \times \dots}_V$$

On key-value data models

“Schema is defined per item”...



In this example:

$$V = Title \times (1 + Author \times (1 + Date \times \dots))$$

This shows the expressiveness of **products** and **coproducts** in data modelling.

Magic square sums

Exercise 48: Prove (110) below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{R} & C \\
 P \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow Q \\
 B & \xleftarrow{S} & D
 \end{array} & + & \begin{array}{ccc}
 A' & \xleftarrow{R'} & C' \\
 P' \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow Q' \\
 B' & \xleftarrow{S} & D'
 \end{array} \\
 & = & \begin{array}{ccc}
 A + A' & \xleftarrow{R+R'} & C + C' \\
 P+P' \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow Q+Q' \\
 B + B' & \xleftarrow{S+S'} & D + D'
 \end{array}
 \end{array} \quad (110)$$



Class 7 — Relational division

Relational division

In the same way

$$z \times y \leqslant x \equiv z \leqslant x \div y$$

means that $x \div y$ is the largest **number** which multiplied by y approximates x ,

$$Z \cdot Y \subseteq X \equiv Z \subseteq X/Y \quad (111)$$


means that X/Y is the largest **relation** which pre-composed with Y approximates X .

What is the pointwise meaning of X/Y ?

We reason:

First, the types of

$$Z \cdot Y \subseteq X \equiv Z \subseteq X/Y$$



Next, the calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & c \ (X/Y) \ a \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{introduce points } C \xleftarrow{c} 1 \text{ and } A \xleftarrow{a} 1 \} \\
 & x(\underline{c}^\circ \cdot (X/Y) \cdot \underline{a})x \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{one-point (187)} \} \\
 & x' = x \Rightarrow x'(\underline{c}^\circ \cdot (X/Y) \cdot \underline{a})x
 \end{aligned}$$

Proceed by going pointfree:


We reason

$$\begin{aligned}
 & id \subseteq \underline{c}^\circ \cdot (X/Y) \cdot \underline{a} \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{shunting rules} \} \\
 & \underline{c} \cdot \underline{a}^\circ \subseteq X/Y \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{universal property (111)} \} \\
 & \underline{c} \cdot \underline{a}^\circ \cdot Y \subseteq X \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{now shunt } \underline{c} \text{ back to the right} \} \\
 & \underline{a}^\circ \cdot Y \subseteq \underline{c}^\circ \cdot X \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{back to points via (23)} \} \\
 & \langle \forall b : a \ Y \ b : c \ X \ b \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$

Outcome

In summary:

$$c (X/Y) a \equiv \langle \forall b : a Y b : c X b \rangle \quad (112)$$



Example:

$a Y b$ = passenger a chooses flight b


$c X b$ = company c operates flight b

$c (X/Y) a$ = company c is the only one trusted by passenger a , that is, a **only flies** c .

Pattern X / Y


Informally, $c (X / Y) a$ captures the linguistic pattern

a **only** Y those b 's
such that $c X b$.



For instance,

Students enrolled
in **courses** only
dealing with
particular **subjects**



Pointwise meaning in full

The full pointwise encoding of

$$Z \cdot Y \subseteq X \equiv Z \subseteq X/Y$$

is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \forall c, b : \langle \exists a : cZa : aYb \rangle : cXb \rangle \\ & \equiv \\ & \langle \forall c, a : cZa : \langle \forall b : aYb : cXb \rangle \rangle \end{aligned}$$

If we drop variables and regard the uppercase letters as denoting Boolean terms dealing without variable c , this becomes

$$\langle \forall b : \langle \exists a : Z : Y \rangle : X \rangle \equiv \langle \forall a : Z : \langle \forall b : Y : X \rangle \rangle$$

recognizable as the **splitting** rule (195) of the Eindhoven calculus.

Put in other words: **existential** quantification is **lower** adjoint to **universal** quantification.

Exercises

Exercise 49: Prove the equalities

$$X \cdot f = X/f^\circ \quad (113)$$

$$X/\perp = \top \quad (114)$$

$$X/id = X \quad (115)$$

and check their pointwise meaning. \square

Exercise 50: Define

$$X \setminus Y = (Y^\circ/X^\circ)^\circ \quad (116)$$

and infer:


$$a(R \setminus S)c \equiv \langle \forall b : b R a : b S c \rangle \quad (117)$$

$$R \cdot X \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq R \setminus Y \quad (118)$$

\square

Patterns in diagrams (again!)

Back to our good old "rectangle":




$$S \cdot R \subseteq P \cdot Q$$

... i.e. the pointwise:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \exists \\
 \begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & a & & d & & & \\
 & \vdots & & \vdots & & & \\
 S & \cdot & R & \Rightarrow & P & \cdot & Q \\
 \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\
 \forall & b & & c & & b & & c
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

Patterns in diagrams - very special case


Again assuming two preorders (\sqsubseteq) and (\leq) :



$$f^o \cdot (\sqsubseteq) = (\leq) \cdot g$$

$$f \ b \sqsubseteq \ a \equiv b \leq \ g \ a \quad (119)$$

In this very special situation,
 f and g in




are said to be **Galois connected** (GC) and we write

$$f \vdash g \quad (120)$$

Patterns in diagrams - very special case


Again assuming two preorders (\sqsubseteq) and (\leq) :



$$f^o \cdot (\sqsubseteq) = (\leq) \cdot g$$

$$f \ b \sqsubseteq \ a \equiv b \leq \ g \ a \quad (119)$$

In this very special situation,
 f and g in




are said to be **Galois connected** (GC) and we write

$$f \vdash g \quad (120)$$

Patterns in diagrams - even more special case

Preorders (\sqsubseteq) and (\leq) are the **identity**:



$$f^\circ = g$$

$$f \ b = a \ \equiv \ b = g \ a \quad (121)$$


That is to say,



Isomorphisms are
special cases of
Galois
connections.

Patterns in diagrams - even more special case


Preorders (\sqsubseteq) and (\leq) are the **identity**:



$$f^\circ = g$$

$$f \ b = a \equiv b = g \ a \quad (121)$$


That is to say,



Isomorphisms are
special cases of
Galois
connections.


GC — mechanics analogy

Stability:




GC — mechanics analogy

Instability:



GC — mechanics analogy

Stability restored:



“Restauratio” rule (Middle Ages).

Example of GC

Integer division:

$$z \times y \leq x \equiv z \leq x \div y$$

that is:

$$z \underbrace{\times y}_f \leq x \equiv z \leq x \underbrace{\div y}_g$$

So:

$$(\times y) \vdash (\div y)$$

Principle:

Difficult $(\div y)$ *explained by* **easy** $(\times y)$.

GCs

Interpreting:

$$f^\circ \cdot (\sqsubseteq) = (\leq) \cdot g, \text{ ie.}$$

$$f \ b \sqsubseteq a \equiv b \leq g \ a, \text{ ie.}$$

$$f \vdash g$$

- $f \ b$ is the **smallest** a such that $b \leq g \ a$ holds.
- $g \ a$ is the **largest** b such that $f \ b \sqsubseteq a$ holds.

Thus $z \times y \leq x \equiv z \leq x \div y$ reads like this:

$x \div y$ is the largest z such that $z \times y \leq x$.

Yes! (back to the primary school desk)

The **whole division** algorithm

$$\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 1 \overline{) 2} \\ 3 \end{array} \quad 2 \times 3 + 1 = 7 \quad , \text{ "i.e." } \quad 3 = 7 \div 2$$

However

$$\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 3 \overline{) 2} \\ 2 \end{array} \quad 2 \times 2 + 3 = 7 \quad \wedge \quad 2 \neq 7 \div 2$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ 5 \overline{) 2} \\ 1 \end{array} \quad 2 \times 1 + 5 = 7 \quad \wedge \quad 1 \neq 7 \div 2$$

That is:

$$\begin{array}{r} x \\ \dots \overline{) y} \\ x \div y \end{array} \quad z \times y \leq x \Rightarrow z \leq x \div y$$

$x \div y$ **largest** z
such that
 $z \times y \leq x$.

GCs as specifications

Thus:

$$z \times y \leq x \equiv z \leq x \div y \quad \text{is a \textbf{specification} of } x \div y$$

How does it relate to its **implementation**, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} x \div y = & \\ & \text{if } x < y \text{ then } 0 \\ & \text{else } 1 + (x - y) \div y \end{aligned}$$

?

It's a long story. For the moment, let us appreciate the power of the GC concept.

GCs as specifications

Consider the following **requirements** about the `take` function in Haskell:

`take n xs` should yield the **longest possible prefix** of `xs`
not exceeding `n` in **length**.

Warming up examples:

`take 2 [10, 20, 30] = [10, 20]`
`take 20 [10, 20, 30] = [10, 20, 30]`
...

How do we write a formal **specification** for these requirements?

Specifying functions on lists

Clearly,

- `take n xs` is a **prefix** of `xs` — specify this as e.g.

$$\text{take } n \text{ xs} \preceq \text{xs}$$

where \preceq denotes the **prefix** partial order.

- the length of `take n xs` cannot exceed `n` — easy to specify:

$$\text{length} (\text{take } n \text{ xs}) \leq n$$

Altogether:

$$\text{length} (\text{take } n \text{ xs}) \leq n \wedge \text{take } n \text{ xs} \preceq \text{xs} \quad (122)$$

But this is not **enough** — (silly) implementation `take n xs = []` meets (122)!

Superlatives...

The crux is how to formally specify the **superlative** in

...**take** n xs should yield the **longest possible prefix**...

This is the **hard** part but there is a standard method to follow:

- think of an arbitrary list ys also satisfying (122)

$$\text{length } ys \leq n \wedge ys \preceq xs$$

- Then (from above) ys should be a prefix of **take** n xs :

$$\text{length } ys \leq n \wedge ys \preceq xs \Rightarrow ys \preceq \text{take } n \text{ } xs \quad (123)$$

Final touch

So we have two clauses,

*a **easy** one (122)*

and

*a **hard** one (123).*

Interestingly, (122) can be derived from (123) itself,

$$\text{length } ys \leq n \wedge ys \preceq xs \Leftarrow ys \preceq \text{take } n \text{ } xs$$

by letting $ys := \text{take } n \text{ } xs$ and simplifying.

So a single line is enough to **formally specify** *take*:

$$\text{length } ys \leq n \wedge ys \preceq xs \equiv ys \preceq \text{take } n \text{ } xs \quad (124)$$

— a **GC**.

Reasoning about specifications (GCs)

One of the advantages of **formal specification** is that one may **quest** the specification (aka **model**) to derive useful properties of the design **before the implementation phase**.

GCs + indirect equality (on partial orders) yield much in this process — see the following exercise.

Exercise 51: Solely relying on specification (124) use indirect equality to prove that

$$\textit{take } (\textit{length } xs) \textit{ } xs = xs \quad (125)$$

$$\textit{take } 0 \textit{ } xs = [] \quad (126)$$

$$\textit{take } n \textit{ } [] = [] \quad (127)$$

hold. \square

GCs: many properties for free

$(f\ b) \leq a \equiv b \sqsubseteq (g\ a)$		
Description	$f = g^b$	$g = f^\sharp$
Definition	$f\ b = \bigwedge \{a : b \sqsubseteq g\ a\}$	$g\ a = \bigvee \{b : f\ b \leq a\}$
Cancellation	$f(g\ a) \leq a$	$b \sqsubseteq g(f\ b)$
Distribution	$f(b \sqcup b') = (f\ b) \vee (f\ b')$	$g(a' \wedge a) = (g\ a') \sqcap (g\ a)$
Monotonicity	$b \sqsubseteq b' \Rightarrow f\ b \leq f\ b'$	$a \leq a' \Rightarrow g\ a \sqsubseteq g\ a'$

Exercise 52: Derive from (119) that both f and g are monotonic. \square

Remark on GCs

Galois connections originate from the work of the French mathematician Evariste Galois (1811-1832). Their main advantages,

simple, generic and highly calculational

are welcome in proofs in computing, due to their size and complexity, recall E. Dijkstra:

elegant \equiv simple and remarkably effective.

In the sequel we will re-interpret the **relational operators** we've seen so far as Galois adjoints.



Examples

Not only

$$\underbrace{z (\times y)}_{f \ z} \leq x \quad \equiv \quad z \leq \underbrace{x (\div y)}_{g \ n}$$

but also the two **shunting rules**,

$$\underbrace{(h \cdot)}_{f \ X} X \subseteq Y \quad \equiv \quad X \subseteq \underbrace{(h^\circ \cdot)}_{g \ Y} Y$$

$$\underbrace{X (\cdot h^\circ)}_{f \ X} \subseteq Y \quad \equiv \quad X \subseteq \underbrace{Y (\cdot h)}_{g \ Y}$$

as well as **converse**,

$$\underbrace{X^\circ}_{f \ X} \subseteq Y \quad \equiv \quad X \subseteq \underbrace{Y^\circ}_{g \ Y}$$

and so and so forth — are **adjoints** of GCs: see the next slides.

Converse

$(f \ X) \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq (g \ Y)$			
Description	$f = g^\flat$	$g = f^\sharp$	Obs.
converse	$(-)^{\circ}$	$(-)^{\circ}$	$b \ R^{\circ} a \equiv a \ R b$

Thus:

Cancellation $(R^{\circ})^{\circ} = R$

Monotonicity $R \subseteq S \equiv R^{\circ} \subseteq S^{\circ}$

Distributions $(R \cap S)^{\circ} = R^{\circ} \cap S^{\circ}, (R \cup S)^{\circ} = R^{\circ} \cup S^{\circ}$

Exercise 53: Why is it that converse-monotonicity can be strengthened to an equivalence? \square

Example of calculation from the GC

Converse involution (cancellation):

$$(R^\circ)^\circ = R \quad (128)$$

Proof of (128):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (R^\circ)^\circ = R \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{antisymmetry ("ping-pong")} \} \\
 & (R^\circ)^\circ \subseteq R \wedge R \subseteq (R^\circ)^\circ \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{°-universal } X^\circ \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq Y^\circ \text{ twice} \} \\
 & R^\circ \subseteq R^\circ \wedge R^\circ \subseteq R^\circ \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{reflexivity (twice)} \} \\
 & \text{TRUE}
 \end{aligned}$$

Relational division

$(f \ X) \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq (g \ Y)$			
Description	$f = g^b$	$g = f^\sharp$	Obs.
right-division	$(\cdot R)$	$(\ / R)$	right-factor
left-division	$(R \cdot)$	$(R \setminus)$	left-factor

that is,

$$X \cdot R \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq Y / R \quad (129)$$

$$R \cdot X \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq R \setminus Y \quad (130)$$

Immediate: $(R \cdot)$ and $(\cdot R)$ are monotonic and distribute over union:

$$R \cdot (S \cup T) = (R \cdot S) \cup (R \cdot T)$$

$$(S \cup T) \cdot R = (S \cdot R) \cup (T \cdot R)$$

$(\setminus R)$ and $(/R)$ are monotonic and distribute over \cap .

Functions

$(f \ X) \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq (g \ Y)$			
Description	$f = g^b$	$g = f^\sharp$	Obs.
shunting rule	$(h \cdot)$	$(h^\circ \cdot)$	NB: h is a function
“converse” shunting rule	$(\cdot h^\circ)$	$(\cdot h)$	NB: h is a function

Consequences:

Functional equality: $h \subseteq g \equiv h = k \equiv h \supseteq k$

Functional division: $R \cdot h = R/h^\circ$

Other operators

$(f \ X) \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq (g \ Y)$			
Description	$f = g^b$	$g = f^\sharp$	Obs.
implication	$(R \cap)$	$(R \Rightarrow)$	$b(R \Rightarrow X)a \equiv bRa \Rightarrow bXa$
difference	$(_ - R)$	$(R \cup)$	$b(X - R) a \equiv \begin{cases} bXa \\ \neg(bRa) \end{cases}$

Thus the universal properties of implication and difference,

$$R \cap X \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq R \Rightarrow Y \quad (131)$$

$$X - R \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq R \cup Y \quad (132)$$

are GCs — etc, etc


Exercise 54: Show that $R \cap (R \Rightarrow Y) \subseteq Y$ (“modus ponens”) holds and that $R - R = \perp - R = \perp$. \square

Relation shrinking

Given relations $R : A \leftarrow B$ and $S : A \leftarrow A$, define $R \restriction S : A \leftarrow B$, pronounced “ R shrunk by S ”, by

$$X \subseteq R \restriction S \equiv X \subseteq R \wedge X \cdot R^\circ \subseteq S \quad (133)$$

cf. diagram:



Property (133) states that $R \restriction S$ is the largest part of R such that, if it yields an output for an input x , this must be a ‘maximum’, with respect to S , among all possible outputs of x by R .

Exercise 55: Show, by indirect equality, that (133) is equivalent to:

$$R \restriction S = R \cap S / R^\circ \quad (134)$$




Relation shrinking

Given relations $R : A \leftarrow B$ and $S : A \leftarrow A$, define $R \restriction S : A \leftarrow B$, pronounced “ R shrunk by S ”, by

$$X \subseteq R \restriction S \equiv X \subseteq R \wedge X \cdot R^\circ \subseteq S \quad (133)$$

cf. diagram:



Property (133) states that $R \restriction S$ is the largest part of R such that, if it yields an output for an input x , this must be a ‘maximum, with respect to S , among all possible outputs of x by R .

Exercise 56: Show, by indirect equality, that (133) is equivalent to:

$$R \restriction S = R \cap S/R^\circ \quad (134)$$

□

Relation shrinking

Example Given

$$Examiner \times Mark \stackrel{R}{\leftarrow} Student = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} Examiner & Mark & Student \\ \hline Smith & 10 & John \\ Smith & 11 & Mary \\ Smith & 15 & Arthur \\ Wood & 12 & John \\ Wood & 11 & Mary \\ Wood & 15 & Arthur \end{array} \right)$$

suppose we wish to choose the best mark for each student.

Relation shrinking

Then $S = \pi_1 \cdot R$ is the relation

$$Mark \xleftarrow{\pi_1 \cdot R} Student = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} Mark & Student \\ \hline 10 & John \\ 11 & Mary \\ 12 & John \\ 15 & Arthur \end{array} \right)$$

and

$$Mark \xleftarrow{S \upharpoonright (\geq)} Student = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} Mark & Student \\ \hline 11 & Mary \\ 12 & John \\ 15 & Arthur \end{array} \right)$$

Properties of shrinking

Two *fusion* rules:

$$(S \cdot f) \restriction R = (S \restriction R) \cdot f \quad (135)$$

$$(f \cdot S) \restriction R = f \cdot (S \restriction (f^\circ \cdot R \cdot f)) \quad (136)$$

“Chaotic optimization”:

$$R \restriction \top = R \quad (137)$$

“Impossible optimization”:

$$R \restriction \perp = \perp \quad (138)$$

“Brute force” determinization:


$$R \restriction id = \text{largest simple fragment of } R \quad (139)$$

Relation overriding

The relational **overriding** combinator

$$R \dagger S = S \cup R \cap \perp / S^\circ \quad (140)$$

yields the relation which contains the **whole** of S and that **part** of R where S is undefined — read $R \dagger S$ as “ R overridden by S ”.




Exercise on relation overriding

Let $R : A \rightarrow B$ be given as in the picture, where

$A = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5\}$ and

$B = \{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4\}$:



Represent as a Boolean matrix the following relation overriding:

$$P = \top \dagger R =$$

	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5
b_1	0	0	0	0	0
b_2	0	0	0	0	0
b_3	0	0	0	0	0
b_4	0	0	0	0	0

Exercise on relation overriding

And now this other one:

$$Q = R \dagger (\underline{b_4} \cdot \underline{a_2}^\circ) =$$

	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5
b_1	0	0	0	0	0
b_2	0	0	0	0	0
b_3	0	0	0	0	0
b_4	0	0	0	0	0

□

Exercise 57: (a) Show that $\perp \dagger S = S$, $R \dagger \perp = R$ and $R \dagger R = R$ hold.
 (b) Infer the universal property:

$$X \subseteq R \dagger S \quad \equiv \quad X - S \subseteq R \wedge (X - S) \cdot S^\circ = \perp \quad (141)$$

□

Class 8 — Predicates become relations

How predicates become relations

Recall from (40) the notation

$$\frac{f}{g} = g^{\circ} \cdot f$$


and, given **predicate** $\mathbb{B} \xleftarrow{p} A$, the relation $A \xleftarrow{\frac{\text{true}}{p}} X$, where *true* is the everywhere-True **constant** function.

Now define:

$$\Phi_p = id \cap \frac{\text{true}}{p} \quad (142)$$

Clearly, Φ_p is the **coreflexive** relation which **represents** predicate p as a binary relation — see the following exercise.

Exercise 58: Show that $y \Phi_p x \equiv y = x \wedge p x \quad \square$

Φ_{even} 

Predicates become relations

Moreover,

$$\Phi_p \cdot \top = \frac{\text{true}}{p} \quad (143)$$

thanks to distributive property (62) and

$$\underline{k} \cdot R \subseteq \underline{k} \quad (144)$$

Then:

$$R \cdot \Phi_p = R \cap \top \cdot \Phi_p \quad (145)$$


$$\Phi_q \cdot R = R \cap \Phi_q \cdot \top \quad (146)$$

These are called **pre** and **post** *restrictions* of R .


Exercise 59: Why does (144) hold? \square

Relational restrictions

Pre restriction $R \cdot \Phi_p$:



Post restriction $\Phi_q \cdot R$:



Distinguished coreflexives: domain and range

Remember...

Kernel of R	Image of R
$A \xleftarrow{\ker R} A$ $\ker R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R^\circ \cdot R$	$B \xleftarrow{\text{img } R} B$ $\text{img } R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \cdot R^\circ$

How about intersecting both with *id*?

$$\delta R = \ker R \cap id \tag{147}$$

$$\rho R = \text{img } R \cap id \tag{148}$$

Distinguished coreflexives: domain and range

Clearly:

$$a' \delta R a \equiv a' = a \wedge \langle \exists b : b R a' : b R a \rangle$$

that is

$$\delta R = \Phi_p \text{ where } p a = \langle \exists b :: b R a \rangle$$

Thus δR captures all a which R reacts to.

Dually,

$$\rho R = \Phi_q \text{ where } q b = \langle \exists a :: b R a \rangle$$

Thus ρR captures all b which R hits as target.

Distinguished coreflexives: domain and range

As was to be expected:

$(f \ X) \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq (g \ Y)$			
Description	f	g	Obs.
domain	δ	$(\top \cdot)$	left \subseteq restricted to coreflexives
range	ρ	$(\cdot \top)$	left \subseteq restricted to coreflexives

Spelling out these GC:

$$\delta X \subseteq Y \equiv X \subseteq \top \cdot Y \quad (149)$$

$$\rho R \subseteq Y \equiv R \subseteq Y \cdot \top \quad (150)$$

PROPOSITIO DE HOMINE ET CAPRA ET LVPO

Recalling the data model (4)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \textit{Being} & \xrightarrow{\textit{Eats}} & \textit{Being} \\
 & \downarrow \textit{where} & \\
 & \textit{Bank} & \xrightarrow{\textit{cross}} \textit{Bank}
 \end{array}$$

we specify the move of *Beings* to the other bank is an example of relational restriction and overriding:

$$\textit{carry}(\textit{where}, \textit{who}) = \textit{where} \upharpoonright (\textit{cross} \cdot \textit{where} \cdot \Phi_{\textit{who}}) \quad (151)$$

In **Alloy** syntax:

```

fun carry[where: Being -> one Bank,
      who: set Being]: Being -> one Bank
{ where ++ (who <: where).cross }

```

Exercises

Exercise 60: Prove the distributive property:

$$g^\circ \cdot (R \cap S) \cdot f = g^\circ \cdot R \cdot f \cap g^\circ \cdot S \cdot f \quad (152)$$

Then show that

$$g^\circ \cdot \Phi_p \cdot f = \frac{f}{g} \cap \frac{\text{true}}{p \cdot g} \quad (153)$$

holds (both sides of the equality mean $g \ b = f \ a \wedge p \ (g \ b)$). \square

Exercise 61: Infer

$$\Phi_q \cdot \Phi_p = \Phi_q \cap \Phi_p \quad (154)$$

from properties (145) and (146). \square

Exercises

Exercise 62: Show that

$$R \dagger f = f$$

holds, arising from (141,132) — where f is a function, of course. \square

Exercise 63: Function *move* (151) could have been defined by

$$\textit{move} = \textit{where}_{\textit{who}}^{\textit{cross}}$$

using the following (generic) **selective update** operator:

$$R_p^f = R \dagger (f \cdot R \cdot \Phi_p) \tag{155}$$


Prove the equalities: $R_p^{\textit{id}} = R$, $R_{\textit{false}}^f = R$ and $R_{\textit{true}}^f = f \cdot R$.

\square

Contracts



More on pre/post relational restrictions

Looking at the types in a **pre** restriction




we immediately realize they fit together into a “magic” square...

... and those in a **post** restriction




More on pre/post relational restrictions


Looking at the types in a **pre** restriction



... and those in a **post** restriction




we immediately realize they fit together into a “magic” square...





More on pre/post relational restrictions

Looking at the types in a **pre** restriction




we immediately realize they fit together into a “magic” square...

... and those in a **post** restriction




Our good old "square" (again!!)



$$R \cdot \Phi_p \subseteq \Phi_q \cdot R$$

What does this mean?

Let us see this for the (simpler) case in which R is a function f :



$$f \cdot \Phi_p \subseteq \Phi_q \cdot f$$

(156)

Contracts

By shunting, (156) is the same as $\Phi_p \subseteq f^\circ \cdot \Phi_q \cdot f$, therefore meaning:

$$\langle \forall a : p\ a : q\ (f\ a) \rangle \quad (157)$$

by exercise 58.

In words:

*For all inputs a such that **condition** $p\ a$ holds, the output $f\ a$ satisfies **condition** q .*

In software design, this is known as a (functional) **contract**, which we shall write

$$p \xrightarrow{f} q \quad (158)$$

— a notation that generalizes the type of f . **Important:** thanks to (146), (156) can also be written: $f \cdot \Phi_p \subseteq \Phi_q \cdot \top$.

Weakest pre-conditions

Note that more than one (**pre**) condition p may ensure (**post**) condition q on the outputs of f .

Indeed, contract

$\text{false} \xrightarrow{f} q$ always holds, but pre-condition false is useless (“**too strong**”).

The weaker p , the better. Now, is there a **weakest** such p ?

See the calculation aside.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
 f \cdot \Phi_p \subseteq \Phi_q \cdot f \\
 \equiv \{ \text{see above (146)} \} \\
 f \cdot \Phi_p \subseteq \Phi_q \cdot \top \\
 \equiv \{ \text{shunting (37); (143)} \} \\
 \Phi_p \subseteq f^\circ \cdot \frac{\text{true}}{q} \\
 \equiv \{ (42) \} \\
 \Phi_p \subseteq \frac{\text{true}}{q \cdot f} \\
 \equiv \{ \Phi_p \subseteq \text{id} ; (57) \} \\
 \Phi_p \subseteq \text{id} \cap \frac{\text{true}}{q \cdot f} \\
 \equiv \{ (142) \} \\
 \Phi_p \subseteq \Phi_{q \cdot f}
 \end{array} \right.$$

We conclude that $q \cdot f$ is such a **weakest** pre-condition.

Weakest pre-conditions

Notation $\text{WP}(f, q) = q \cdot f$ is often used for **weakest** pre-conditions.

Exercise 64: Calculate the weakest pre-condition $\text{WP}(f, q)$ for the following function / post-condition pairs:

- $f \ x = x^2 + 1$, $q \ y = y \leq 10$ (in \mathbb{R})
- $f = \mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\text{succ}} \mathbb{N}$, $q = \text{even}$
- $f \ x = x^2 + 1$, $q \ y = y \leq 0$ (in \mathbb{R})

□

Exercise 65: Show that $q \xleftarrow{g \cdot f} p$ holds provided $r \xleftarrow{f} p$ and $q \xleftarrow{g} r$ hold. □

Invariants versus contracts

In case **contract**

$$q \xrightarrow{f} q$$

holds (158), we say that q is an **invariant** of f — meaning that the “truth value” of q remains unchanged by execution of f .


More generally, invariant q is **preserved** by function f provided contract $p \xrightarrow{f} q$ holds and $p \Rightarrow q$, that is, $\Phi_p \subseteq \Phi_q$.

Some pre-conditions are weaker than others:

*We shall say that w is the **weakest** pre-condition for f to preserve **invariant** q wherever $\text{WP}(f, q) = w \wedge q$, where $\Phi_{(p \wedge q)} = \Phi_p \cdot \Phi_q$.*

Invariants versus contracts

Recalling the Alcuin puzzle, let us define the **starvation** invariant as a predicate on the state of the puzzle, passing the *where* function as a parameter *w*:



$$\textit{starving } w = w \cdot \textit{CanEat} \subseteq w \cdot \underline{\textit{Farmer}}$$

Recalling (151),

$$\textit{carry}(\textit{where}, \textit{who}) = \textit{where} \dagger (\textit{cross} \cdot \textit{where} \cdot \Phi_{\textit{who}})$$

we also define:

$$\textit{trip } b \textit{ } w = \textit{carry } (w, b) \tag{159}$$

Invariants versus contracts

Then the **contract**

$$\textit{starving} \xrightarrow{\textit{trip } b} \textit{starving}$$


would mean that the function *trip b* — that should carry *b* to the other bank of the river — always preserves the invariant:

$$\text{WP}(\textit{trip } b, \textit{starving}) = \textit{starving}.$$

Things are not that easy, however: there is a need for a **pre-condition** ensuring that *b* is on the *Farmer*'s bank and is *the right being to carry* !

Let us see a simpler example first.

Library loan example



$u R b$ means “book b currently on loan to library user u ”.

Desired properties:

- *same book not on loan to more than one user;*
- *no book with no authors;*
- *no two users with the same card Id .*

NB: lowercase arrow labels denote functions, as usual.

Library loan example

Encoding of desired properties:

- no book on loan to more than one user:

$Book \xrightarrow{R} User$ is **simple**

- no book without an author:

$Book \xrightarrow{Auth} Author$ is **entire**

- no two users with the same card Id:

$User \xrightarrow{card} Id$ is **injective**

NB: as all other arrows are functions, they are simple+entire.

Library loan example

Encoding of desired properties as relational **invariants**:

- no book on loan to more than one user:

$$\text{img } R \subseteq \text{id} \quad (160)$$

- no book without an author:

$$\text{id} \subseteq \ker \text{Auth} \quad (161)$$

- no two users with the same card Id:

$$\ker \text{card} \subseteq \text{id} \quad (162)$$

Library loan example

Now think of two operations on $User \xleftarrow{R} Book$, one that **returns** books to the library and another that **records** new borrowings:

$$return\ S\ R = R - S \quad (163)$$

$$borrow\ S\ R = S \cup R \quad (164)$$

Clearly, these operations only change the *books-on-loan* relation R , which is conditioned by invariant

$$inv\ R = \text{img}\ R \subseteq id \quad (165)$$

The question is, then: are the following “types”

$$inv \xleftarrow{return\ S} inv \quad (166)$$

$$inv \xleftarrow{borrow\ S} inv \quad (167)$$

ok? We check (166,167) below.

Library loan example

Checking (166):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{inv } (\text{return } S \ R) \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{inline definitions} \} \\
 & \text{img } (R - S) \subseteq \text{id} \\
 \Leftarrow & \quad \{ \text{since img is monotonic} \} \\
 & \text{img } R \subseteq \text{id} \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{definition} \} \\
 & \text{inv } R \\
 & \square
 \end{aligned}$$

So, for all R , $\text{inv } R \Rightarrow \text{inv } (\text{return } S \ R)$ holds — invariant inv is preserved.

Library loan example

At this point note that (166) was checked only as a *warming-up* exercise — we don't need to worry about it! Why?

As $R - S$ is smaller than R (exercise ??) and “smaller than injective is injective” (exercise 29), it is immediate that inv (165) is preserved.

To see this better, unfold and draw definition (165):

$$\text{inv } R = \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Book} & \xleftarrow{R^\circ} & \text{User} \\ R \downarrow & \subseteq & \downarrow \text{id} \\ \text{User} & \xleftarrow{\text{id}} & \text{User} \end{array}$$

As R is on the lower-path of the square, it can always get smaller.

Library loan example

This “rule of thumb” does not work for *borrow* S because, in general, $R \subseteq \text{borrow } S R$.

So R gets bigger, not smaller, and we have to check the contract:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{inv } (\text{borrow } S R) \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{inline definitions} \} \\
 & \text{img } (S \cup R) \subseteq \text{id} \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{exercise 26} \} \\
 & \text{img } R \subseteq \text{id} \wedge \text{img } S \subseteq \text{id} \wedge S \cdot R^\circ \subseteq \text{id} \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{definition of inv} \} \\
 & \text{inv } R \wedge \underbrace{\text{img } S \subseteq \text{id} \wedge S \cdot R^\circ \subseteq \text{id}}_{\text{WP}(\text{borrow } S, \text{inv})}
 \end{aligned}$$

Library loan example (Alloy)


In practice, our proposed **workflow** does not go immediately to the **calculation** of the **weakest precondition** of a **contract**.

We **model-check** the **contract** first, in order to save the process from childish errors:

What is the point in trying to prove something that a model checker can easily tell is a nonsense?

This follows a systematic process, illustrated next.

Relation Algebra + Alloy round-trip



Library loan example (Alloy)

First we write the Alloy model of what we have thus far:

```
sig Book {
  title : one Title,
  isbn : one ISBN,
  Auth : some Author,
  R : lone User
}
sig User {
  name : one Name,
  add : some Address,
  card : one Id
}
sig Title, ISBN, Author,
  Name, Address, Id { }
```

```
fact {
  card .~ card in iden
  -- card is injective
}
fun borrow
  [S, R : Book → lone User] :
  Book → lone User {
    R + S
  }
fun return
  [S, R : Book → lone User] :
  Book → lone User {
    R - S
  }
```

Library loan example (Alloy)

As we have seen, *return* is no problem, so we focus on *borrow*.

Realizing that most attributes of *Book* and *User* don't matter wrt. checking *borrow*, we comment them all, obtaining a much smaller model:

```
sig Book { R : lone User }
sig User { }
fun borrow
  [S, R : Book → lone User] :
    Book → lone User {
      R + S
    }
```

Next, we single out the **invariant**, making it explicit as a predicate (aside).

```
sig Book { R : User }
sig User { }
pred inv {
  R in Book → lone User
}
fun borrow
  [S, R : Book → User] :
    Book → User {
      R + S
    }
```

Library loan example (Alloy)

In the step that follows, we make the model **dynamic**, in the sense that we need at least two instances of relation R — one before *borrow* is applied and the other after.

We introduce *Time* as a way of recording such two moments, pulling R out of *Book*

$\text{sig } Time \{ r : Book \rightarrow User \}$

$\text{sig } Book \{ \}$

$\text{sig } User \{ \}$

and re-writing *inv* accordingly (aside).

$\text{pred inv } [t : Time] \{$
 $\quad t \cdot r \text{ in } Book \rightarrow \text{lone } User$
 $\}$

Note how

$r : Time \rightarrow (Book \rightarrow User)$ is a **function** — it yields, for each $t \in Time$, the relation $Book \xrightarrow{r\ t} User$.

Library loan example (Alloy)

This makes it possible to express contract $inv \xrightarrow{\text{borrow } S} inv$ in terms of $t \in \text{Time}$,

$$\langle \forall t, t' : inv\ t \wedge r\ t' = \text{borrow } S\ (r\ t) : inv\ t' \rangle$$

i.e. in Alloy:

```
assert contract {
  all t, t' : Time, S : Book → User |
    inv [t] and t' · r = borrow [t · r, S] ⇒ inv [t']
}
```

Once we check this, for instance running

check contract for 3 but exactly 2 Time

we shall obtain counter-examples. (These were expected...)

Library loan example (Alloy)

The counter-examples will quickly tell us what the problems are, guiding us to add the following pre-condition to the contract:

```
pred pre [t : Time, S : Book → User] {  
  S in Book → lone User  
  ~S · (t · r) in iden  
}
```

The fact that this does not yield counter-examples anymore does not tell us that

- *pre* is enough in general
- *pre* is weakest.

This we have to prove by calculation — as we have seen before.


Library loan example (Alloy)

Note that pre-conditioned *borrow* $S \cdot \Phi_{pre}$ is not longer a **function**, because it is not **entire** anymore.

We can encode such a relation in Alloy in an easy-to-read way, as a predicate structured in two parts — pre-condition and post-condition:

```
pred borrow [t, t' : Time, S : Book → User] {  
  -- pre-condition  
  S in Book → lone User  
  ~S · (t · r) in iden  
  -- post-condition  
  t' · r = t · r + S  
}
```

Alloy + Relation Algebra round-trip



Summary


- The Alloy + Relation Algebra round-trip enables us to take advantage of the best of the two verification strategies.
- Diagrams of **invariants** help in detecting which **contracts** don't need to be checked.
- Functional specifications are good as starting point but soon evolve towards becoming relations, comparable to the **methods** of an OO programming language.
- Time was added to the model just to obtain more than one "state". In general, *Time* will be **linearly ordered** so that the **traces** of the model can be reasoned about.⁵

⁵In Alloy, just declare: `open util/ordering[Time]`.

Class 9 - Wrapping up

Library loan example revisited

More detailed data model of our **library** with **invariants** captured by diagram



where

- M — records **books** on loan, identified by $ISBN$;
 - N — records library **users** (identified by user id's in UID);
- (both simple) and
- R — records **loan** dates.

Library loan example revisited

The two squares in the diagram impose bounds on R :

- Non-existing **books** cannot be on loan (left square);
- Only known **users** can take books home (right square).

(**NB:** in the database terminology these are known as **integrity constraints**.)

Exercise 66: Add variables to both squares in (168) so that the same conditions are expressed pointwise. Then show that the conjunction of the two squares means the same as assertion

$$R^\circ \subseteq \langle M^\circ \cdot T, N^\circ \cdot T \rangle \quad (169)$$

and draw this in a diagram. \square

Library loan example revisited

Exercise 67: Consider implementing M , R and N as **files** in a relational **database**. For this, think of **operations** on the database such as, for example, that which records new loans (K):

$$\text{borrow}(K, (M, R, N)) = (M, R \cup K, N) \quad (170)$$

It can be checked that the **pre-condition**

$$\text{pre-borrow}(K, (M, R, N)) = R \cdot K^\circ \subseteq \text{id}$$

is necessary for maintaining (168) (why?) but it is not enough. Calculate — for a rectangle in (168) of your choice — the corresponding clause to be added to *pre-borrow*. \square

Library loan example revisited

Exercise 68: The operations that **buy** new books

$$\textit{buy}(X, (M, R, N)) = (M \cup X, R, N) \quad (171)$$

and **register** new users

$$\textit{register}(Y, (M, R, N)) = (M, R, N \cup Y) \quad (172)$$

don't need any **pre-conditions**. Why? (Hint: compute their WP.) \square

NB: see annex on proofs by \subseteq -monotonicity for a strategy generalizing the exercise above.

Relational contracts

Finally, let the following definition

$$p \xrightarrow{R} q \quad \equiv \quad R \cdot \Phi_p \subseteq \Phi_q \cdot R \quad (173)$$

generalize functional contracts (156) to arbitrary relations, meaning:

$$\langle \forall b, a : b R a : p a \Rightarrow q b \rangle \quad (174)$$

— see the exercise below.

Exercise 69: Show that an alternative way of stating (173) is

$$p \xrightarrow{R} q \quad \equiv \quad R \cdot \Phi_p \subseteq \Phi_q \cdot \top \quad (175)$$

□


Exercise 19 (continued)

Exercise 70: Recalling exercise 19, let the following relation specify that two dates are at least one week apart in time:


$$d \text{ Ok } d' \equiv |d - d'| > 1 \text{ week}$$

Looking at the type diagram below right, say in your own words the meaning of the invariant specified by the relational type (??) statement below, on the left:


$$\ker (\text{home} \cup \text{away}) - \text{id} \xrightarrow{\text{date}} \text{Ok}$$



Case study: railway topologies



Case study: railway topologies




$$Sw \xleftarrow{S} N \xleftarrow{R} N \xrightarrow{P} SI$$

where

Sw — switches ('agulhas')

SI — signals ('sinais')

Case study: railway topologies




$$Sw \xleftarrow{S} N \xleftarrow{R} N \xrightarrow{P} SI$$

Switches:

$$switchOk(S, R, P) = \delta S \subseteq R^\circ \cdot (\neq) \cdot R$$

Case study: railway topologies



$$Sw \xleftarrow{S} N \xleftarrow{R} N \xrightarrow{P} SI$$

Add a switch:

$$addSwitch(s, n) (S, R, P) = (S \cup \underline{s} \cdot \underline{n}^{\circ}, R, P)$$

Case study: railway topologies

$$\text{switchOk} (\text{addSwitch} (s, n) (S, R, P))$$

$$\equiv \{ \dots\dots\dots \}$$

$$\delta(S \cup \underline{s} \cdot \underline{n}^\circ) \subseteq R^\circ \cdot (\neq) \cdot R$$

$$\equiv \{ \dots\dots\dots \}$$

$$\text{switchOk} (S, R, P) \wedge \underline{n} \cdot \top \cdot \underline{n}^\circ \subseteq R^\circ \cdot (\neq) \cdot R$$

$$\equiv \{ \dots\dots\dots \}$$

$$\text{switchOk} (S, R, P) \wedge \top \subseteq \underline{n}^\circ \cdot R^\circ \cdot (\neq) \cdot R \cdot \underline{n}$$

$$\equiv \{ \dots\dots\dots \}$$

$$\text{switchOk} (S, R, P) \wedge \langle \exists n_1, n_2 : n_1 \neq n_2 : n R^\circ n_1 \wedge n_2 R n \rangle$$

$$\equiv \{ \dots\dots\dots \}$$

$$\text{switchOk} (S, R, P) \wedge \underbrace{\langle \exists n_1, n_2 : n_1 \neq n_2 : n_1 R n \wedge n_2 R n \rangle}_{WP}$$

Relations as functions — the power transpose

Implicit in how e.g. **Alloy** works is the fact that **relations** can be represented by **functions**. Let $A \xrightarrow{R} B$ be a relation in

$$\begin{aligned}\wedge R &: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P} B \\ \wedge R a &= \{b \mid b R a\}\end{aligned}$$

such that:

$$\wedge R = f \quad \equiv \quad \langle \forall b, a :: b R a \equiv b \in f a \rangle \quad (176)$$

That is (universal property):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \rightarrow \mathcal{P} B & \xrightarrow{(\in \cdot)} & A \rightarrow B \\ & \cong & \\ A \rightarrow \mathcal{P} B & \xleftarrow{\wedge} & A \rightarrow B \end{array} \quad f = \wedge R \quad \equiv \quad \in \cdot f = R \quad (177)$$

In words: any **relation** can be represented by set-valued **function**.

Relations as functions — the “Maybe” transpose

Let $A \xrightarrow{S} B$ be a **simple** relation. Define the function

$$\Gamma S : A \rightarrow B + 1$$

such that:

$$\Gamma S = f \equiv \langle \forall b, a :: b S a \equiv (i_1 b) = f a \rangle$$

That is:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & (i_1^\circ \cdot) & \\
 A \rightarrow B + 1 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & A \rightarrow B \\
 & \cong & \\
 & \xleftarrow{\quad \Gamma \quad} &
 \end{array}
 \quad f = \Gamma S \equiv S = i_1^\circ \cdot f \quad (178)$$

In words: simple **relations** can be represented by “pointer”-valued **functions**.

“Maybe” transpose in action (Haskell)

(Or how **data** becomes **functional**.)

For finite relations, and assuming these represented **extensionally** as lists of pairs, the function

$$mT = \text{flip lookup} :: Eq\ a \Rightarrow [(a, b)] \rightarrow (a \rightarrow \text{Maybe } b)$$

implements the “Maybe”-transpose

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & (i_1^\circ \cdot) & \\
 A \rightarrow B + 1 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & A \rightarrow B \\
 & \cong & \\
 & \Gamma &
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 f = \Gamma S \quad \equiv \quad S = i_1^\circ \cdot f$$

in Haskell.

Data "functionalization"

Inspired by (178), we may implement

$$\text{Just}^\circ \cdot mT$$

in Haskell,

```
pap :: Eq a => [(a, t)] → a → t  
pap m = unJust · (mT m) where unJust (Just a) = a
```

which converts a list of **key-value pairs** into a *partial function*.

NB: *pap* abbreviates "partial application".

*In this way, the **columnar** approach to data processing can be made **functional**.*

Exercises

Exercise 71: Derive from (177) the laws of cancellation and reflection:

$$\in \cdot \wedge R = R \quad (179)$$

$$\wedge \in = id \quad (180)$$

□

Exercise 72: The fusion law

$$\wedge R \cdot f = \wedge(R \cdot f) \quad (181)$$

follows immediately from

$$\wedge R \cdot f = \wedge S \quad \equiv \quad R \cdot f = S \quad (182)$$

Prove (182). □

Background — Eindhoven quantifier calculus

Trading:

$$\langle \forall k : R \wedge S : T \rangle = \langle \forall k : R : S \Rightarrow T \rangle \quad (183)$$

$$\langle \exists k : R \wedge S : T \rangle = \langle \exists k : R : S \wedge T \rangle \quad (184)$$

de Morgan:

$$\neg \langle \forall k : R : T \rangle = \langle \exists k : R : \neg T \rangle \quad (185)$$

$$\neg \langle \exists k : R : T \rangle = \langle \forall k : R : \neg T \rangle \quad (186)$$

One-point:

$$\langle \forall k : k = e : T \rangle = T[k := e] \quad (187)$$

$$\langle \exists k : k = e : T \rangle = T[k := e] \quad (188)$$

Background — Eindhoven quantifier calculus

Nesting:

$$\langle \forall a, b : R \wedge S : T \rangle = \langle \forall a : R : \langle \forall b : S : T \rangle \rangle \quad (189)$$

$$\langle \exists a, b : R \wedge S : T \rangle = \langle \exists a : R : \langle \exists b : S : T \rangle \rangle \quad (190)$$

Rearranging- \forall :

$$\langle \forall k : R \vee S : T \rangle = \langle \forall k : R : T \rangle \wedge \langle \forall k : S : T \rangle \quad (191)$$

$$\langle \forall k : R : T \wedge S \rangle = \langle \forall k : R : T \rangle \wedge \langle \forall k : R : S \rangle \quad (192)$$

Rearranging- \exists :

$$\langle \exists k : R : T \vee S \rangle = \langle \exists k : R : T \rangle \vee \langle \exists k : R : S \rangle \quad (193)$$

$$\langle \exists k : R \vee S : T \rangle = \langle \exists k : R : T \rangle \vee \langle \exists k : S : T \rangle \quad (194)$$

Splitting:

$$\langle \forall j : R : \langle \forall k : S : T \rangle \rangle = \langle \forall k : \langle \exists j : R : S \rangle : T \rangle \quad (195)$$

$$\langle \exists j : R : \langle \exists k : S : T \rangle \rangle = \langle \exists k : \langle \exists j : R : S \rangle : T \rangle \quad (196)$$

References



D. Jackson.

Software Abstractions: Logic, Language, and Analysis.

The MIT Press, Cambridge Mass., 2012.

Revised edition, ISBN 0-262-01715-2.



C.B. Jones.

Software Development — A Rigorous Approach.

Prentice-Hall, 1980.

ISBN 0138218846.