

# Maude Summer School: Lecture 1

José Meseguer

Computer Science Department  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and  
Leverhulme visiting professor at King's College, London

## Formal Specification and Verification in Maude

These lectures will introduce you to Maude. The four main ideas of Maude are that:

1. Programming in Maude is **mathematical modeling** using a **computational logic** as the programming language.
2. **Computation** is **formal deduction** in the computational logic.
3. The **meaning** of a program  $P$  is a **mathematical model**  $\mathbb{C}_P$  in first-order logic, called the **canonical model** of  $P$ .
4. Saying that program  $P$  **satisfies** a formal **property**  $\varphi$  **exactly means** that  $\mathbb{C}_P \models \varphi$  in the first-order logic sense.

## High Performance, Tools, and Applications

Maude is a **high-performance** language. It ranked second, shortly after Haskell, in the 2018 INRIA-Grenoble competition among 14 languages.

Maude has a **formal tool environment** supporting both **deductive** and **model checking** verification of Maude programs.

Maude has been used in many **applications** worldwide. See:

- <http://maude.cs.illinois.edu/w/index.php/Applications>
- And for a (somewhat dated) survey: “J. Meseguer, “Twenty years of rewriting logic,” J. Log. Algebr. Program. 81(7-8): 721–781 (2012).

## Modeling Deterministic and Concurrent Systems

Maude can naturally model:

1. **Deterministic systems** in **equational logic**, in its **sublanguage** of **functional modules**.
  2. **Concurrent systems** in **rewriting logic**, in its **full language** of **system modules**.
- Lectures 1 and 2 will focus on **equational logic** and **functional modules**.
  - Lectures 3 and 4 will mainly focus on **rewriting logic** and **system modules**.

## Equational Theories

Theories in **equational logic** are called **equational theories**. In Computer Science they are sometimes referred to as **algebraic specifications**.

An **equational theory** is a pair  $(\Sigma, E)$ , where:

- $\Sigma$ , called the **signature**, describes the **syntax** of the theory, that is, what **types** of data and what (typed) **operation symbols** (function symbols) are involved;
- $E$  is a set of **equations** between expressions (called  **$\Sigma$ -terms**) in the syntax of  $\Sigma$ .

## Unsorted, Many-Sorted, and Order-Sorted Signatures

Our syntax  $\Sigma$  can be more or less expressive, depending on how many **types** (called **sorts**) of data it allows, and what **relationships** between types it supports:

- **unsorted** (or single-sorted) signatures have only one sort, and operation symbols on it;
- **many-sorted** signatures allow different sorts, such as `Integer`, `Bool`, `List`, etc., and operation symbols relating these sorts;
- **order-sorted** signatures are many-sorted signatures that, in addition, allow **subtype** relations between sorts, such as `Natural < Integer < Rational`.

## Maude Functional Modules

Maude **functional modules are** equational theories  $(\Sigma, E)$ , declared with syntax

```
fmod  $(\Sigma, E)$  endfm
```

Such theories can be unsorted, many-sorted, or order-sorted.

In what follows we will see examples of unsorted, many-sorted and order-sorted equational theories  $(\Sigma, E)$  expressed as Maude **functional modules**, and of how such theories are used as **functional programs** that **compute by equational deduction** (replacement of equals for equals) with their equations  $E$ .

## Unsorted Functional Modules

\*\*\* Natural number addition in prefix syntax

```
fmod NAT-PREFIX is
  sort Natural .
  op 0 : -> Natural [ctor] .
  op s : Natural -> Natural [ctor] .
  op + : Natural Natural -> Natural .
  vars N M : Natural .
  eq +(N,0) = N .
  eq +(N,s(M)) = s(+(N,M)) .
endfm
```

```
Maude> red +(s(s(0)),s(s(0))) .
reduce in NAT-PREFIX : +(s(s(0)), s(s(0))) .
result Natural: s(s(s(s(0))))
Maude>
```



## Tracing Maude's Reduce Command

We can use Maude's **trace** facility to see how Maude uses **equational deduction** (replacement of equals for equals) in a **left to right** manner to evaluate **functional expressions** with the **reduce** command:

```
Maude> set trace on .
Maude> red +(s(s(0)),s(s(0))) .
reduce in NAT-PREFIX : +(s(s(0)), s(s(0))) .
***** equation
eq +(N, s(M)) = s(+ (N, M)) .
N --> s(s(0))
M --> s(0)
+(s(s(0)), s(s(0)))
--->
s(+ (s(s(0)), s(0)))
***** equation
```

eq +(N, s(M)) = s(+(N, M)) .

N --> s(s(0))

M --> 0

+(s(s(0)), s(0))

---->

s(+(s(s(0)), 0))

\*\*\*\*\* equation

eq +(N, 0) = N .

N --> s(s(0))

+(s(s(0)), 0)

---->

s(s(0))

result Natural: s(s(s(s(0))))

## Unsorted Functional Modules (II)

\*\*\* Natural's addition and multiplication in mixfix syntax

```
fmod NAT-MIXFIX is
  sort Natural .
  op 0 : -> Natural [ctor] .
  op s_ : Natural -> Natural [ctor] .
  op _+_ : Natural Natural -> Natural .
  op *_ : Natural Natural -> Natural .
  vars N M : Natural .
  eq N + 0 = N .
  eq N + s M = s(N + M) .
  eq N * 0 = 0 .
  eq N * s M = N + (N * M) .
endfm
```

```
Maude> red (s s 0) + (s s 0) .
reduce in NAT-MIXFIX : s s 0 + s s 0 .
result Natural: s s s s 0
Maude>
```

## Many-Sorted Functional Modules

```
fmod NAT-LIST is
  protecting NAT-MIXFIX .
  sort List .
  op nil : -> List [ctor] .
  op _.._ : Natural List -> List [ctor] .
  op length : List -> Natural .
  var N : Natural .
  var L : List .
  eq length(nil) = 0 .
  eq length(N . L) = s length(L) .
endfm
```

```
Maude> red length(0 . (s 0 . (s s 0 . (0 . nil)))) .
reduce in NAT-LIST : length(0 . s 0 . s s 0 . 0 . nil) .
result Natural: s s s s 0
Maude>
```

## The Need for Order-Sorted Signatures

Many-sorted signatures are still **too restrictive**. The problem is that **some operations are partial**, and there is no **natural** way of defining them in just a many-sorted framework.

Consider, division by 0, or defining a function **first** that takes the first element of a list of natural numbers, or a predecessor function **p** that assigns to each natural number its predecessor. What can we do? Declaring operators:

```
op _/_ : Rat Rat -> Rat .  
op first : List -> Natural .  
op p_ : Natural -> Natural .
```

we then have the awkward problem of defining the values of  $1 / 0$ , **first(nil)** and **p 0**, which in fact are **undefined**.

## The Need for Order-Sorted Signatures (II)

These functions are **partial** with the typing just given, but **become total** on appropriate **subsorts** `NzRat < Rat` of nonzero rationals, `NeList < List` of nonempty lists, and `NzNatural < Natural` of nonzero naturals. If we declare,

```
op _/_ : Rat NzRat -> Rat .
op s_ : Natural -> NzNatural .
op _._ : Natural List -> NeList .
op first : NeList -> Natural .
op p_ : NzNatural -> Natural .
```

everything is fine. Subsorts also allow us to **overload** operator symbols. For example, `Natural < Integer`, and

```
op _+_ : Natural Natural -> Natural .
op _+_ : Integer Integer -> Integer .
```

## Order-Sorted Functional Modules

```
fmod NATURAL is
  sorts Natural NzNatural .
  subsorts NzNatural < Natural .
  op 0 : -> Natural [ctor] .
  op s_ : Natural -> NzNatural [ctor] .
  op p_ : NzNatural -> Natural .
  op _+_ : Natural Natural -> Natural .
  op _+_ : NzNatural NzNatural -> NzNatural .
  vars N M : Natural .
  eq p s N = N .
  eq N + 0 = N .
  eq N + s M = s(N + M) .
endfm
```

```
Maude> red p((s s 0) + (s s 0)) .
reduce in NATURAL : p (s s 0 + s s 0) .
result NzNatural: s s s 0
```

## Order-Sorted Functional Modules (II)

```
fmod NAT-LIST-II is
  protecting NATURAL .
  sorts NeList List .
  subsorts NeList < List .
  op nil : -> List [ctor] .
  op _.._ : Natural List -> NeList [ctor] .
  op length : List -> Natural .
  op first : NeList -> Natural .
  op rest : NeList -> List .
  var N : Natural .
  var L : List .
  eq length(nil) = 0 .
  eq length(N . L) = s length(L) .
  eq first(N . L) = N .
  eq rest(N . L) = L .
endfm
```



## Rewriting as Efficient Equational Deduction

Maude computes with equations  $E$  from left to right. For example, in the second step of our trace:

```
***** equation
eq +(N, s(M)) = s(+(N, M)) .
N --> s(s(0))
M --> 0
+(s(s(0)), s(0)) ----> s(+(s(s(0)), 0))
```

the **subexpression**  $+(s(s(0)), s(0))$  of the first step's result:  $s(+(s(s(0)), s(0)))$  has been **matched** as an **instance** of the equation's **lefthand side**  $+(N, s(M)) = s(+(N, M))$  with **matching substitution**  $\{N \mapsto s(s(0)), M \mapsto 0\}$ , which **applied** to the equation's **righthand side** yields the **resulting subexpression**  $s(+(s(s(0)), 0))$  within:  $s(s(+(s(s(0)), 0)))$ .

## Rewriting as Efficient Equational Deduction (II)

This efficient form of equational deduction is called **term rewriting**, and is achieved as follows:

1. The equations  $E$  in  $(\Sigma, E)$  are **oriented** as a **term rewriting system**  $(\Sigma, \vec{E})$ , where  $\vec{E} = \{u \rightarrow v \mid (u = v) \in E\}$  are called its **rewrite rules**.
2. A **functional expression** or **term**  $t$  is **rewritten** or **simplified** to  $t'$  with  $\vec{E}$  in **one step**, written  $t \rightarrow_{\vec{E}} t'$ , iff there is a **subterm**  $w$  in  $t$  (notation:  $t = t[w]$ ), a **rule**  $(u \rightarrow v) \in \vec{E}$  and a **substitution**  $\theta$  such that: (i)  $w = u\theta$ , (ii)  $w' = v\theta$ , and (iii)  $t' = t[w'] = t[v\theta]$ , where,  $u\theta$  (resp.  $v\theta$ ) denotes the **instantiation** of  $u$  (resp.  $v$ ) with substitution  $\theta$ .

Let us illustrate all this in our trace example.

## Rewriting as Efficient Equational Deduction (III)

In our 2nd trace step for equation:  $+(N, \mathbf{s}(M)) = \mathbf{s}(+(N, M))$

1.  $t = \mathbf{s}(+(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(0)), \mathbf{s}(0))) = \mathbf{s}([+(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(0)), \mathbf{s}(0))])$

2.  $\theta = \{N \mapsto \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(0)), M \mapsto 0\}$

3.  $w = +(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(0)), \mathbf{s}(0)) = +(N, \mathbf{s}(M))\theta$

4.  $w' = \mathbf{s}(+(N, M))\theta = \mathbf{s}(+(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(0)), 0))$ , and

5.  $t' = \mathbf{s}([w']) = \mathbf{s}([\mathbf{s}(+(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(0)), 0))]) = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(+(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(0)), 0)))$

yielding the **one-step rewrite**:

$$t = \mathbf{s}([+(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(0)), \mathbf{s}(0))]) \rightarrow_{\vec{E}} \mathbf{s}([\mathbf{s}(+(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(0)), 0))]) = t'$$

with rule  $+(N, \mathbf{s}(M)) \rightarrow \mathbf{s}(+(N, M))$ .