

Topics in Automated Deduction (CS 576)

Elsa L. Gunter

2112 Siebel Center

egunter@cs.uiuc.edu

[http://www.cs.uiuc.edu/class/
sp06/cs576/](http://www.cs.uiuc.edu/class/sp06/cs576/)

Theory = Module

Syntax:

theory *MyTh* = *ImpTh*₁ + ... + *ImpTh*_{*n*} :

(declarations, definitions, theorems, proofs, ...) **end**

- *MyTh*: name of theory being built. Must live in file *MyTh.thy*.
- *ImpTh*_{*i*}: name of *imported* theories. Importing is transitive.

Concrete Syntax

When writing terms and types in `.thy` files (or an Isabelle shell):

Types and terms need to be enclosed in `"..."`

Except for single identifiers, e.g. `'a`

`"..."` won't always be shown on slides

Proofs

General schema:

```
lemma name:  "goal"
```

```
apply (...)
```

```
⋮
```

```
done
```

If the lemma is suitable as a simplification rule:

```
lemma name[simp]:  " ..."
```

Adds lemma *name* to future simplifications

Meta-logic: Basic Constructs

Implication: \Rightarrow ($=>$)

For separating premises and conclusion of theorems / rules

Equality: \equiv ($=$)

For definitions

Universal Quantifier: \wedge ($!!$)

Usually inserted and removed by Isabelle automatically

Do not use inside HOL formulae

Rule/Goal Notation

$$[|A_1; \dots; A_n|] \Longrightarrow B$$

abbreviates

$$A_1 \Longrightarrow \dots \Longrightarrow A_n \Longrightarrow B$$

and means the rule (or potential rule):

$$\frac{A_1; \dots; A_n}{B}$$

; \approx “and”

Note: A theorem is a rule; a rule is a theorem.

The Proof/Goal State

$$1. \ \wedge x_1 \dots x_m. \ [\mid A_1 ; \dots ; A_n \mid] \implies B$$

$x_1 \dots x_m$ Local constants (fixed variables)

$A_1 \dots A_n$ Local assumptions

B Actual (sub)goal

Proof Methods

- Simplification and a bit of logic
 - **Syntax:** `auto`
 - **Effect:** tries to solve as many subgoals as possible using simplification and basic logical reasoning
- More specialized tactics to come

Top-down Proofs

sorry

“completes” any proof (by giving up, and accepting it)

Suitable for top-down development of theories:

Assume lemmas first, prove them later.

Only allowed for interactive proof!

A Recursive datatype

```
datatype 'a list = Nil | Cons 'a "'a list"
```

`Nil`: empty list

`Cons x xs`: list with head `x::'a`, tail `xs::'a list`

A toy list: `Cons False (Cons True Nil)`

Syntactic sugar: `[False, True]`

Structural Induction on Lists

$P\ xs$ holds for all lists xs if

- $P\ Nil$, and
- for arbitrary a and $list$, $P\ list$ implies

$P\ (Cons\ a\ list)$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} P\ ys \\ \vdots \\ P\ Nil \quad P\ (Cons\ y\ ys) \end{array}}{P\ xs}$$

In Isabelle:

```
[| ?P []; !!a list. ?P list ==> ?P (a # list) |] ==> ?P ?list
```

A Recursive Function: List Append

Declaration:

`consts app :: "'a list \Rightarrow 'a list \Rightarrow 'a list`

and definition by *primitive recursion*:

`primrec`

`app Nil ys = _____`

`app (Cons x xs) ys = _____app xs ..._____`

One rule per constructor

Recursive calls only applied to constructor arguments

Guarantees termination (total function)

Proof Method

- Structural Induction
 - **Syntax:** `(induct x)`

`x` must be a free variable in the first subgoal

The type of `x` must be a datatype
 - **Effect:** Generates 1 new subgoal per constructor
 - Type of `x` determines which induction principle to use

Demo: Append and Reverse

Introducing New Types

Keywords:

- `typedef`: Primitive for type definitions; Only real way of introducing a new type with new properties
More on this later
- `typedefcl`: Pure declaration; New type with no properties (expect that it is non-empty)

Introducing New Types

Keywords:

- `types`: Abbreviation - may be used in constant declarations
- `datatype`: Defines recursive data-types; solutions to free algebra specifications
Basis for primitive recursive function definitions

typedefcl

`typedefcl` *name*

Introduces new “opaque” *name* without definition

Serves similar role for generic reasoning as polymorphism, but can’t be specialized

Example:

`typedefcl` `addr` — An abstract type of addresses

types

`types` $\langle tyvars \rangle$ *name* = τ

Introduces an abbreviation $\langle tyvars \rangle$ *name* for type τ

Examples:

`types`

`name = string`

`('a,'b)foo = "'a list * 'b"`

Type abbreviations are expanded immediately after parsing

Not present in internal representation and Isabelle output

`datatype`: The Example

```
datatype 'a list = Nil | Cons 'a "'a list"
```

Properties:

- Type constructors: $\text{Nil} :: 'a \text{ list}$
 $\text{Cons} :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ list}$
- Distinctness: $\text{Nil} \neq \text{Cons } x \text{ xs}$
- Injectivity:
 $(\text{Cons } x \text{ xs} = \text{Cons } y \text{ ys}) = (x = y \wedge \text{xs} = \text{ys})$

`datatype`: The General Case

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \text{datatype } (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)\tau & = & C_1 \tau_{1,1} \dots \tau_{1,n_1} \\ & | & \dots \\ & | & C_k \tau_{k,1} \dots \tau_{k,n_k} \end{array}$$

- Type Constructors:

$$C_i :: \tau_{i,1} \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow \tau_{i,n_i} \Rightarrow (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)\tau$$

- Distinctness: $C_i x_i \dots x_{i,n_i} \neq C_j y_j \dots y_{j,n_j}$ if $i \neq j$
- Injectivity: $(C_i x_1 \dots x_{n_i} = C_i y_1 \dots y_{n_i}) = (x_1 = y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{n_i} = y_{n_i})$

Distinctness and Injectivity are applied automatically

Induction must be applied explicitly

Definitions by Example

Declaration: `consts`

```
lot_size :: "nat * nat"
sq : "nat  $\Rightarrow$  nat"
```

Definition: `defs`

```
"lot_size  $\equiv$  (62, 103)"
sq_def: "sq n  $\equiv$  n * n"
```

Declarations

+ definitions: `constdefs`

```
lot_size :: "nat * nat"
lot_size_def: "lot_size  $\equiv$  (62, 103)"
sq : "nat  $\Rightarrow$  nat"
sq_def: "sq n  $\equiv$  n * n"
```

Definition Restrictions

`constdefs`

```
prime :: "nat  $\Rightarrow$  bool"
```

```
"prime p  $\equiv$  p < 1  $\wedge$  (m dvd p  $\longrightarrow$  m = 1  $\vee$  m = p)"
```

Not a definition: m free, but not on left

! Every free variable on rhs must occur as argument
on lhs !

```
"prime p  $\equiv$  p < 1  $\wedge$  ( $\forall$  m. m dvd p  $\longrightarrow$  m = 1  $\vee$  m = p)"
```

Note: no recursive definitions with `defs` or `constdefs`

Using Definitions

Definitions are not used automatically

Unfolding of definition of sq:

```
apply (unfold sq_def)
```

HOL Functions are Total

Why nontermination can be harmful:

If $f\ x$ is undefined, is $f\ x = f\ x$?

Excluded Middle says it must be True or False

Reflexivity says it's True

How about $f\ x = 0$? $f\ x = 1$? $f\ x = y$? If $\neg f\ x = y$
then $\forall y. f\ x = y$. Then $f\ x = f\ x \neq$

! All functions in HOL must be total !

Function Definition in Isabelle/HOL

- Non-recursive definitions with `defs/constdefs`
No problem
- Primitive-recursive (over datatypes) with `primrec`
Termination proved automatically internally
- Well-founded recursion with `recdef`
User must (help to) prove termination
(\rightsquigarrow later)

primrec Example

primrec

```
"app Nil          ys = ys"
```

```
"app (Cons x xs) ys = Cons x (app xs ys)"
```

primrec: The General Case

If τ is a **datatype** with constructors C_1, \dots, C_k , then $f :: \dots \Rightarrow \tau \Rightarrow \tau'$ can be defined by *primitive recursion* by:

$$\begin{aligned} f \ x_1 \dots (C_1 \ y_{1,1} \dots y_{1,n_1}) \dots x_m &= r_1 \\ &\dots \\ f \ x_1 \dots (C_k \ y_{k,1} \dots y_{k,n_k}) \dots x_m &= r_k \end{aligned}$$

The recursive calls in r_i must be *structurally smaller*, i.e. of the form $f \ a_1 \dots y_{i,j} \dots a_m$.

nat is a datatype

```
datatype nat = 0 | Suc nat
```

Functions on nat are definable by **primrec**!

primrec

$f\ 0 = \dots$

$f\ (Suc\ n) = \dots f\ n \dots$

Type option

```
datatype 'a option = None | Some 'a
```

Important application:

$\dots \Rightarrow 'a \text{ option} \approx \text{partial function:}$
 $\text{None} \approx \text{no result}$
 $\text{Some } x \approx \text{result of } x$

option Example

```
consts lookup :: 'k  $\Rightarrow$  ('k  $\times$  'v)list  $\Rightarrow$  'v option
```

```
primrec
```

```
lookup k [ ] = None
```

```
lookup k (x#xs) =
```

```
(if fst x = k then Some(snd x) else lookup k xs)
```

case

Every `datatype` introduces a `case` construct, e.g.

`(case xs of [] \Rightarrow ... | y#ys \Rightarrow ...y ...ys ...)`

In general: one case per constructor

Same number of cases as in `datatype`

No nested patterns (e.g. `x# y# zs`)

Nested cases are allowed

Needs `()` in context

Case Distinctions

`apply (case_tac t)`

creates k subgoals:

$$t = C_i \ x_1 \ \dots \ x_{n_i} \implies \dots$$

one for each constructor C_i