

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/)

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
```

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

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)

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

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

- 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 = ...
```

```
f (Suc n) = ...f n ...
```

Type option

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

Important application:

... \Rightarrow 'a option \approx partial function:
None \approx no result
Some x \approx 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

Demo: Trees

Term Rewriting

Term rewriting means . . .

Terminology: equation becomes *rewrite rule*

Using a set of equations $l = r$ from left to right

As long as possible (possibly forever!)

Example

Equations:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 + n &= n & (1) \\ (\text{Suc } m) + n &= \text{Suc}(m + n) & (2) \\ (0 \leq m) &= \text{True} & (3) \\ (\text{Suc } m \leq \text{Suc } n) &= (m \leq n) & (4) \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 + \text{Suc } 0 &\leq \text{Suc } 0 + x & \underline{\underline{(1)}} \\ \text{Suc } 0 &\leq \text{Suc } 0 + x & \underline{\underline{(2)}} \\ \text{Suc } 0 &\leq \text{Suc}(0 + x) & \underline{\underline{(4)}} \\ 0 &\leq 0 + x & \underline{\underline{(3)}} \\ &\text{True} \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting: More Formally

substitution = mapping of variables to terms

- $l = r$ is *applicable* to term $t[s]$ if there is a substitution σ such that $\sigma(l) = s$
 - s is an instance of l
- Result: $t[\sigma(r)]$
- Also have theorem: $t[s] = t[\sigma(r)]$

Example

- Equation: $0 + n = n$
- Term: $a + (0 + (b + c))$
- Substitution: $\sigma = \{n \mapsto b + c\}$
- Result: $a + (b + c)$
- Theorem: $a + (0 + (b + c)) = a + (b + c)$

Conditional Rewriting

Rewrite rules can be conditional:

$$\llbracket P_1; \dots; P_n \rrbracket \Longrightarrow l = r$$

is *applicable* to term $t[s]$ with substitution σ if:

- $\sigma(l) = s$ and
- $\sigma(P_1), \dots, \sigma(P_n)$ are provable (possibly again by rewriting)

Variables

Three kinds of variables in Isabelle:

- bound: $\forall x. x = x$
- free: $x = x$
- *schematic*: $?x = ?x$
(“unknown”, a.k.a. *meta-variables*)

Can be mixed in term or formula: $\forall b. \exists y. f\ ?a\ y = b$

Variables

- Logically: free = bound at meta-level
- Operationally:
 - free variables are fixed
 - schematic variables are instantiated by substitutions

From x to $?x$

State lemmas with free variables:

```
lemma app_Nil2 [simp]: "xs @ [ ] = xs"
```

```
⋮
```

```
done
```

After the proof: Isabelle changes xs to $?xs$ (internally):

$$?xs @ [] = ?xs$$

Now usable with arbitrary values for $?xs$

Example: rewriting

$$\text{rev}(a @ []) = \text{rev } a$$

using `app_Nil2` with $\sigma = \{?xs \mapsto a\}$

Basic Simplification

Goal: 1. $\llbracket P_1; \dots; P_m \rrbracket \implies C$

`apply (simp add: eq_thm1 ... eq_thmn)`

Simplify (mostly rewrite) $P_1; \dots; P_m$ and C using

- lemmas with attribute `simp`
- rules from `primrec` and `datatype`
- additional lemmas $eq_thm_1 \dots eq_thm_n$
- assumptions $P_1; \dots; P_m$

Variations:

- `(simp ... del: ...)` removes `simp`-lemmas
- `add` and `del` are optional