

# Automatic Deduction — Introduction to Isabelle

## LVA 703522

### 1 Isar

#### 1.1 Propositional Logic

▷ Provide Isar proof texts that prove the following lemmas. You may only use the methods rule and -.

```
lemma "(A ∨ A) = (A ∧ A)"
proof
  assume "A ∨ A"
  then have a: "A" by rule
  from a a show "A ∧ A" by rule
next
  assume "A ∧ A"
  then have "A" by rule
  then show "A ∨ A" by rule
qed
```

Variation, using backticks.

```
lemma "(A ∨ A) = (A ∧ A)"
proof
  assume "A ∨ A"
  then have "A" by rule
  from `A` `A` show "A ∧ A" by rule
next
  assume "A ∧ A"
  then have "A" by rule
  then show "A ∨ A" by rule
qed
```

```
lemma "(A ∨ B) ∨ C ⟶ A ∨ (B ∨ C)"
proof
  assume "(A ∨ B) ∨ C"
  then show "A ∨ (B ∨ C)"
proof
  assume "A ∨ B"
  then show ?thesis
proof
  assume "A"

```

```

    then show ?thesis by rule
  next
    assume "B"
    then have "B  $\vee$  C" by rule
    then show ?thesis by rule
  qed
next
  assume "C"
  then have "B  $\vee$  C" by rule
  then show ?thesis by rule
qed
qed

```

## 1.2 Predicate Logic

▷ Provide Isar proof texts that prove the following lemmas. Again, you may not use automation.

```

lemma " $((\forall x. P x) \wedge (\forall x. Q x)) = (\forall x. (P x \wedge Q x))$ "
proof
  assume pq: " $(\forall x. P x) \wedge (\forall x. Q x)$ "
  from pq have p: " $\forall x. P x$ " ..
  from pq have q: " $\forall x. Q x$ " ..
  show " $\forall x. P x \wedge Q x$ "
  proof
    fix x
    from p have p': "P x" ..
    from q have q': "Q x" ..
    from p' q' show "P x  $\wedge$  Q x" ..
  qed
next
  assume pq: " $\forall x. P x \wedge Q x$ "
  show " $(\forall x. P x) \wedge (\forall x. Q x)$ "
  proof
    show " $\forall x. P x$ "
    proof
      fix x
      from pq have "P x  $\wedge$  Q x" ..
      then show "P x" ..
    qed
  next
    show " $\forall x. Q x$ "
    proof
      fix x
      from pq have "P x  $\wedge$  Q x" ..
      then show "Q x" ..
    qed
  qed
qed
qed

```

```

lemma " $(\exists x. P x) \vee (\exists x. Q x) = (\exists x. (P x \vee Q x))$ "
proof
  assume " $(\exists x. P x) \vee (\exists x. Q x)$ "
  then show " $\exists x. P x \vee Q x$ "
  proof
    assume " $\exists x. P x$ "
    then obtain y where "P y" ..
    then have "P y  $\vee$  Q y" ..
    then show ?thesis ..
  next
    assume " $\exists x. Q x$ "
    then obtain y where "Q y" ..
    then have "P y  $\vee$  Q y" ..
    then show ?thesis ..
  qed
next
  assume " $\exists x. P x \vee Q x$ "
  then obtain y where "P y  $\vee$  Q y" ..
  then show " $(\exists x. P x) \vee (\exists x. Q x)$ "
  proof
    assume "P y"
    then have " $\exists x. P x$ " ..
    then show ?thesis ..
  next
    assume "Q y"
    then have " $\exists x. Q x$ " ..
    then show ?thesis ..
  qed
qed

```

The following lemma also requires `classical`:  $(\neg P \implies P) \implies P$  (or an equivalent theorem) in order to be proved. You need to invoke this explicitly with `proof` rule `classical` or similar.

```

lemma " $(\neg (\forall x. P x)) = (\exists x. \neg P x)$ "
proof
  assume " $\neg (\forall x. P x)$ "
  show " $\exists x. \neg P x$ "
  proof (rule classical)
    assume " $\neg (\exists x. \neg P x)$ "
    have " $\forall x. P x$ " proof
      fix x
      show "P x"
      proof (rule classical)
        assume " $\neg P x$ "
        then have " $\exists x. \neg P x$ " ..
        with ' $\neg (\exists x. \neg P x)$ ' show ?thesis ..
      qed
    qed
  qed

```

```

    with '¬ (∀x. P x)' show ?thesis ..
  qed
next
  assume "∃x. ¬ P x"
  then obtain x where "¬ P x" by rule
  show "¬ (∀x. P x)" proof
    assume "∀x. P x"
    then have "P x" by rule
    from '¬ P x' 'P x' show "False" by rule
  qed
qed

```

*Hint:* it may be useful to study the natural deduction proofs of these lemmas before attempting to provide Isar proofs.