Summer Term 2024

Interactive Theorem Proving using Isabelle/HOL

Session 7

René Thiemann

Department of Computer Science

Outline

- Inductive Definitions
- Rule Inversion and Rule Induction
- Sets in Isabelle

Inductive Definitions

Definition Principles so Far

- `definition`
  - non-recursive definitions
  - no pattern matching on left-hand sides, form: $f\ x_1 \dots x_n = rhs$
  - no simp-rules, but obtain defining equation: $f\_def\colon f\ x_1 \dots x_n = rhs$
- `fun` or `function`
  - recursive functions definitions including pattern matching on lhss
  - functions have to be terminating
  - obtain simp-rules and induction scheme

Purpose of Definition

- `definition` is the most primitive definition principle
- `definition` can be used formalize certain concepts
- after having derived interface-lemmas to concept, one might hide internal definition (in particular the defining equation is by default not added to simpset)
- many higher-level definition principles internally are based on `definition`
  - example: `function` uses some internal `definition`s which are hidden to user (demo)

Example: Injectivity

```
definition injective :: "('a ⇒ 'b) ⇒ bool" where
  "injective f = (∀x y. f x = f y ⟶ x = y)"

lemma injectiveI: "(⋀ x y. f x = f y ⟹ x = y) ⟹ injective f"
  unfolding injective_def by auto

lemma injectiveD: "injective f ⟹ f x = f y ⟹ x = y"
  unfolding injective_def by auto     (* hide injective_def at this point *)
```


Limits of `definition` and `function`

- restriction of `definition` and `function`: no capability to conveniently model potentially non-terminating processes
- consider datatype `prog`, modelling simple programming language with while-loops
- aim: define `eval` function, e.g., of type `prog ⇒ state ⇒ state option`, that returns state after complete evaluation of program or fails
- attempt 1: define `eval` via `function`
  - not possible, since termination is not provable (some programs are non-terminating)
- attempt 2: fuel-based approach (introduce some bounded resource to ensure termination)
  - first define `eval_b :: nat ⇒ prog ⇒ state ⇒ state option`, a bounded version of `eval` that restricts the number of loop-iterations
  - `eval_b` can be defined via `fun`
  - `eval p s = (if ∃ n. eval_b n p s ≠ None`
    `then eval_b (SOME n. eval_b n p s ≠ None) p s`
    `else None)`
  - reasoning with this fuel-based-approach is at least tedious

Solution: Inductive Predicates

model `eval` as inductive predicate of type `prog ⇒ state ⇒ state ⇒ bool` that correspond to standard inference rules of a big-step semantics

$$\frac{c \text{ is not satisfied in } s}{(while\ c\ P)\ s \overset{eval}{\hookrightarrow} s}\ \text{(while-false)}$$

$$\frac{c \text{ is satisfied in } s \qquad P\ s \overset{eval}{\hookrightarrow} t \qquad (while\ c\ P)\ t \overset{eval}{\hookrightarrow} u}{(while\ c\ P)\ s \overset{eval}{\hookrightarrow} u}\ \text{(while-true)}$$

$$\vdots$$

(further rules for assignment, sequential composition, etc.)

Demo

modeling programming language semantics

Inductive Predicates in More Detail

- constant `P :: 'a₁ ⇒ … ⇒ 'aₙ ⇒ bool` is n-ary predicate
- inductive predicate `P` is inductively defined, that is, by inference rules
- meaning: input satisfies `P` iff witnessed by arbitrary (finite) application of inference rules
- syntax
  `inductive P :: "'a₁ ⇒ … ⇒ 'aₙ ⇒ bool" where …`
  followed by `|`-separated list of propositions (inference rules)
- generated facts

`P.intros`	inference rules
`P.cases`	case analysis (rule inversion)
`P.induct`	induction (rule induction)
`P.simps`	equational definition

Odd Numbers, Inductively

- textual description
  - 1 is odd
  - if n is odd, then also $n+2$ is odd
- inference rules

$$\frac{}{1 \text{ odd}} \qquad \frac{n \text{ odd}}{n+2 \text{ odd}}$$

-
```
inductive is_odd :: "nat ⇒ bool"
  where
    "is_odd 1"
  | "is_odd n ⟹ is_odd (n + 2)"
```


Special Case – Inductively Defined Sets

- given set S, let χ_S be characteristic function such that $\chi_S(x)$ is true iff $x \in S$
- characteristic function is obviously predicate
- inductive sets are common special case and come with special syntax
  `inductive_set S :: "'a₁ ⇒ ... 'aₙ ⇒ 'a set" for c₁ ... cₙ where`

Example – Reflexive Transitive Closure

- (binary) relations encoded by type `('a × 'b) set`
- given relation R, reflexive transitive closure, often written R^*, given by $(x,y) \in R^*$ iff $x\,R\,x_1\,R\,x_2\,R \cdots R\,x_n\,R\,y$ for arbitrary $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ (think: path in graph)
-
```
inductive_set star :: "('a × 'a) set ⇒ ('a × 'a) set" for R
  where
    refl [simp]: "(x, x) ∈ star R"
  | step: "(x, y) ∈ R ⟹ (y, z) ∈ star R ⟹ (x, z) ∈ star R"
```
- remark: one can label individual inference rules; these names will then be used for case-analyses, inductions, and as names of introduction rules (`star.step`)

Rule Inversion and Rule Induction

Rule Inversion

- reasoning backwards "which rule could have been used to derive some fact"
- case analysis according to inference rules
- if inductive predicate/set is first of current facts, `cases` applies rule inversion implicitly
- otherwise, use "`cases rule: c.cases`" for inductively defined constant `c`

Demo – Zero is Not Odd

```
lemma is_odd0: "is_odd 0 = False" sorry
```

Rule Induction

- induction according to inference rules
- if inductive predicate/set is first of current facts, `induction` applies rule induction implicitly
- otherwise, use "`induction rule: c.induct`" for inductively defined constant `c`
- `case` names are taken from names of inference rules (if any, otherwise numbered)

Demo – If Number is Odd it's Odd

- `lemma is_odd_odd: assumes "is_odd x" shows "odd x" sorry`
- remarks
  - `odd x` is just an abbreviation of `x` not being divisible by 2
  - in lemma-command one can explicitly assume facts (`assumes`) which are accessible by implicit label `assms`, before the goal statement is written after `shows`
  - further examples on `assumes` and `shows` are provided in lemmas `is_odd_odd3` and `star_trans1` in the demo theory

Demo – Reflexive Transitive Closure is Transitive

- ```
  lemma star_trans:
    assumes "(x, y) ∈ star R" and "(y, z) ∈ star R
    shows "(x, z) ∈ star R"
   sorry
  ```

More Information on Inductive Definitions

`isabelle doc isar-ref` (chapter 11.1)

Sets in Isabelle

Sets in Isabelle

- type '`'a set`' for sets with elements of type `'a`

Set Basics

- `x ∈ A` – membership
- `A ∩ B` – intersection
- `A ∪ B` – union
- `-A` – complement
- `A - B` – difference
- `A ⊆ B` and `A ⊂ B` – subset
- `{}` – empty set
- `UNIV` – universal set (all elements of specific type)
- `{x}` – singleton set
- `insert x A` – insertion of single elements (`insert x A = {x} ∪ A`)
- ``f ` A`` – image of function with respect to set ("map `f` over elements of `A`")
  ```

Demo – Example Proof

```
lemma "A ∩ (B ∪ C) ⊆ (A ∩ B) ∪ (A ∩ C)"
```

No New Primitives Required

- several of the basic set operations could be defined inductively
- examples

```
inductive_set intersection :: "'a set ⇒ 'a set ⇒ 'a set" for A B where
  "x ∈ A ⟹ x ∈ B ⟹ x ∈ intersection A B"

inductive_set disjunction :: "'a set ⇒ 'a set ⇒ 'a set" for A B where
  "x ∈ A ⟹ x ∈ disjunction A B"
| "x ∈ B ⟹ x ∈ disjunction A B"

inductive_set empty :: "'a set"

inductive_set Univ :: "'a set" where
  "x ∈ Univ"
```


Further Operations on Sets

- `set` – convert list to set
- `Collect p` – convert predicate `p :: 'a ⇒ bool` to set of type `'a set`
- `finite A` – is set finite?
- `card A :: nat` – cardinality of set (note: `card A = 0` whenever `A` is infinite)
- `sum f A` – $\sum_{x \in A} f(x)$ (note: `sum f A = 0` whenever `A` is infinite)
- `prod f A` – similar to `sum`, just product
- `Ball A p` – do all elements of `A` satisfy predicate `p`?
- `Bex A p` – does some element of `A` satisfy predicate `p`?
- `{x .. y}` – all elements between `x` and `y`

Syntax for Set Comprehension

- `{x . p x}` – same as `Collect p`
- `{t | x y. p x y}` – same as `{z. ∃ x y. t = z ∧ p x y}`
- example: `{ (x + 5, y) | x y. x < 7 ∧ odd y }`