



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:
 - no simp-rules, but obtain defining equation:
- **fun** or **function**
 - recursive functions definitions including pattern matching on lhss
 - functions have to be terminating
 - obtain simp-rules and induction scheme

$$f \ x_1 \dots x_n = rhs$$
$$f_def: f \ x_1 \dots x_n = rhs$$

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 `definitions` 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

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{c \text{ is not satisfied in } s}{(\textit{while } c P) s \xrightarrow{\textit{eval}} s} \text{ (while-false)} \\
 \\
 \frac{c \text{ is satisfied in } s \quad P s \xrightarrow{\textit{eval}} t \quad (\textit{while } c P) t \xrightarrow{\textit{eval}} u}{(\textit{while } c P) s \xrightarrow{\textit{eval}} u} \text{ (while-true)} \\
 \\
 \vdots \\
 \text{(further rules for assignment, sequential composition, etc.)}
 \end{array}$$

Demo

modeling programming language semantics

Inductive Predicates in More Detail

- constant $P :: 'a_1 \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow 'a_n \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ 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

<code>P.intros</code>	inference rules
<code>P.cases</code>	case analysis (rule inversion)
<code>P.induct</code>	induction (rule induction)
<code>P.simps</code>	equational definition

Odd Numbers, Inductively

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

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

- `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 $x R x_1 R x_2 R \dots R x_n R y$ for arbitrary x_1, x_2, \dots, 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

- $x \in A$ – membership
- $A \cap B$ – intersection
- $A \cup B$ – union
- $\neg A$ – complement
- $A - B$ – difference
- $A \subseteq B$ and $A \subset B$ – subset
- $\{\}$ – empty set
- UNIV – universal set (all elements of specific type)
- $\{x\}$ – singleton set
- $\text{insert } x \ A$ – insertion of single elements ($\text{insert } x \ A = \{x\} \cup A$)
- $f ` A$ – image of function with respect to set (“map f over elements of A ”)

Demo – Example Proof

lemma " $A \cap (B \cup C) \subseteq (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$ "

No New Primitives Required

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

```
inductive_set intersection :: "'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set" for A B where
  " $x \in A \implies x \in B \implies x \in \text{intersection } A B$ "
```

```
inductive_set union :: "'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set" for A B where
  " $x \in A \implies x \in \text{union } A B$ "
| " $x \in B \implies x \in \text{union } A B$ "
```

```
inductive_set empty :: "'a set"
```

```
inductive_set Univ :: "'a set" where
  " $x \in \text{Univ}$ "
```

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 }`