Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP) Course
Parts X, XI

Thomas Tuerk (tuerk@kth.se)

Academic Year 2016/17, Period 4

version 625b457 of Mon May 8 09:30:24 2017

Part X

Basic Definitions

Definitional Extensions

- there are **conservative definition principles** for types and constants
- conservative means that all theorems that can be proved in extended theory can also be proved in original one
- however, such extensions make the theory more comfortable
- definitions introduce **no new inconsistencies**
- the HOL community has a very strong tradition of a purely definitional approach

Axiomatic Extensions

- **axioms** are a different approach
- they allow postulating arbitrary properties, i. e. extending the logic with arbitrary theorems
- this approach might introduce new inconsistencies
- in HOL axioms are very rarely needed
- using definitions is often considered more elegant
- it is hard to keep track of axioms
- use axioms only if you really know what you are doing

Oracles

- **oracles** are families of axioms
- however, they are used differently than axioms
- they are used to enable usage of external tools and knowledge
- you might want to use an external automated prover
- this external tool acts as an oracle
  - it provides answers
  - it does not explain or justify these answers
- you don't know, whether this external tool might be buggy
- all theorems proved via it are tagged with a special oracle-tag
- tags are propagated
- this allows keeping track of everything depending on the correctness of this tool

Oracles II

- Common oracle-tags
  - `DISK_THM` — theorem was written to disk and read again
  - `HolSatLib` — proved by MiniSat
  - `HolSmtLib` — proved by external SMT solver
  - `fast_proof` — proof was skipped to compile a theory rapidly
  - `cheat` — we cheated :-)
- **cheating** via e. g. the `cheat` tactic means skipping proofs
- it can be helpful during proof development
  - test whether some lemmata allow you finishing the proof
  - skip lengthy but boring cases and focus on critical parts first
  - experiment with exact form of invariants
  - ...
- cheats should be removed reasonable quickly
- HOL warns about cheats and skipped proofs

Pitfalls of Definitional Approach

- definitions can't introduce new inconsistencies
- they force you to state all assumed properties at one location
- however, you still need to be careful
- Is your definition really expressing what you had in mind ?
- Does your formalisation correspond to the real world artefact ?
- How can you convince others that this is the case ?
- we will discuss methods to deal with this later in this course
  - formal sanity
  - conformance testing
  - code review
  - comments, good names, clear coding style
  - ...
- this is highly complex and needs a lot of effort in general

Specifications

- HOL allows to introduce new constants with certain properties, provided the existence of such constants has been shown

Specification of `EVEN` and `ODD`

```
> EVEN_ODD_EXISTS
val it = |- ?even odd. even 0 /\ ~odd 0 /\ (!n. even (SUC n) <=> odd n) /\
                       (!n. odd (SUC n) <=> even n)

> val EO_SPEC = new_specification ("EO_SPEC", ["EVEN", "ODD"], EVEN_ODD_EXISTS);
val EO_SPEC = |- EVEN 0 /\ ~ODD 0 /\ (!n. EVEN (SUC n) <=> ODD n) /\
                 (!n. ODD (SUC n) <=> EVEN n)
```

- `new_specification` is a convenience wrapper
  - it uses existential quantification instead of Hilbert's choice
  - deals with pair syntax
  - stores resulting definitions in theory
- `new_specification` captures the underlying principle nicely

Definitions

- special case: new constant defined by equality

Specification with Equality

```
> double_EXISTS
val it =
|- ?double. (!n. double n = (n + n))

> val double_def = new_specification ("double_def", ["double"], double_EXISTS);
val double_def =
   |- !n. double n = n + n
```

- there is a specialised methods for such non-recursive definitions

Non Recursive Definitions

```
> val DOUBLE_DEF = new_definition ("DOUBLE_DEF", ``DOUBLE n = n + n``)
val DOUBLE_DEF =
   |- !n. DOUBLE n = n + n
```


Restrictions for Definitions

- all variables occurring on right-hand-side (rhs) need to be arguments
  - e. g. `new_definition (..., ``F n = n + m``)` fails
  - `m` is free on rhs
- all type variables occurring on rhs need to occur on lhs
  - e. g. `new_definition ("IS_FIN_TY",`
    `` ``IS_FIN_TY = FINITE (UNIV : 'a set)`` ``) fails
  - `IS_FIN_TY` would lead to inconsistency
  - `|- FINITE (UNIV : bool set)`
  - `|- ~FINITE (UNIV : num set)`
  - `T <=> FINITE (UNIV:bool set) <=>`
    `IS_FIN_TY <=>`
    `FINITE (UNIV:num set) <=> F`
  - therefore, such definitions can't be allowed

Underspecified Functions

- function specification do not need to define the function precisely
- multiple different functions satisfying one spec are possible
- functions resulting from such specs are called **underspecified**
- underspecified functions are still total, one just lacks knowledge
- one common application: modelling **partial functions**
  - functions like e. g. `HD` and `TL` are total
  - they are defined for empty lists
  - however, is is not specified, which value they have for empty lists
  - only known: `HD [] = HD []` and `TL [] = TL []`

```
val MY_HD_EXISTS = prove (``?hd. !x xs. (hd (x::xs) = x)``, ...);
val MY_HD_SPEC =
  new_specification ("MY_HD_SPEC", ["MY_HD"], MY_HD_EXISTS)
```


Primitive Type Definitions

- HOL allows introducing non-empty subtypes of existing types
- a predicate `P : ty -> bool` describes a subset of an existing type `ty`
- `ty` may contain type variables
- only **non-empty** types are allowed
- therefore a non-emptyness proof `ex-thm` of form `?e. P e` is needed
- `new_type_definition (op-name, ex-thm)` then introduces a new type `op-name` specified by `P`

Primitive Type Definitions - Example 1

- lets try to define a type `dlist` of lists containing no duplicates
- predicate `ALL_DISTINCT : 'a list -> bool` is used to define it
- easy to prove theorem `dlist_exists`: `|- ?l. ALL_DISTINCT l`
- `val dlist_TY_DEF = new_type_definitions("dlist", dlist_exists)` defines a new type `'a dlist` and returns a theorem

```
|- ?(rep :'a dlist -> 'a list).
     TYPE_DEFINITION ALL_DISTINCT rep
```

- `rep` is a function taking a `'a dlist` to the list representing it
  - `rep` is injective
  - a list satisfies `ALL_DISTINCT` iff there is a corresponding `dlist`

Primitive Type Definitions - Example 2

- `define_new_type_bijections` can be used to define bijections between old and new type

```
> define_new_type_bijections {name="dlist_tybij", ABS="abs_dlist",
    REP="rep_dlist", tyax=dlist_TY_DEF}

val it =
   |- (!a. abs_dlist (rep_dlist a) = a) /\
      (!r. ALL_DISTINCT r <=> (rep_dlist (abs_dlist r) = r))
```

- other useful theorems can be automatically proved by
  - `prove_abs_fn_one_one`
  - `prove_abs_fn_onto`
  - `prove_rep_fn_one_one`
  - `prove_rep_fn_onto`

Primitive Definition Principles Summary

- primitive definition principles are easily explained
- they lead to conservative extensions
- however, they are cumbersome to use
- LCF approach allows implementing more convenient definition tools
  - `Datatype` package
  - `TFL` (Terminating Functional Programs) package
  - `IndDef` (Inductive Definition) package
  - `quotientLib` Quotient Types Library
  - ...

Functional Programming

- the `Datatype` package allows to define datatypes conveniently
- the `TFL` package allows to define (mutually recursive) functions
- the `EVAL` conversion allows evaluating those definitions
- this gives many HOL developments the feeling of a functional program
- there is really a close connection between functional programming an definitions in HOL
  - functional programming design principles apply
  - `EVAL` is a great way to test quickly, whether your definitions are working as intended

Functional Programming Example

```
> Datatype `mylist = E | L 'a mylist`
val it = (): unit

> Define `(mylen E = 0) /\ (mylen (L x xs) = SUC (mylen xs))`
Definition has been stored under "mylen_def"
val it =
   |- (mylen E = 0) /\ !x xs. mylen (L x xs) = SUC (mylen xs):
   thm

> EVAL ``mylen (L 2 (L 3 (L 1 E)))``
val it =
   |- mylen (L 2 (L 3 (L 1 E))) = 3:
   thm
```


Datatype Package

- the `Datatype` package allows to define SML style datatypes easily
- there is support for
  - algebraic datatypes
  - record types
  - mutually recursive types
  - ...
- many constants are automatically introduced
  - constructors
  - case-split constant
  - size function
  - field-update and accessor functions for records
  - ...
- many theorems are derived and stored in current theory
  - injectivity and distinctness of constructors
  - nchotomy and structural induction theorems
  - rewrites for case-split, size and record update functions
  - ...

Datatype Package - Example I

Tree Datatype in SML

```
datatype ('a,'b) btree =   Leaf of 'a
                         | Node of ('a,'b) btree * 'b * ('a,'b) btree
```

Tree Datatype in HOL

```
Datatype `btree =   Leaf 'a
                  | Node btree 'b btree`
```

Tree Datatype in HOL — Deprecated Syntax

```
Hol_datatype `btree =   Leaf of 'a
                      | Node of btree => 'b => btree`
```


Datatype Package - Example I - Derived Theorems 1

btree_distinct

```
|- !a2 a1 a0 a. Leaf a <> Node a0 a1 a2
```

btree_11

```
|- (!a a'. (Leaf a = Leaf a') <=> (a = a')) /\
   (!a0 a1 a2 a0' a1' a2'.
      (Node a0 a1 a2 = Node a0' a1' a2') <=>
      (a0 = a0') /\ (a1 = a1') /\ (a2 = a2'))
```

btree_nchotomy

```
|- !bb. (?a. bb = Leaf a) \/ (?b b1 b0. bb = Node b b1 b0)
```

btree_induction

```
|- !P. (!a. P (Leaf a)) /\
       (!b b0. P b /\ P b0 ==> !b1. P (Node b b1 b0)) ==>
       !b. P b
```

Datatype Package - Example I - Derived Theorems 2

btree_size_def

```
|- (!f f1 a. btree_size f f1 (Leaf a) = 1 + f a) /\
   (!f f1 a0 a1 a2.
     btree_size f f1 (Node a0 a1 a2) =
     1 + (btree_size f f1 a0 + (f1 a1 + btree_size f f1 a2)))
```

bbtree_case_def

```
|- (!a f f1. btree_CASE (Leaf a) f f1 = f a) /\
   (!a0 a1 a2 f f1. btree_CASE (Node a0 a1 a2) f f1 = f1 a0 a1 a2)
```

btree_case_cong

```
|- !M M' f f1.
     (M = M') /\ (!a. (M' = Leaf a) ==> (f a = f' a)) /\
     (!a0 a1 a2.
        (M' = Node a0 a1 a2) ==> (f1 a0 a1 a2 = f1' a0 a1 a2)) ==>
     (btree_CASE M f f1 = btree_CASE M' f' f1')
```


Datatype Package - Example II

Enumeration type in SML

```
datatype my_enum = E1 | E2 | E3
```

Enumeration type in HOL

```
Datatype ‘my_enum = E1 | E2 | E3‘
```


Datatype Package - Example II - Derived Theorems

my_enum_nchotomy

```
|- !P. P E1 /\ P E2 /\ P E3 ==> !a. P a
```

my_enum_distinct

```
|- E1 <> E2 /\ E1 <> E3 /\ E2 <> E3
```

my_enum2num_thm

```
|- (my_enum2num E1 = 0) /\ (my_enum2num E2 = 1) /\ (my_enum2num E3 = 2)
```

my_enum2num_num2my_enum

```
|- !r. r < 3 <=> (my_enum2num (num2my_enum r) = r)
```


Datatype Package - Example III

Record type in SML

```
type rgb = { r : int, g : int, b : int }
```

Record type in HOL

```
Datatype ‘rgb = <| r : num; g : num; b : num |>‘
```

Datatype Package - Example III - Derived Theorems

rgb_component_equality

```
|- !r1 r2. (r1 = r2) <=>
        (r1.r = r2.r) /\ (r1.g = r2.g) /\ (r1.b = r2.b)
```

rgb_nchotomy

```
|- !rr. ?n n0 n1. rr = rgb n n0 n1
```

rgb_r_fupd

```
|- !f n n0 n1. rgb n n0 n1 with r updated_by f = rgb (f n) n0 n1
```

rgb_updates_eq_literal

```
|- !r n1 n0 n.
    r with <|r := n1; g := n0; b := n|> = <|r := n1; g := n0; b := n|>
```


Datatype Package - Example IV

- nested record types are not allowed
- however, mutual recursive types can mitigate this restriction

Filesystem Datatype in SML

```
datatype file = Text of string
              | Dir of {owner : string ,
                        files : (string * file) list}
```

Not Supported Nested Record Type Example in HOL

```
Datatype `file = Text string
               | Dir <| owner : string ;
                        files : (string # file) list |>`
```

Filesystem Datatype - Mutual Recursion in HOL

```
Datatype `file = Text string
               | Dir directory
          ;
          directory = <| owner : string ;
                         files : (string # file) list |>`
```


Datatype Package - No support for Co-Algebraic Types

- there is no support for co-algebraic types
- the Datatype package could be extended to do so
- other systems like Isabelle/HOL provide high-level methods for defining such types

Co-algebraic Type Example in SML — Lazy Lists

```
datatype 'a lazylist = Nil
                     | Cons of ('a * (unit -> 'a lazylist))
```


Datatype Package - Discussion

- Datatype package allows to define many useful datatypes
- however, there are many limitations
  - some types cannot be defined in HOL, e. g. empty types
  - some types are not supported, e. g. co-algebraic types
  - there are bugs (currently e. g. some trouble with certain mutually recursive definitions)
- biggest restrictions in practice (in my opinion and my line of work)
  - no support for co-algebraic datatypes
  - no nested record datatypes
- depending on datatype, different sets of useful lemmata are derived
- most important ones are added to TypeBase
  - tools like Induct_on, Cases_on use them
  - there is support for pattern matching

TFL package

- TFL package implements support for terminating functional definitions
- `Define` defines functions from high-level descriptions
- there is support for pattern matching
- look and feel is like function definitions in SML
- based on **well-founded recursion** principle
- `Define` is the most common way for definitions in HOL

Well-Founded Relations

- a relation `R : 'a -> 'a -> bool` is called **well-founded**, iff there are no infinite descending chains

  `wellfounded R = ~?f. !n. R (f (SUC n)) (f n)`

- Example: `$< : num -> num -> bool` is well-founded
- if arguments of recursive calls are smaller according to well-founded relation, the recursion terminates
- this is the essence of termination proofs

Well-Founded Recursion

- a well-founded relation `R` can be used to define recursive functions
- this recursion principle is called `WFREC` in HOL
- idea of `WFREC`
  - if arguments get smaller according to `R`, perform recursive call
  - otherwise abort and return `ARB`
- `WFREC` always defines a function
- if all recursive calls indeed decrease according to `R`, the original recursive equations can be derived from the `WFREC` representation
- TFL uses this internally
- however, this is well-hidden from the user

`Define` - Initial Examples

Simple Definitions

```
> val DOUBLE_def = Define `DOUBLE n = n + n`
val DOUBLE_def =
   |- !n. DOUBLE n = n + n:
   thm

> val MY_LENGTH_def = Define `(MY_LENGTH [] = 0) /\
                              (MY_LENGTH (x::xs) = SUC (MY_LENGTH xs))`
val MY_LENGTH_def =
   |- (MY_LENGTH [] = 0) /\ !x xs. MY_LENGTH (x::xs) = SUC (MY_LENGTH xs):
   thm

> val MY_APPEND_def = Define `(MY_APPEND [] ys = ys) /\
                              (MY_APPEND (x::xs) ys = x :: (MY_APPEND xs ys))`
val MY_APPEND_def =
   |- (!ys. MY_APPEND [] ys = ys) /\
      (!x xs ys. MY_APPEND (x::xs) ys = x::MY_APPEND xs ys):
   thm
```

Define discussion

- Define feels like a function definition in HOL
- it can be used to define "terminating" recursive functions
- Define is implemented by a large, non-trivial piece of SML code
- it uses many heuristics
- outcome of Define sometimes hard to predict
- the input descriptions are only hints
  - the produced function and the definitional theorem might be different
  - in simple examples, quantifiers added
  - pattern compilation takes place
  - earlier "conjuncts" have precedence

Define - More Examples

```
> val MY_HD_def = Define `MY_HD (x :: xs) = x`
val MY_HD_def = |- !x xs. MY_HD (x::xs) = x : thm

> val IS_SORTED_def = Define `
     (IS_SORTED (x1 :: x2 :: xs) = ((x1 < x2) /\ (IS_SORTED (x2::xs)))) /\
     (IS_SORTED _ = T)`
val IS_SORTED_def =
   |- (!xs x2 x1. IS_SORTED (x1::x2::xs) <=> x1 < x2 /\ IS_SORTED (x2::xs)) /\
      (IS_SORTED [] <=> T) /\ (!v. IS_SORTED [v] <=> T)

> val EVEN_def = Define `(EVEN 0 = T) /\ (ODD 0 = F) /\
                         (EVEN (SUC n) = ODD n) /\ (ODD (SUC n) = EVEN n)`
val EVEN_def =
   |- (EVEN 0 <=> T) /\ (ODD 0 <=> F) /\ (!n. EVEN (SUC n) <=> ODD n) /\
      (!n. ODD (SUC n) <=> EVEN n) : thm

> val ZIP_def = Define `(ZIP (x::xs) (y::ys) = (x,y)::(ZIP xs ys)) /\
                        (ZIP _ _ = [])`
val ZIP_def =
   |- (!ys y xs x. ZIP (x::xs) (y::ys) = (x,y)::ZIP xs ys) /\
      (!v1. ZIP [] v1 = []) /\ (!v4 v3. ZIP (v3::v4) [] = []) : thm
```


Primitive Definitions

- Define introduces (if needed) the function using WFREC
- intended definition derived as a theorem
- the theorems are stored in current theory
- usually, one never needs to look at it

Examples

```
val IS_SORTED_primitive_def =
|- IS_SORTED =
   WFREC (@R. WF R /\ !x1 xs x2. R (x2::xs) (x1::x2::xs))
     (\IS_SORTED a.
        case a of
          [] => I T
        | [x1] => I T
        | x1::x2::xs => I (x1 < x2 /\ IS_SORTED (x2::xs)))
```


Induction Theorems

- Define automatically defines induction theorems
- these theorems are stored in current theory with suffix ind
- use DB.fetch "-" "something_ind" to retrieve them
- these induction theorems are useful to reason about corresponding recursive functions

Example

```
val IS_SORTED_ind = |- !P.
     ((!x1 x2 xs. P (x2::xs) ==> P (x1::x2::xs)) /\
      P [] /\
      (!v. P [v])) ==>
     !v. P v
```

`Define` failing

- `Define` might fail for various reasons to define a function
  - such a function cannot be defined in HOL
  - such a function can be defined, but not via the methods used by TFL
  - TFL can define such a function, but its heuristics are too weak and user guidance is required
  - there is a bug :-)
- **termination** is an important concept for `Define`
- it is easy to misunderstand termination in the context of HOL
- however, we need to understand it to understand `Define`

Termination in HOL

- in SML it is natural to talk about termination of functions
- in the HOL logic there is no concept of execution
- thus, there is no concept of termination in HOL
- however, it is useful to think in terms of termination
- the TFL package implements heuristics to define functions that would terminate in SML
- the TFL package uses well-founded recursion
- the required well-founded relation corresponds to a termination proof
- therefore, it is very natural to think of `Define` searching a termination proof
- important: this is the idea behind this function definition package, not a property of HOL

HOL is not limited to "terminating" functions

Termination in HOL II

- one can define "non-terminating" functions in HOL
- however, one cannot do so (easily) with `Define`

Definition of `WHILE` in HOL

```
|- !P g x. WHILE P g x = if P x then WHILE P g (g x) else x
```

Execution Order

There is no "execution order". One can easily define a complicated constant function:

```
(myk : num -> num) (n:num) = (let x = myk (n+1) in 0)
```

Unsound Definitions

A function `f : num -> num` with `!n. f n = f (n+1) + f (n+2)` can be defined in HOL despite termination issues. However a function `f` with the following property cannot be defined in HOL:

```
!n. f n = ((f n) + 1)
```

Such a function would allow to prove `0 = 1`.

Manual Termination Proofs I

- TFL uses various heuristics to find a well-founded relation
- however, these heuristics may not be strong enough
- in such cases the user can provide a well-founded relation manually
- the most common well-founded relations are **measures**
- measures map values to natural numbers and use the less relation
  `|- !(f:'a -> num) x y. measure f x y <=> (f x < f y)`
- moreover, existing well-founded relations can be combined
  - lexicographic order `LEX`
  - list lexicographic order `LLEX`
  - ...

Manual Termination Proofs II

- if `Define` fails to find a termination proof, `Hol_defn` can be used
- `Hol_defn` defers termination proofs
- it derives termination conditions and sets up the function definitions
- all results are packaged as a value of type `defn`
- after calling `Hol_defn` the defined function(s) can be used
- however, the intended definition theorem has not been derived yet
- to derive it, one needs to
  - provide a well-founded relation
  - show that termination conditions respect that relation
- `Defn.tprove` and `Defn.tgoal` for this
- proofs usually start by providing relation via tactic `WF_REL_TAC`

Manual Termination Proof Example 1

```
> val qsort_defn = Hol_defn "qsort" `
  (qsort ord [] = []) /\
  (qsort ord (x::rst) =
     (qsort ord (FILTER ($~ o ord x) rst)) ++
     [x] ++
     (qsort ord (FILTER (ord x) rst)))`

val qsort_defn = HOL function definition (recursive)

Equation(s) :
 [...] |- qsort ord [] = []
 [...] |- qsort ord (x::rst) =
            qsort ord (FILTER ($~ o ord x) rst) ++ [x] ++
            qsort ord (FILTER (ord x) rst)

Induction : ...

Termination conditions :
  0. !rst x ord. R (ord,FILTER (ord x) rst) (ord,x::rst)
  1. !rst x ord. R (ord,FILTER (($~ o ord) x) rst) (ord,x::rst)
  2. WF R
```


Manual Termination Proof Example 2

```
> Defn.tgoal qsort_defn

Initial goal:

?R.
  WF R /\ (!rst x ord. R (ord,FILTER (ord x) rst) (ord,x::rst)) /\
  !rst x ord. R (ord,FILTER ($~ o ord x) rst) (ord,x::rst)

> e (WF_REL_TAC `measure (\(_, l). LENGTH l)`)

1 subgoal :

(!rst x ord. LENGTH (FILTER (ord x) rst) < LENGTH (x::rst)) /\
(!rst x ord. LENGTH (FILTER (\x'. ~ord x x') rst) < LENGTH (x::rst))

> ...
```


Manual Termination Proof Example 3

```
> val (qsort_def, qsort_ind) =
  Defn.tprove (qsort_defn,
    WF_REL_TAC `measure (\(_, l). LENGTH l)` >> ...)

val qsort_def =
|- (qsort ord [] = []) /\
   (qsort ord (x::rst) =
    qsort ord (FILTER ($~ o ord x) rst) ++ [x] ++
    qsort ord (FILTER (ord x) rst))

val qsort_ind =
|- !P. (!ord. P ord []) /\
       (!ord x rst.
          P ord (FILTER (ord x) rst) /\
          P ord (FILTER ($~ o ord x) rst) ==>
          P ord (x::rst)) ==>
       !v v1. P v v1
```

Part XI

Good Definitions

Importance of Good Definitions

- using *good* definitions is very important
- good definitions are vital for clarity
- proofs depend a lot on the form of definitions
- unluckily, it is hard to state what a good definition is
- even harder to come up with good definitions
- let's look at it a bit closer anyhow

Importance of Good Definitions — Clarity

- HOL guarentees that theorems do indeed hold
- However, does the theorem mean what you think it does?
- one can separate your development in
  - main theorems you care for
  - auxiliary developments used to derive your main theorems
- it is essential to understand your main theorems
  - you need to understand all the definitions directly used
  - you need to understand the indirectly used ones as well
  - you need to convince others that you express the intended statement
  - therefore, it is vital to **use very simple, clear definitions**
- defining concepts is often the main development task
- auxiliary part
  - can be as technical and complicated as you like
  - correctness is guarenteed by HOL

Importance of Good Definitions — Proofs

- good definitions can shorten proofs significantly
- they improve maintainablity
- they can improve automation drastically
- unluckily for proofs definitions often need to be technical
- this contradicts clarity aims

How to come up with good definitions

- unluckily, it is hard to state what a good definition is
- it is even harder to come up with them
  - there are often many competing interests
  - a lot of experience and detailed tool knowledge is needed
  - much depends on personal style and taste
- general advice: use more than one definition
  - in HOL you can derive equivalent definitions as theorems
  - define a concept as clearly and easily as possible
  - derive equivalent definitions for various purposes
    - one very close to your favourite textbook
    - one nice for certain types of proofs
    - another one good for evaluation
    - ...
- lessons from functional programming apply

Good Definitions in Functional Programming

Objectives

- clarity (readability, maintainability)
- performance (runtime speed, memory usage, ...)

General Advice

- use the powerful type-system
- use many small function definitions
- encode invariants in types and function signatures

Good Definitions – no number endcodings

- many programmers familiar with C encode everything as a number
- enumeration types are very cheap in SML and HOL
- use them instead

Example Enumeration Types

In C the result of an order comparison is an integer with 3 equivalence classes: 0, negative and positive integers. In SML, it is better to use a variant type.

```
val _ = Datatype ‘ordering = LESS | EQUAL | GREATER‘;

val compare_def = Define ‘
   (compare LESS    lt eq gt = lt)
/\ (compare EQUAL   lt eq gt = eq)
/\ (compare GREATER lt eq gt = gt) ‘;

val list_compare_def = Define ‘
   (list_compare cmp [] [] = EQUAL) /\ (list_compare cmp [] l2 = LESS)
/\ (list_compare cmp l1 [] = GREATER)
/\ (list_compare cmp (x::l1) (y::l2) = compare (cmp (x:'a) y)
     (* x<y *) LESS
     (* x=y *) (list_compare cmp l1 l2)
     (* x>y *) GREATER) ‘;
```


Good Definitions — Isomorphic Types

- the type-checker is your friend
  - it helps you find errors
  - code becomes more robust
  - using good types is a great way of writing self-documenting code
- therefore, use many types
- even use types isomorphic to existing ones

Virtual and Physical Memory Addresses

Virtual and physical addresses might in a development both be numbers. It is still nice to use separate types to avoid mixing them up.

```
val _ = Datatype ‘vaddr = VAddr num‘;
val _ = Datatype ‘paddr = PAddr num‘;

val virt_to_phys_addr_def = Define ‘
  virt_to_phys_addr (VAddr a) = PAddr( translation of a )‘;
```

Good Definitions — Encoding Invariants

- try to encode as many invariants as possible in the types
- this allows the type-checker to ensure them for you
- you don't have to check them manually any more
- your code becomes more robust and clearer

Network Connections (Example by Yaron Minsky from Jane Street)

Consider the following datatype for network connections. It has many implicit invariants.

```
datatype connection_state = Connected | Disconnected | Connecting;

type connection_info = {
  state             : connection_state,
  server            : inet_address,
  last_ping_time    : time option,
  last_ping_id      : int option,
  session_id        : string option,
  when_initiated    : time option,
  when_disconnected : time option
}
```


Good Definitions — Encoding Invariants II

Network Connections (Example by Yaron Minsky from Jane Street) II

The following definition of `connection_info` makes the invariants explicit:

```
type connected    = { last_ping         : (time * int) option,
                      session_id        : string };
type disconnected = { when_disconnected : time };
type connecting   = { when_initiated    : time };

datatype connection_state =
  Connected of connected
| Disconneted of disconneted
| Connecting of connecting;

type connection_info = {
  state  : connection_state,
  server : inet_address
}
```


Good Definitions in HOL

Objectives

- clarity (readability)
- good for proofs
- performance (good for automation, easily evaluatable, ...)

General Advice

- same advice as for functional programming applies
- use even smaller definitions
  - introduce auxiliary definitions for important function parts
  - use extra definitions for important constants
  - ...
- tiny definitions
  - allow keeping proof state small by unfolding only needed ones
  - allow many small lemmata
  - improve maintainability

Good Definitions in HOL II

Multiple Equivalent Definitions

- satisfy competing requirements by having multiple equivalent definitions
- derive them as theorems
- initial definition should be as clear as possible
  - clarity allows simpler reviews
  - simplicity reduces the likelihood of errors

Example - `ALL_DISTINCT`

```
|- (ALL_DISTINCT [] <=> T) /\
   (!h t. ALL_DISTINCT (h::t) <=> ~MEM h t /\ ALL_DISTINCT t)

|- !l. ALL_DISTINCT l <=>
       !x. MEM x l ==> (FILTER ($= x) l = [x])

|- !ls. ALL_DISTINCT ls <=> (CARD (set ls) = LENGTH ls):
```

Good Definitions in HOL III

Formal Sanity

- directly after your definition, prove some sanity check lemmata
- these should express important properties
- this checks your intuition against your actual definition
- these sanity check lemmata are useful for following proofs
- they improve maintainability

Example - ALL_DISTINCT

```
|- ALL_DISTINCT []
|- !x. ALL_DISTINCT [x]
|- !l. ALL_DISTINCT (REVERSE l) <=> ALL_DISTINCT l
|- !x l. ALL_DISTINCT (SNOC x l) <=> ~MEM x l /\ ALL_DISTINCT l
|- !l1 l2. ALL_DISTINCT (l1 ++ l2) <=>
        ALL_DISTINCT l1 /\ ALL_DISTINCT l2 /\ !e. MEM e l1 ==> ~MEM e l2
```


Good Definitions in HOL IV

Technical Issues

- write definition such that they work well with HOL's tools
- this requires you to know HOL well
- a lot of experience is required
- general advice
  - avoid explicit case-expressions
  - avoid pairs, e. g. use curried functions

Example

```
val ZIP_GOOD_def = Define `(ZIP (x::xs) (y::ys) = (x,y)::(ZIP xs ys)) /\
                           (ZIP _ _ = [])`

val ZIP_BAD1_def = Define `ZIP xs ys = case (xs, ys) of
                                        (x::xs, y::ys) => (x,y)::(ZIP xs ys)
                                      | (_, _) => []`

val ZIP_BAD2_def = Define `(ZIP (x::xs, y::ys) = (x,y)::(ZIP (xs, ys))) /\
                           (ZIP _ = [])`
```