

Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP) Course

Thomas Tuerk (tuerk@kth.se)



Academic Year 2016/17, Period 4

version cf844ad of Mon May 15 09:02:18 2017

Part I

Introduction



- Complex systems almost certainly contain bugs.
- Critical systems (e.g. avionics) need to meet very high standards.
- It is infeasible in practice to achieve such high standards just by testing.
- Debugging via testing suffers from diminishing returns.

**“Program testing can be used to show the presence
of bugs, but never to show their absence!”
— Edsger W. Dijkstra**

- Pentium FDIV bug (1994)
(missing entry in lookup table, \$475 million damage)
- Ariane V explosion (1996)
(integer overflow, \$1 billion prototype destroyed)
- Mars Climate Orbiter (1999)
(destroyed in Mars orbit, mixup of units pound-force and newtons)
- Knight Capital Group Error in Ultra Short Time Trading (2012)
(faulty deployment, repurposing of critical flag, \$440 lost in 45 min on stock exchange)
- ...

Fun to read

<http://www.cs.tau.ac.il/~nachumd/verify/horror.html>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_software_bugs

- proof can show absence of errors in design
- but proofs talk about a **design**, not a **real system**
- $\Rightarrow$ testing and proving complement each other

**“As far as the laws of mathematics
refer to reality, they are not certain;
and as far as they are certain,
they do not refer to reality.”
— Albert Einstein**

Mathematical Proof

- informal, convince other mathematicians
- checked by community of domain experts
- subtle errors are hard to find
- often provide some new insight about our world
- often short, but require creativity and a brilliant idea

Formal Proof

- formal, rigorously use a logical formalism
- checkable by *stupid* machines
- very reliable
- often contain no new ideas and no amazing insights
- often long, very tedious, but largely trivial

We are interested in formal proofs in this lecture.

In **Principia Mathematica** it takes 300 pages to prove $1+1=2$.

This is nicely illustrated in **Logicomix - An Epic Search for Truth**.



Automated vs Manual (Formal) Proof



Fully Manual Proof

- very tedious one has to grind through many trivial but detailed proofs
- easy to make mistakes
- hard to keep track of all assumptions and preconditions
- hard to maintain, if something changes (see Ariane V)

Automated Proof

- amazing success in certain areas
- but still often infeasible for interesting problems
- hard to get insights in case a proof attempt fails
- even if it works, it is often not that automated
 - ▶ run automated tool for a few days
 - ▶ abort, change command line arguments to use different heuristics
 - ▶ run again and iterate till you find a set of heuristics that prove it fully automatically in a few seconds

- combine strengths of manual and automated proofs
- many different options to combine automated and manual proofs
 - ▶ mainly check existing proofs (e. g. HOL Zero)
 - ▶ user mainly provides lemmata statements, computer searches proofs using previous lemmata and very few hints (e. g. ACL 2)
 - ▶ most systems are somewhere in the middle
- typically the human user
 - ▶ provides insights into the problem
 - ▶ structures the proof
 - ▶ provides main arguments
- typically the computer
 - ▶ checks proof
 - ▶ keeps track of all use assumptions
 - ▶ provides automation to grind through lengthy, but trivial proofs

Typical Interactive Proof Activities



- provide precise definitions of concepts
- state properties of these concepts
- prove these properties
 - ▶ human provides insight and structure
 - ▶ computer does book-keeping and automates simple proofs
- build and use libraries of formal definitions and proofs
 - ▶ formalisations of mathematical theories like
 - ★ lists, sets, bags, ...
 - ★ real numbers
 - ★ probability theory
 - ▶ specifications of real-world artefacts like
 - ★ processors
 - ★ programming languages
 - ★ network protocols
 - ▶ reasoning tools

**There is a strong connection with programming.
Lessons learned in Software Engineering apply.**

- there are many different interactive provers, e. g.
 - ▶ Isabelle/HOL
 - ▶ Coq
 - ▶ PVS
 - ▶ HOL family of provers
 - ▶ ACL2
 - ▶ ...
- important differences
 - ▶ the formalism used
 - ▶ level of trustworthiness
 - ▶ level of automation
 - ▶ libraries
 - ▶ languages for writing proofs
 - ▶ user interface
 - ▶ ...

Which theorem prover is the best one? :-)



- there is no **best** theorem prover
- better question: Which is the **best one for a certain purpose?**
- important points to consider
 - ▶ existing libraries
 - ▶ used logic
 - ▶ level of automation
 - ▶ user interface
 - ▶ importance development speed versus trustworthiness
 - ▶ How familiar are you with the different provers?
 - ▶ Which prover do people in your vicinity use?
 - ▶ your personal preferences
 - ▶ ...

**In this course we use the HOL theorem prover,
because it is used by the TCS group.**

Part II

Organisational Matters



Aims

- introduction to interactive theorem proving (ITP)
- being able to evaluate whether a problem can benefit from ITP
- hands-on experience with HOL
- learn how to build a formal model
- learn how to express and prove important properties of such a model
- learn about basic conformance testing
- use a theorem prover on a small project

Required Prerequisites

- some experience with functional programming
- knowing Standard ML syntax
- basic knowledge about logic (e. g. First Order Logic)

- Interactive Theorem Proving Course takes place in Period 4 of the academic year 2016/2017

- always in room 4523 or 4532

- each week

Mondays	10:15 - 11:45	lecture
Wednesdays	10:00 - 12:00	practical session
Fridays	13:00 - 15:00	practical session

- no lecture on Monday, 1st of May, instead on Wednesday, 3rd May
- last lecture: 12th of June
- last practical session: 21st of June
- 9 lectures, 17 practical sessions

- after each lecture an exercise sheet is handed out
- work on these exercises alone, except if stated otherwise explicitly
- exercise sheet contains due date
 - ▶ usually 10 days time to work on it
 - ▶ hand in during practical sessions
 - ▶ lecture Monday → hand in at latest in next week's Friday session
- main purpose: understanding ITP and learn how to use HOL
 - ▶ no detailed grading, just pass/fail
 - ▶ retries possible till pass
 - ▶ if stuck, ask me or one another
 - ▶ practical sessions intend to provide this opportunity

- very informal
- main purpose: work on exercises
 - ▶ I have a look and provide feedback
 - ▶ you can ask questions
 - ▶ I might sometimes explain things not covered in the lectures
 - ▶ I might provide some concrete tips and tricks
 - ▶ you can also discuss with each other
- attendance not required, but highly recommended
 - ▶ exception: session on 21st April
- only requirement: turn up long enough to hand in exercises
- you need to bring your own computer

- exercises are intended to be handed-in during practical sessions
- attend at least one practical session each week
- leave reasonable time to discuss exercises
 - ▶ don't try to hand your solution in Friday 14:55
- retries possible, but reasonable attempt before deadline required
- handing-in outside practical sessions
 - ▶ only if you have a good reason
 - ▶ decided on a case-by-case basis
- electronic hand-ins
 - ▶ only to get detailed feedback
 - ▶ does not replace personal hand-in
 - ▶ exceptions on a case-by-case basis if there is a good reason
 - ▶ I recommend using a KTH GitHub repo

Passing the ITP Course



- there is only a pass/fail mark
- to pass you need to
 - ▶ attend at least 7 of the 9 lectures
 - ▶ pass 8 of the 9 exercises

- we have the advantage of being a small group
- therefore we are flexible
- so please ask questions, even during lectures
- there are many shy people, therefore
 - ▶ anonymous checklist after each lecture
 - ▶ anonymous background questionnaire in first practical session
- further information is posted on **Interactive Theorem Proving Course** group on Group Web
- contact me (Thomas Tuerk) directly, e. g. via email `thomas@kth.se`

Part III

HOL 4 History and Architecture



- **Stanford LCF** 1971-72 by Milner et al.
- formalism devised by Dana Scott in 1969
- intended to reason about recursively defined functions
- intended for computer science applications
- strengths
 - ▶ powerful simplification mechanism
 - ▶ support for backward proof
- limitations
 - ▶ proofs need a lot of memory
 - ▶ fixed, hard-coded set of proof commands



Robin Milner
(1934 - 2010)

- Milner worked on improving LCF in Edinburgh
- research assistants
 - ▶ Lockwood Morris
 - ▶ Malcolm Newey
 - ▶ Chris Wadsworth
 - ▶ Mike Gordon
- **Edinburgh LCF** 1979
- introduction of **Meta Language** (ML)
- ML was invented to write proof procedures
- ML become an influential functional programming language
- using ML allowed implementing the **LCF approach**

- implement an abstract datatype **thm** to represent theorems
- semantics of ML ensure that values of type **thm** can only be created using its interface
- interface is very small
 - ▶ predefined theorems are axioms
 - ▶ function with result type theorem are inferences
- $\implies$ However you create a theorem, it is valid.
- together with similar abstract datatypes for types and terms, this forms the **kernel**

Modus Ponens Example

Inference Rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash a \Rightarrow b \quad \Delta \vdash a}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash b}$$

SML function

```
val MP : thm -> thm -> thm
MP( $\Gamma \vdash a \Rightarrow b$ )( $\Delta \vdash a$ ) = ( $\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash b$ )
```

- very trustworthy — only the small kernel needs to be trusted
- efficient — no need to store proofs

Easy to extend and automate

However complicated and potentially buggy your code is, if a value of type theorem is produced, it has been created through the small trusted interface. Therefore the statement really holds.

There are now many interactive theorem provers out there that use an approach similar to that of Edinburgh LCF.

- HOL family
 - ▶ HOL theorem prover
 - ▶ HOL Light
 - ▶ HOL Zero
 - ▶ Proof Power
 - ▶ ...
- Isabelle
- Nuprl
- Coq
- ...

- 1979 Edinburgh LCF by Milner, Gordon, et al.
- 1981 Mike Gordon becomes lecturer in Cambridge
- 1985 Cambridge LCF
 - ▶ Larry Paulson and Gérard Huet
 - ▶ implementation of ML compiler
 - ▶ powerful simplifier
 - ▶ various improvements and extensions
- 1988 HOL
 - ▶ Mike Gordon and Keith Hanna
 - ▶ adaption of Cambridge LCF to classical higher order logic
 - ▶ intention: hardware verification
- 1990 HOL90
reimplementation in SML by Konrad Slind at University of Calgary
- 1998 HOL98
implementation in Moscow ML and new library and theory mechanism
- since then HOL Kananaskis releases, called informally **HOL 4**

- **ProofPower**

commercial version of HOL88 by Roger Jones, Rob Arthan et al.

- **HOL Light**


lean CAML / OCaml port by John Harrison

- **HOL Zero**

trustworthy proof checker by Mark Adams

- **Isabelle**

- ▶ 1990 by Larry Paulson
- ▶ meta-theorem prover that supports multiple logics
- ▶ however, mainly HOL used, ZF a little
- ▶ nowadays probably the most widely used HOL system
- ▶ originally designed for software verification



Part IV

HOL's Logic



- the HOL theorem prover uses a version of classical **higher order logic**: classical higher order predicate calculus with terms from the typed lambda calculus (i. e. simple type theory)
- this sounds complicated, but is intuitive for SML programmers
- (S)ML and HOL logic designed to fit each other
- if you understand SML, you understand HOL logic

HOL = functional programming + logic

Ambiguity Warning

The acronym *HOL* refers to both the *HOL interactive theorem prover* and the *HOL logic* used by it. It's also a common abbreviation for *higher order logic* in general.

- SML datatype for types
 - ▶ **Type Variables** ($'a, \alpha, 'b, \beta, \dots$)
Type variables are implicitly universally quantified. Theorems containing type variables hold for all instantiations of these. Proofs using type variables can be seen as proof schemata.
 - ▶ **Atomic Types** (c)
Atomic types denote fixed types. Examples: `num`, `bool`, `unit`
 - ▶ **Compound Types** $((\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)op)$
 op is a **type operator** of arity n and $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ **argument types**. Type operators denote operations for constructing types.
Examples: `num list` or `'a # 'b`.
 - ▶ **Function Types** $(\sigma_1 \rightarrow \sigma_2)$
 $\sigma_1 \rightarrow \sigma_2$ is the type of **total** functions from σ_1 to σ_2 .
- types are never empty in HOL, i. e.
for each type at least one value exists
- all HOL functions are total

- SML datatype for terms

- ▶ **Variables** ($x, y, \dots$)
- ▶ **Constants** ($c, \dots$)
- ▶ **Function Application** ($f\ a$)
- ▶ **Lambda Abstraction** ($\lambda x. f\ x$ or $\lambda x. fx$)

Lambda abstraction represents anonymous function definition.

The corresponding SML syntax is `fn x => f x`.

- terms have to be well-typed
- same typing rules and same type-inference as in SML take place
- terms very similar to SML expressions
- notice: predicates are functions with return type `bool`, i. e. no distinction between functions and predicates, terms and formulae

HOL term	SML expression	type HOL / SML
0	0	<code>num</code> / <code>int</code>
<code>x:'a</code>	<code>x:'a</code>	variable of type <code>'a</code>
<code>x:bool</code>	<code>x:bool</code>	variable of type <code>bool</code>
<code>x + 5</code>	<code>x + 5</code>	applying function <code>+</code> to <code>x</code> and <code>5</code>
<code>\x. x + 5</code>	<code>fn x => x + 5</code>	anonymous (a. k. a. inline) function of type <code>num -> num</code>
<code>(5, T)</code>	<code>(5, true)</code>	<code>num # bool</code> / <code>int * bool</code>
<code>[5;3;2]++[6]</code>	<code>[5,3,2]@[6]</code>	<code>num list</code> / <code>int list</code>

- in SML, the names of function arguments does not matter (much)
- similarly in HOL, the names of variables used by lambda-abstractions does not matter (much)
- the lambda-expression $\lambda x. t$ is said to **bind** the variables x in term t
- variables that are guarded by a lambda expression are called **bound**
- all other variables are **free**
- Example: x is free and y is bound in $(x = 5) \wedge (\lambda y. (y < x))$
- the names of bound variables are unimportant semantically
- two terms are called **alpha-equivalent** iff they differ only in the names of bound variables
- Example: $\lambda x. x$ and $\lambda y. y$ are alpha-equivalent
- Example: x and y are not alpha-equivalent

- theorems are of the form $\Gamma \vdash p$ where
 - ▶ Γ is a set of hypothesis
 - ▶ p is the conclusion of the theorem
 - ▶ all elements of Γ and p are formulae, i. e. terms of type `bool`
- $\Gamma \vdash p$ records that using Γ the statement p **has been** proved
- notice difference to logic: there it means **can be** proved
- the proof itself is not recorded
- theorems can only be created through a small interface in the **kernel**

- the HOL kernel is hard to explain
 - ▶ for historic reasons some concepts are represented rather complicated
 - ▶ for speed reasons some derivable concepts have been added
- instead consider the HOL Light kernel, which is a cleaned-up version
- there are two predefined constants
 - ▶ $= : 'a \rightarrow 'a \rightarrow \text{bool}$
 - ▶ $@ : ('a \rightarrow \text{bool}) \rightarrow 'a$
- there are two predefined types
 - ▶ `bool`
 - ▶ `ind`
- the meaning of these types and constants is given by inference rules and axioms

$$\frac{}{\vdash t = t} \text{REFL}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma \vdash s = t \\ \Delta \vdash t = u \end{array}}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash s = u} \text{TRANS}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma \vdash s = t \\ \Delta \vdash u = v \\ \text{types fit} \end{array}}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash s(u) = t(v)} \text{COMB}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma \vdash s = t \\ x \text{ not free in } \Gamma \end{array}}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. s = \lambda x. t} \text{ABS}$$

$$\frac{}{\vdash (\lambda x. t)x = t} \text{BETA}$$

$$\frac{}{\{p\} \vdash p} \text{ASSUME}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \Leftrightarrow q \quad \Delta \vdash p}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash q} \text{EQ_MP}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \quad \Delta \vdash q}{(\Gamma - \{q\}) \cup (\Delta - \{p\}) \vdash p \Leftrightarrow q} \text{DEDUCT_ANTISYM_RULE}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma[x_1, \dots, x_n] \vdash p[x_1, \dots, x_n]}{\Gamma[t_1, \dots, t_n] \vdash p[t_1, \dots, t_n]} \text{INST}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n] \vdash p[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n]}{\Gamma[\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n] \vdash p[\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n]} \text{INST_TYPE}$$

- 3 axioms needed

ETA_AX	$-(\lambda x. t \ x) = t$
SELECT_AX	$- P \ x \Longrightarrow P((@)P))$
INFINITY_AX	predefined type <code>ind</code> is infinite

- definition principle for constants
 - ▶ constants can be introduced as abbreviations
 - ▶ constraint: no free vars and no new type vars
- definition principle for types
 - ▶ new types can be defined as non-empty subtypes of existing types
- both principles
 - ▶ lead to conservative extensions
 - ▶ preserve consistency

Everything else is derived from this small kernel.

$$\begin{aligned} T &=_{def} (\lambda p. p) = (\lambda p. p) \\ \wedge &=_{def} \lambda p q. (\lambda f. f p q) = (\lambda f. f T T) \\ \implies &=_{def} \lambda p q. (p \wedge q \Leftrightarrow p) \\ \forall &=_{def} \lambda P. (P = \lambda x. T) \\ \exists &=_{def} \lambda P. (\forall q. (\forall x. P(x) \implies q) \implies q) \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

- Kernel defines abstract datatypes for types, terms and theorems
- one does not need to look at the internal implementation
- therefore, easy to exchange
- there are at least 3 different kernels for HOL
 - ▶ standard kernel (de Bruijn indices)
 - ▶ experimental kernel (name / type pairs)
 - ▶ OpenTheory kernel (for proof recording)

- HOL theorem prover uses classical higher order logic
- HOL logic is very similar to SML
 - ▶ syntax
 - ▶ type system
 - ▶ type inference
- HOL theorem prover very trustworthy because of LCF approach
 - ▶ there is a small kernel
 - ▶ proofs are not stored explicitly
- you don't need to know the details of the kernel
- usually one works at a much higher level of abstraction

Part V

Basic HOL Usage



- practical issues are discussed in practical sessions
 - ▶ how to install HOL
 - ▶ which key-combinations to use in emacs-mode
 - ▶ detailed signature of libraries and theories
 - ▶ all parameters and options of certain tools
 - ▶ ...
- exercise sheets sometimes
 - ▶ ask to read some documentation
 - ▶ provide examples
 - ▶ list references where to get additional information
- if you have problems, ask me outside lecture (tuerk@kth.se)
- covered only very briefly in lectures

- webpage: <https://hol-theorem-prover.org>
- HOL supports two SML implementations
 - ▶ Moscow ML (<http://mosml.org>)
 - ▶ PolyML (<http://www.polym1.org>)
- I recommend using PolyML
- please use emacs with
 - ▶ hol-mode
 - ▶ sml-mode
 - ▶ hol-unicode, if you want to type Unicode
- please install recent revision from git repo or Kananaskis 11 release
- documentation found on HOL webpage and with sources

- HOL is a collection of SML modules
- starting HOL starts a SML Read-Eval-Print-Loop (REPL) with
 - ▶ some HOL modules loaded
 - ▶ some default modules opened
 - ▶ an input wrapper to help parsing terms called `unquote`
- `unquote` provides special quotes for terms and types
 - ▶ implemented as input filter
 - ▶ `'my-term'` becomes `Parse.Term [QUOTE "my-term"]`
 - ▶ `':my-type'` becomes `Parse.Type [QUOTE ":my-type"]`
- main interfaces
 - ▶ **emacs** (used in the course)
 - ▶ vim
 - ▶ bare shell

- `*Script.sml` — HOL proof script file
 - ▶ script files contain definitions and proof scripts
 - ▶ executing them results in HOL searching and checking proofs
 - ▶ this might take very long
 - ▶ resulting theorems are stored in `*Theory.{sml|sig}` files
- `*Theory.{sml|sig}` — HOL theory
 - ▶ auto-generated by corresponding script file
 - ▶ load quickly, because they don't search/check proofs
 - ▶ do not edit theory files
- `*Syntax.{sml|sig}` — syntax libraries
 - ▶ contain syntax related functions
 - ▶ i. e. functions to construct and destruct terms and types
- `*Lib.{sml|sig}` — general libraries
- `*Simps.{sml|sig}` — simplifications
- `selftest.sml` — selftest for current directory

- `bin` — HOL binaries
- `src` — HOL sources
- `examples` — HOL examples
 - ▶ interesting projects by various people
 - ▶ examples owned by their developer
 - ▶ coding style and level of maintenance differ a lot
- `help` — sources for reference manual
 - ▶ after compilation home of reference HTML page
- `Manual` — HOL manuals
 - ▶ Tutorial
 - ▶ Description
 - ▶ Reference (PDF version)
 - ▶ Interaction
 - ▶ Quick (cheat pages)
 - ▶ Style-guide
 - ▶ ...

- HOL supports both Unicode and pure ASCII input and output
- advantages of Unicode compared to ASCII
 - ▶ easier to read (good fonts provided)
 - ▶ no need to learn special ASCII syntax
- disadvantages of Unicode compared to ASCII
 - ▶ harder to type (even with `hol-unicode.el`)
 - ▶ less portable between systems
- whether you like Unicode is highly a matter of personal taste
- HOL's policy
 - ▶ no Unicode in HOL's source directory `src`
 - ▶ Unicode in examples directory `examples` is fine
- I recommend turning Unicode output off initially
 - ▶ this simplifies learning the ASCII syntax
 - ▶ no need for special fonts
 - ▶ it is easier to copy and paste terms from HOL's output

Where to find help?



- reference manual
 - ▶ available as HTML pages, single PDF file and in-system help
- description manual
- Style-guide (still under development)
- HOL webpage (<https://hol-theorem-prover.org>)
- mailing-list hol-info
- `DB.match` and `DB.find`
- `*Theory.sig` and `selftest.sml` files
- ask someone, e. g. me :-) (tuerk@kth.se)

Part VI

Forward Proofs



- we already discussed the HOL Logic
- the kernel itself does not even contain basic logic operators
- usually one uses a much higher level of abstraction
 - ▶ many operations and datatypes are defined
 - ▶ high-level derived inference rules are used
- let's now look at this more common abstraction level

Common Terms and Types

	Unicode	ASCII
type vars	$\alpha, \beta, \dots$	'a, 'b, ...
type annotated term	term:type	term:type
true	T	T
false	F	F
negation	$\neg b$	~b
conjunction	$b1 \wedge b2$	b1 /\ b2
disjunction	$b1 \vee b2$	b1 \/ b2
implication	$b1 \implies b2$	b1 ==> b2
equivalence	$b1 \iff b2$	b1 <=> b2
disequation	$v1 \neq v2$	v1 <> v2
all-quantification	$\forall x. P\ x$	!x. P x
existential quantification	$\exists x. P\ x$	?x. P x
Hilbert's choice operator	$@x. P\ x$	@x. P x

There are similar restrictions to constant and variable names as in SML.

HOL specific: don't start variable names with an underscore

Syntax conventions

- common function syntax
 - ▶ prefix notation, e. g. $SUC\ x$
 - ▶ infix notation, e. g. $x + y$
 - ▶ quantifier notation, e. g. $\forall x. P\ x$ means $(\forall) (\lambda x. P\ x)$
- infix and quantifier notation functions can be turned into prefix notation
Example: $(+)\ x\ y$ and $\$+\ x\ y$ are the same as $x + y$
- quantifiers of the same type don't need to be repeated
Example: $\forall x\ y. P\ x\ y$ is short for $\forall x. \forall y. P\ x\ y$
- there is special syntax for some functions
Example: $if\ c\ then\ v1\ else\ v2$ is nice syntax for $COND\ c\ v1\ v2$
- associative infix operators are usually right-associative
Example: $b1\ /\ \ b2\ /\ \ b3$ is parsed as $b1\ /\ \ (b2\ /\ \ b3)$

Operator Precedence

It is easy to misjudge the binding strength of certain operators. Therefore use plenty of parenthesis.

Term Parser

Use special quotation provided by `unquote`.

Use Syntax Functions

Terms are just SML values of type `term`. You can use syntax functions (usually defined in `*Syntax.sml` files) to create them.

Parser

“:bool”

“T”

“~b”

“... /\ ...”

“... \/ ...”

“... ==> ...”

“... = ...”

“... <=> ...”

“... <> ...”

Syntax Funs

mk_type ("bool", []) or bool

mk_const ("T", bool) or T

mk_neg (
 mk_var ("b", bool))

mk_conj (... , ...)

mk_disj (... , ...)

mk_imp (... , ...)

mk_eq (... , ...)

mk_eq (... , ...)

mk_neg (mk_eq (... , ...))

type of Booleans

term true

negation of

Boolean var b

conjunction

disjunction

implication

equation

equivalence

negated equation

Inference Rules for Equality



$$\frac{}{\vdash t = t} \text{ REFL}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s = t \quad x \text{ not free in } \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. s = \lambda x. t} \text{ ABS}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma \vdash s = t \\ \Delta \vdash u = v \\ \text{types fit} \end{array}}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash s(u) = t(v)} \text{ MK-COMB}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s = t}{\Gamma \vdash t = s} \text{ GSYM}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s = t \quad \Delta \vdash t = u}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash s = u} \text{ TRANS}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \Leftrightarrow q \quad \Delta \vdash p}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash q} \text{ EQ_MP}$$

$$\frac{}{\vdash (\lambda x. t)x = t} \text{ BETA}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma[x_1, \dots, x_n] \vdash p[x_1, \dots, x_n]}{\Gamma[t_1, \dots, t_n] \vdash p[t_1, \dots, t_n]} \text{ INST}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n] \vdash p[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n]}{\Gamma[\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n] \vdash p[\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n]} \text{ INST_TYPE}$$

Inference Rules for Implication



$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q \quad \Delta \vdash p}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash q} \text{ MP, MATCH_MP}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p = q}{\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q} \text{ EQ_IMP_RULE}$$
$$\Gamma \vdash q \Rightarrow p$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q \quad \Delta \vdash q \Rightarrow p}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash p = q} \text{ IMP_ANTISYM_RULE}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow q \quad \Delta \vdash q \Rightarrow r}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash p \Rightarrow r} \text{ IMP_TRANS}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p}{\Gamma - \{q\} \vdash q \Rightarrow p} \text{ DISCH}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash q \Rightarrow p}{\Gamma \cup \{q\} \vdash p} \text{ UNDISCH}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow F}{\Gamma \vdash \sim p} \text{ NOT_INTRO}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \sim p}{\Gamma \vdash p \Rightarrow F} \text{ NOT_ELIM}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \quad \Delta \vdash q}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash p \wedge q} \text{ CONJ}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \wedge q}{\Gamma \vdash p} \text{ CONJUNCT1}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \wedge q}{\Gamma \vdash q} \text{ CONJUNCT2}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p}{\Gamma \vdash p \vee q} \text{ DISJ1}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash q}{\Gamma \vdash p \vee q} \text{ DISJ2}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma \vdash p \vee q \\ \Delta_1 \cup \{p\} \vdash r \\ \Delta_2 \cup \{q\} \vdash r \end{array}}{\Gamma \cup \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 \vdash r} \text{ DISJ_CASES}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \quad x \text{ not free in } \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash \forall x. p} \text{ GEN}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall x. p}{\Gamma \vdash p[u/x]} \text{ SPEC}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p[u/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \exists x. p} \text{ EXISTS}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \vdash \exists x. p \\ \Delta \cup \{p[u/x]\} \vdash r \\ u \text{ not free in } \Gamma, \Delta, p \text{ and } r \end{array}}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash r} \text{ CHOOSE}$$

- axioms and inference rules are used to derive theorems
- this method is called **forward proof**
 - ▶ one starts with basic building blocks
 - ▶ one moves step by step forward
 - ▶ finally the theorem one is interested in is derived
- one can also implement own proof tools

Forward Proofs — Example I



Let's prove $\forall p. p \implies p$.

```
val IMP_REFL_THM = let
  val tm1 = 'p:bool';
  val thm1 = ASSUME tm1;
  val thm2 = DISCH tm1 thm1;
in
  GEN tm1 thm2
end

fun IMP_REFL t =
  SPEC t IMP_REFL_THM;
```

```
> val tm1 = 'p': term
> val thm1 = [p] |- p: thm
> val thm2 = |- p ==> p: thm

> val IMP_REFL_THM =
  |- !p. p ==> p: thm

> val IMP_REFL =
  fn: term -> thm
```

Let's prove $\forall P v. (\exists x. (x = v) \wedge P x) \iff P v$.

```
val tm_v = ''v:'a'';  
val tm_P = ''P:'a -> bool'';  
val tm_lhs = ''?x. (x = v) /\ P x''  
val tm_rhs = mk_comb (tm_P, tm_v);
```

```
val thm1 = let  
  val thm1a = ASSUME tm_rhs;  
  val thm1b =  
    CONJ (REFL tm_v) thm1a;  
  val thm1c =  
    EXISTS (tm_lhs, tm_v) thm1b  
in  
  DISCH tm_rhs thm1c  
end
```

```
> val thm1a = [P v] |- P v: thm  
> val thm1b =  
  [P v] |- (v = v) /\ P v: thm  
> val thm1c =  
  [P v] |- ?x. (x = v) /\ P x  
  
> val thm1 = [] |-  
  P v ==> ?x. (x = v) /\ P x: thm
```



```
val thm2 = let
  val thm2a =
    ASSUME (('u:'a = v) /\ P u)
  val thm2b = AP_TERM tm_P
    (CONJUNCT1 thm2a);
  val thm2c = EQ_MP thm2b
    (CONJUNCT2 thm2a);
  val thm2d =
    CHOOSE (('u:'a',
      ASSUME tm_lhs) thm2c
in
  DISCH tm_lhs thm2d
end
```

```
val thm3 = IMP_ANTISYM_RULE thm2 thm1
val thm4 = GENL [tm_P, tm_v] thm3
```

```
> val thm2a = [(u = v) /\ P u] |-
  (u = v) /\ P u: thm
> val thm2b = [(u = v) /\ P u] |-
  P u <=> P v
> val thm2c = [(u = v) /\ P u] |-
  P v
> val thm2d = [?x. (x = v) /\ P x] |-
  P v

> val thm2 = [] |-
  ?x. (x = v) /\ P x ==> P v

> val thm3 = [] |-
  ?x. (x = v) /\ P x <=> P v
> val thm4 = [] |- !P v.
  ?x. (x = v) /\ P x <=> P v
```

Part VII

Backward Proofs



- let's prove $\neg A \vee B. A \wedge B \Leftrightarrow B \wedge A$

```
(* Show |- A /\ B ==> B /\ A *)  
val thm1a = ASSUME ``A /\ B``;  
val thm1b = CONJ (CONJUNCT2 thm1a) (CONJUNCT1 thm1a);  
val thm1 = DISCH ``A /\ B`` thm1b
```

```
(* Show |- B /\ A ==> A /\ B *)  
val thm2a = ASSUME ``B /\ A``;  
val thm2b = CONJ (CONJUNCT2 thm2a) (CONJUNCT1 thm2a);  
val thm2 = DISCH ``B /\ A`` thm2b
```

```
(* Combine to get |- A /\ B <=> B /\ A *)  
val thm3 = IMP_ANTISYM_RULE thm1 thm2
```

```
(* Add quantifiers *)  
val thm4 = GENL [``A:bool``, ``B:bool``] thm3
```

- this is how you write down a proof
- for finding a proof it is however often useful to think **backwards**

Motivation II - thinking backwards



- we want to prove
 - ▶ $\neg A \vee B \iff A \wedge B \iff B \wedge A$
- all-quantifiers can easily be added later, so let's get rid of them
 - ▶ $A \wedge B \iff B \wedge A$
- now we have an equivalence, let's show 2 implications
 - ▶ $A \wedge B \implies B \wedge A$
 - ▶ $B \wedge A \implies A \wedge B$
- we have an implication, so we can use the precondition as an assumption
 - ▶ using $A \wedge B$ show $B \wedge A$
 - ▶ $A \wedge B \implies B \wedge A$

- we have a conjunction as assumption, let's split it
 - ▶ using A and B show $B \wedge A$
 - ▶ $A \wedge B \implies B \wedge A$
- we have to show a conjunction, so let's show both parts
 - ▶ using A and B show B
 - ▶ using A and B show A
 - ▶ $A \wedge B \implies B \wedge A$
- the first two proof obligations are trivial
 - ▶ $A \wedge B \implies B \wedge A$
- ...
- we are done

- common practise
 - ▶ think backwards to find proof
 - ▶ write found proof down in forward style
- often switch between backward and forward style within a proof
Example: induction proof
 - ▶ backward step: induct on ...
 - ▶ forward steps: prove base case and induction case
- whether to use forward or backward proofs depend on
 - ▶ support by the interactive theorem prover you use
 - ★ HOL 4 and close family: emphasis on backward proof
 - ★ Isabelle/HOL: emphasis on forward proof
 - ★ Coq : emphasis on backward proof
 - ▶ your way of thinking
 - ▶ the theorem you try to prove

- in HOL
 - ▶ proof tactics / backward proofs used for most user-level proofs
 - ▶ forward proofs used usually for writing automation
- backward proofs are implemented by **tactics** in HOL
 - ▶ decomposition into subgoals implemented in SML
 - ▶ SML datastructures used to keep track of all open subgoals
 - ▶ forward proof used to construct theorems
- to understand backward proofs in HOL we need to look at
 - ▶ **goal** — SML datatype for proof obligations
 - ▶ **goalStack** — library for keeping track of goals
 - ▶ **tactic** — SML type for functions performing backward proofs

- goals represent proof obligations, i. e. theorems we need/want to prove
- the SML type `goal` is an abbreviation for `term list * term`
- the goal `([asm_1, ..., asm_n], c)` records that we need/want to prove the theorem $\{asm_1, \dots, asm_n\} \vdash c$

Example Goals

Goal

`([‘‘A’’, ‘‘B’’], ‘‘A /\ B’’)`
`([‘‘B’’, ‘‘A’’], ‘‘A /\ B’’)`
`([‘‘B /\ A’’], ‘‘A /\ B’’)`
`([], ‘‘(B /\ A) ==> (A /\ B)’’)`

Theorem

$\{A, B\} \vdash A \wedge B$
 $\{A, B\} \vdash A \wedge B$
 $\{B \wedge A\} \vdash A \wedge B$
 $\vdash (B \wedge A) \implies (A \wedge B)$

- the SML type `tactic` is an abbreviation for the type `goal -> goal list * validation`
- `validation` is an abbreviation for `thm list -> thm`
- given a goal, a tactic
 - ▶ decides into which subgoals to decompose the goal
 - ▶ returns this list of subgoals
 - ▶ returns a validation that
 - ★ given a list of theorems for the computed subgoals
 - ★ produces a theorem for the original goal
- special case: empty list of subgoals
 - ▶ the validation (given `[]`) needs to produce a theorem for the goal
- notice: a tactic might be invalid

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \quad \Delta \vdash q}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash p \wedge q} \text{CONJ} \qquad \frac{t \equiv \text{conj1} \wedge \text{conj2} \quad \text{asl} \vdash \text{conj1} \quad \text{asl} \vdash \text{conj2}}{\text{asl} \vdash t}$$

```
val CONJ_TAC: tactic = fn (asl, t) =>
  let
    val (conj1, conj2) = dest_conj t
  in
    ([ (asl, conj1), (asl, conj2) ],
     fn [th1, th2] => CONJ th1 th2 | _ => raise Match)
  end
handle HOL_ERR _ => raise ERR "CONJ_TAC" ""
```

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p \implies q \quad \Delta \vdash q \implies p}{\Gamma \cup \Delta \vdash p = q} \text{IMP_ANTISYM_RULE}$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} t \equiv \text{lhs} = \text{rhs} \\ \text{asl} \vdash \text{lhs} ==> \text{rhs} \\ \text{asl} \vdash \text{rhs} ==> \text{lhs} \end{array}}{\text{asl} \vdash t}$$

```
val EQ_TAC: tactic = fn (asl, t) =>
  let
    val (lhs, rhs) = dest_eq t
  in
    ([ (asl, mk_imp (lhs, rhs)), (asl, mk_imp (rhs, lhs)) ],
     fn [th1, th2] => IMP_ANTISYM_RULE th1 th2
       | _          => raise Match)
  end
handle HOL_ERR _ => raise ERR "EQ_TAC" ""
```

- the `proofManagerLib` keeps track of open goals
- it uses `goalStack` internally
- important commands
 - ▶ `g` — set up new goal
 - ▶ `e` — expand a tactic
 - ▶ `p` — print the current status
 - ▶ `top_thm` — get the proved thm at the end

Previous Goalstack

–

User Action

g ' !A B. A /\ B <=> B /\ A ' ;

New Goalstack

Initial goal:

!A B. A /\ B <=> B /\ A

: proof

Tactic Proof Example II



Previous Goalstack

Initial goal:

$!A \ B. \ A \ /\ \ B \ \Leftrightarrow \ B \ /\ \ A$

: proof

User Action

e GEN_TAC;

e GEN_TAC;

New Goalstack

$A \ /\ \ B \ \Leftrightarrow \ B \ /\ \ A$

: proof

Tactic Proof Example III



Previous Goalstack

$A \wedge B \Leftrightarrow B \wedge A$

: proof

User Action

e EQ_TAC;

New Goalstack

$B \wedge A \Rightarrow A \wedge B$

$A \wedge B \Rightarrow B \wedge A$

: proof

Tactic Proof Example IV



Previous Goalstack

$B \wedge A \implies A \wedge B$

$A \wedge B \implies B \wedge A$: proof

User Action

e STRIP_TAC;

New Goalstack

$B \wedge A$

0. A

1. B

Tactic Proof Example V



Previous Goalstack

B /\ A

0. A

1. B

User Action

e CONJ_TAC;

New Goalstack

A

0. A

1. B

B

0. A

1. B

Tactic Proof Example VI



Previous Goalstack

A

-
- 0. A
 - 1. B

B

-
- 0. A
 - 1. B

User Action

```
e (ACCEPT_TAC (ASSUME 'B:bool'));  
e (ACCEPT_TAC (ASSUME 'A:bool'));
```

New Goalstack

$B \wedge A \implies A \wedge B$

: proof

Tactic Proof Example VII



Previous Goalstack

$B \wedge A \implies A \wedge B$

: proof

User Action

```
e STRIP_TAC;  
e (ASM_REWRITE_TAC[]);
```

New Goalstack

Initial goal proved.

```
|- !A B. A /\ B <=> B /\ A:  
  proof
```

Previous Goalstack

Initial goal proved.

```
|- !A B. A /\ B <=> B /\ A:  
  proof
```

User Action

```
val thm = top_thm();
```

Result

```
val thm =  
  |- !A B. A /\ B <=> B /\ A:  
  thm
```

Combined Tactic

```
val thm = prove (''!A B. A /\ B <=> B /\ A'',
  GEN_TAC >> GEN_TAC >>
  EQ_TAC >| [
    STRIP_TAC >>
    STRIP_TAC >| [
      ACCEPT_TAC (ASSUME 'B:bool'),
      ACCEPT_TAC (ASSUME 'A:bool')
    ],
    STRIP_TAC >>
    ASM_REWRITE_TAC[]
  ]);
```

Result

```
val thm =
  |- !A B. A /\ B <=> B /\ A:
  thm
```

Cleaned-up Tactic

```
val thm = prove (''!A B. A /\ B <=> B /\ A'',  
  REPEAT GEN_TAC >>  
  EQ_TAC >> (  
    REPEAT STRIP_TAC >>  
    ASM_REWRITE_TAC []  
  ));
```

Result

```
val thm =  
  |- !A B. A /\ B <=> B /\ A:  
  thm
```

- in HOL most user-level proofs are tactic-based
 - ▶ automation often written in forward style
 - ▶ low-level, basic proofs written in forward style
 - ▶ nearly everything else is written in backward (tactic) style
- there are **many** different tactics
- in the lecture only the most basic ones will be discussed
- **you need to learn about tactics on your own**
 - ▶ good starting point: Quick manual
 - ▶ learning finer points takes a lot of time
 - ▶ exercises require you to read up on tactics
- often there are many ways to prove a statement, which tactics to use depends on
 - ▶ personal way of thinking
 - ▶ personal style and preferences
 - ▶ maintainability, clarity, elegance, robustness
 - ▶ ...

Part VIII

Basic Tactics



- originally tactics were written all in capital letters with underscores
Example: `ALL_TAC`
- since 2010 more and more tactics have overloaded lower-case syntax
Example: `all_tac`
- sometimes, the lower-case version is shortened
Example: `REPEAT`, `rpt`
- sometimes, there is special syntax
Example: `THEN`, `\`, `>>`
- which one to use is mostly a matter of personal taste
 - ▶ all-capital names are hard to read and type
 - ▶ however, not for all tactics there are lower-case versions
 - ▶ mixed lower- and upper-case tactics are even harder to read
 - ▶ often shortened lower-case name is not *speaking*

In the lecture we will use mostly the old-style names.

GEN_TAC	remove outermost all-quantifier
DISCH_TAC	move antecedent of goal into assumptions
CONJ_TAC	splits conjunctive goal
STRIP_TAC	splits on outermost connective (combination of GEN_TAC, CONJ_TAC, DISCH_TAC, ...)
DISJ1_TAC	selects left disjunct
DISJ2_TAC	selects right disjunct
EQ_TAC	reduce Boolean equality to implications
ASSUME_TAC thm	add theorem to list of assumptions
EXISTS_TAC term	provide witness for existential goal

- tacticals are SML functions that combine tactics to form new tactics
- common workflow
 - ▶ develop large tactic interactively
 - ▶ using `goalStack` and editor support to execute tactics one by one
 - ▶ combine tactics manually with tacticals to create larger tactics
 - ▶ finally end up with one large tactic that solves your goal
 - ▶ use `prove` or `store_thm` instead of `goalStack`
- make sure to **clearly mark proof structure** by e. g.
 - ▶ use indentation
 - ▶ use parentheses
 - ▶ use appropriate connectives
 - ▶ ...
- `goalStack` commands like `e` or `g` should not appear in your final proof

Some Basic Tacticals



tac1 >> tac2	THEN, \\	applies tactics in sequence
tac > tacL	THENL	applies list of tactics to subgoals
tac1 >- tac2	THEN1	applies tac2 to the first subgoal of tac1
REPEAT tac	rpt	repeats tac until it fails
NTAC n tac		apply tac n times
REVERSE tac	reverse	reverses the order of subgoals
tac1 ORELSE tac2		applies tac1 only if tac2 fails
TRY tac		do nothing if tac fails
ALL_TAC	all_tac	do nothing
NO_TAC		fail

- (equational) rewriting is at the core of HOL's automation
- we will discuss it in detail later
- details complex, but basic usage is straightforward
 - ▶ given a theorem `rewr_thm` of form $\vdash P\ x = Q\ x$ and a term `t`
 - ▶ rewriting `t` with `rewr_thm` means
 - ▶ replacing each occurrence of a term $P\ c$ for some `c` with $Q\ c$ in `t`
- **warning:** rewriting may loop

Example: rewriting with theorem $\vdash X \iff (X \wedge T)$

`REWRITE_TAC` thms

rewrite goal using equations found
in given list of theorems

`ASM_REWRITE_TAC` thms

in addition use assumptions

`ONCE_REWRITE_TAC` thms

rewrite once in goal using equations

`ONCE_ASM_REWRITE_TAC` thms

rewrite once using assumptions

Case-Split and Induction Tactics



<code>Induct_on 'term'</code>	induct on term
<code>Induct</code>	induct on all-quantor
<code>Cases_on 'term'</code>	case-split on term
<code>Cases</code>	case-split on all-quantor
<code>MATCH_MP_TAC</code> thm	apply rule
<code>IRULE_TAC</code> thm	generalised apply rule

POP_ASSUM thm-tac

use and remove first assumption
common usage **POP_ASSUM MP_TAC**

PAT_ASSUM term thm-tac
also **PAT_X_ASSUM** term thm-tac

use (and remove) first
assumption matching pattern

WEAKEN_TAC term-pred

removes first assumption
satisfying predicate

- decision procedures try to solve the current goal completely
- they either succeed or fail
- no partial progress
- decision procedures vital for automation

TAUT_TAC	propositional logic tautology checker
DECIDE_TAC	linear arithmetic for num
METIS_TAC thms	first order prover
numLib.ARITH_TAC	Presburger arithmetic
intLib.ARITH_TAC	uses Omega test

- it is vital to structure your proofs well
 - ▶ improved maintainability
 - ▶ improved readability
 - ▶ improved reusability
 - ▶ saves time in medium-run
- therefore, use many small lemmata
- also, use many explicit subgoals

'term-frag' <code>by</code> tac	show term with tac and add it to assumptions
'term-frag' <code>suffices_by</code> tac	show it suffices to prove term

- notice that `by` and `suffices_by` take **term fragments**
- term fragments are also called **term quotations**
- they represent (partially) unparsed terms
- parsing takes time place during execution of tactic in context of goal
- this helps to avoid type annotations
- however, this means syntax errors show late as well
- the library `Q` defines many tactics using term fragments

- here many tactics are presented in a very short amount of time
- there are many, many more important tactics out there
- few people can learn a programming language just by reading manuals
- similar few people can learn HOL just by reading and listening
- you should write your own proofs and play around with these tactics
- solving the exercises is highly recommended
(and actually required if you want credits for this course)

- we want to prove $!1. \text{LENGTH} (\text{APPEND } 1 \ 1) = 2 * \text{LENGTH } 1$
- first step: set up goal on `goalStack`
- at same time start writing proof script

Proof Script

```
val LENGTH_APPEND_SAME = prove (  
  ‘‘!1. LENGTH (APPEND 1 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1‘‘,
```

Actions

- run `g ‘‘!1. LENGTH (APPEND 1 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1‘‘`
- this is done by hol-mode
- move cursor inside term and press `M-h g`
(menu-entry HOL - Goalstack - New goal)

Tactical Proof - Example I - Slide 2



Current Goal

`!1. LENGTH (1 ++ 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1`

- the outermost connective is an all-quantor
- let's get rid of it via `GEN_TAC`

Proof Script

```
val LENGTH_APPEND_SAME = prove (  
  ``!1. LENGTH (1 ++ 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1``,  
  GEN_TAC
```

Actions

- run `e GEN_TAC`
- this is done by hol-mode
- mark line with `GEN_TAC` and press `M-h e`
(menu-entry `HOL - Goalstack - Apply tactic`)

Current Goal

`LENGTH (1 ++ 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1`

- `LENGTH` of `APPEND` can be simplified
- let's search an appropriate lemma with `DB.match`

Actions

- run `DB.print_match [] 'LENGTH (_ ++ _)'`
- this is done via hol-mode
- press M-h m and enter term pattern
(menu-entry HOL - Misc - DB match)
- this finds the theorem `listTheory.LENGTH_APPEND`
`| - !11 12. LENGTH (11 ++ 12) = LENGTH 11 + LENGTH 12`

Current Goal

`LENGTH (1 ++ 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1`

- let's rewrite with found theorem `listTheory.LENGTH_APPEND`

Proof Script

```
val LENGTH_APPEND_SAME = prove (  
  ‘‘!1. LENGTH (APPEND 1 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1‘‘,  
  GEN_TAC >>  
  REWRITE_TAC[listTheory.LENGTH_APPEND]
```

Actions

- connect the new tactic with tactical `>>` (`THEN`)
- use hol-mode to expand the new tactic

Current Goal

$\text{LENGTH } 1 + \text{LENGTH } 1 = 2 * \text{LENGTH } 1$

- let's search a theorem for simplifying $2 * \text{LENGTH } 1$
- prepare for extending the previous rewrite tactic

Proof Script

```
val LENGTH_APPEND_SAME = prove (  
  ‘‘!1. LENGTH (APPEND 1 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1‘‘,  
  GEN_TAC >>  
  REWRITE_TAC[listTheory.LENGTH_APPEND]
```

Actions

- `DB.match` finds theorem `arithmeticTheory.TIMES2`
- press M-h b and undo last tactic expansion
(menu-entry HOL - Goalstack - Back up)

Current Goal

`LENGTH (1 ++ 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1`

- extend the previous rewrite tactic
- finish proof

Proof Script

```
val LENGTH_APPEND_SAME = prove (  
  ‘‘!1. LENGTH (APPEND 1 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1‘‘,  
  GEN_TAC >>  
  REWRITE_TAC[listTheory.LENGTH_APPEND, arithmeticTheory.TIMES2]);
```

Actions

- add `TIMES2` to the list of theorems used by rewrite tactic
- use hol-mode to expand the extended rewrite tactic
- goal is solved, so let's add closing parenthesis and semicolon

- we have a finished tactic proving our goal
- notice that `GEN_TAC` is not needed
- let's polish the proof script

Proof Script

```
val LENGTH_APPEND_SAME = prove (  
  “!l. LENGTH (APPEND l l) = 2 * LENGTH l”,  
  GEN_TAC >>  
  REWRITE_TAC[listTheory.LENGTH_APPEND, arithmeticTheory.TIMES2]);
```

Polished Proof Script

```
val LENGTH_APPEND_SAME = prove (  
  “!l. LENGTH (APPEND l l) = 2 * LENGTH l”,  
  REWRITE_TAC[listTheory.LENGTH_APPEND, arithmeticTheory.TIMES2]);
```

- let's prove something slightly more complicated
- drop old goal by pressing M-h d
(menu-entry HOL - Goalstack - Drop goal)
- set up goal on `goalStack` (M-h g)
- at same time start writing proof script

Proof Script

```
val NOT_ALL_DISTINCT_LEMMA = prove (‘‘!x1 x2 x3 11 12 13.  
  (MEM x1 11 /\ MEM x2 12 /\ MEM x3 13) /\  
  ((x1 <= x2) /\ (x2 <= x3) /\ x3 <= SUC x1) ==>  
  ~(ALL_DISTINCT (11 ++ 12 ++ 13))‘‘,
```

Current Goal

```
!x1 x2 x3 11 12 13.  
  (MEM x1 11 /\ MEM x2 12 /\ MEM x3 13) /\  
  x1 <= x2 /\ x2 <= x3 /\ x3 <= SUC x1 ==>  
  ~ALL_DISTINCT (11 ++ 12 ++ 13)
```

- let's strip the goal

Proof Script

```
val NOT_ALL_DISTINCT_LEMMA = prove (‘‘!x1 x2 x3 11 12 13.  
  (MEM x1 11 /\ MEM x2 12 /\ MEM x3 13) /\  
  ((x1 <= x2) /\ (x2 <= x3) /\ x3 <= SUC x1) ==>  
  ~(ALL_DISTINCT (11 ++ 12 ++ 13))‘‘,  
  REPEAT STRIP_TAC
```

Current Goal

```
!x1 x2 x3 11 12 13.  
  (MEM x1 11 /\ MEM x2 12 /\ MEM x3 13) /\  
  x1 <= x2 /\ x2 <= x3 /\ x3 <= SUC x1 ==>  
  ~ALL_DISTINCT (11 ++ 12 ++ 13)
```

- let's strip the goal

Proof Script

```
val LENGTH_APPEND_SAME = prove (  
  ‘‘!1. LENGTH (APPEND 1 1) = 2 * LENGTH 1‘‘,  
  REPEAT STRIP_TAC
```

Actions

- add `REPEAT STRIP_TAC` to proof script
- expand this tactic using hol-mode

Current Goal

F

```
-----
0.  MEM x1 11          4.  x2 <= x3
1.  MEM x2 12          5.  x3 <= SUC x1
2.  MEM x3 13          6.  ALL_DISTINCT (11 ++ 12 ++ 13)
3.  x1 <= x2
```

- oops, we did too much, we would like to keep ALL_DISTINCT in goal

Proof Script

```
val NOT_ALL_DISTINCT_LEMMA = prove (''...',
REPEAT GEN_TAC >> STRIP_TAC
```

Actions

- undo REPEAT STRIP_TAC (M-h b)
- expand more fine-tuned strip tactic

Current Goal

$\sim \text{ALL_DISTINCT } (11 \ ++ \ 12 \ ++ \ 13)$

0. MEM x1 11	3. x1 <= x2
1. MEM x2 12	4. x2 <= x3
2. MEM x3 13	5. x3 <= SUC x1

- now let's simplify `ALL_DISTINCT`
- search suitable theorems with `DB.match`
- use them with rewrite tactic

Proof Script

```
val NOT_ALL_DISTINCT_LEMMA = prove (‘‘...’’,  
REPEAT GEN_TAC >> STRIP_TAC >>  
REWRITE_TAC[listTheory.ALL_DISTINCT_APPEND, listTheory.MEM_APPEND]
```

Current Goal

$$\sim((\text{ALL_DISTINCT } 11 \wedge \text{ALL_DISTINCT } 12 \wedge !e. \text{MEM } e \ 11 \implies \sim \text{MEM } e \ 12) \wedge \text{ALL_DISTINCT } 13 \wedge !e. \text{MEM } e \ 11 \wedge \text{MEM } e \ 12 \implies \sim \text{MEM } e \ 13)$$

0. MEM x1 11	3. x1 <= x2
1. MEM x2 12	4. x2 <= x3
2. MEM x3 13	5. x3 <= SUC x1

- from assumptions 3, 4 and 5 we know $x2 = x1 \wedge x2 = x3$
- let's deduce this fact by `DECIDE_TAC`

Proof Script

```
val NOT_ALL_DISTINCT_LEMMA = prove ('...',  
  REPEAT GEN_TAC >> STRIP_TAC >>  
  REWRITE_TAC[listTheory.ALL_DISTINCT_APPEND, listTheory.MEM_APPEND] >>  
  '(x2 = x1) \wedge (x2 = x3)' by DECIDE_TAC
```


Current Goals — 2 subgoals, one for each disjunct

$\sim((\text{ALL_DISTINCT } 11 \wedge \text{ALL_DISTINCT } 12 \wedge !e. \text{MEM } e \ 11 \implies \sim \text{MEM } e \ 12) \wedge \text{ALL_DISTINCT } 13 \wedge !e. \text{MEM } e \ 11 \wedge \text{MEM } e \ 12 \implies \sim \text{MEM } e \ 13)$

0. MEM x1 11	4. x2 <= x3
1. MEM x2 12	5. x3 <= SUC x1
2. MEM x3 13	6a. x2 = x1
3. x1 <= x2	6b. x2 = x3

- both goals are easily solved by first-order reasoning
- let's use `METIS_TAC[]` for both subgoals

Proof Script

```
val NOT_ALL_DISTINCT_LEMMA = prove ('...',  
  REPEAT GEN_TAC >> STRIP_TAC >>  
  REWRITE_TAC[listTheory.ALL_DISTINCT_APPEND, listTheory.MEM_APPEND] >>  
  '(x2 = x1) \/\ (x2 = x3)' by DECIDE_TAC >> (  
    METIS_TAC[]  
  ));
```

Finished Proof Script

```
val NOT_ALL_DISTINCT_LEMMA = prove (  
  ‘‘!x1 x2 x3 l1 l2 l3.  
    (MEM x1 l1 /\ MEM x2 l2 /\ MEM x3 l3) /\  
    ((x1 <= x2) /\ (x2 <= x3) /\ x3 <= SUC x1) ==>  
    ~(ALL_DISTINCT (l1 ++ l2 ++ l3))‘‘,  
  REPEAT GEN_TAC >> STRIP_TAC >>  
  REWRITE_TAC[listTheory.ALL_DISTINCT_APPEND, listTheory.MEM_APPEND] >>  
  ‘(x2 = x1) \/ (x2 = x3)’ by DECIDE_TAC >> (  
    METIS_TAC[]  
  ));
```

- notice that proof structure is explicit
- parentheses and indentation used to mark new subgoals

Part IX

Induction Proofs



- mathematical (a. k. a. natural) induction principle:
If a property P holds for 0 and $P(n)$ implies $P(n + 1)$ for all n ,
then $P(n)$ holds for all n .
- HOL is expressive enough to encode this principle as a theorem.

$$\vdash !P. P\ 0 \ /\ \ (!n. P\ n \ ==> P\ (SUC\ n)) \ ==> !n. P\ n$$

- Performing mathematical induction in HOL means applying this theorem (e. g. via `HO_MATCH_MP_TAC`)
- there are many similarish induction theorems in HOL
- Example: complete induction principle

$$\vdash !P. (!n. (!m. m < n ==> P\ m) ==> P\ n) ==> !n. P\ n$$

- **structural induction** theorems are an important special form of induction theorems
- they describe performing induction on the structure of a datatype
- Example: $\vdash !P. P [] \wedge (!t. P t \implies !h. P (h::t)) \implies !l. P l$
- structural induction is used very frequently in HOL
- for each algebraic datatype, there is an induction theorem

- there are many induction theorems in HOL
 - ▶ datatype definitions lead to induction theorems
 - ▶ recursive function definitions produce corresponding induction theorems
 - ▶ recursive relation definitions give rise to induction theorems
 - ▶ many are manually defined
- Examples

$\vdash !P. P [] \wedge (!l. P l \implies !x. P (SNOC\ x\ l)) \implies !l. P l$

$\vdash !P. P\ FEMPTY \wedge$
 $(!f. P\ f \implies !x\ y. x\ NOTIN\ FDOM\ f \implies P\ (f\ |+ (x,y))) \implies !f. P\ f$

$\vdash !P. P\ \{\}\ \wedge$
 $(!s. FINITE\ s \wedge P\ s \implies !e. e\ NOTIN\ s \implies P\ (e\ INSERT\ s)) \implies$
 $!s. FINITE\ s \implies P\ s$

$\vdash !R\ P. (!x\ y. R\ x\ y \implies P\ x\ y) \wedge (!x\ y\ z. P\ x\ y \wedge P\ y\ z \implies P\ x\ z) \implies$
 $!u\ v. R^+\ u\ v \implies P\ u\ v$

Induction (and Case-Split) Tactics



- the tactic `Induct` (or `Induct_on`) usually used to start induction proofs
- it looks at the type of the quantifier (or its argument) and applies the default induction theorem for this type
- this is usually what one needs
- other (non default) induction theorems can be applied via `INDUCT_THEN` or `HO_MATCH_MP_TAC`
- similarish `Cases_on` picks and applies default case-split theorems

- let's prove via induction
$$!11\ 12. \text{ REVERSE } (11 ++ 12) = \text{ REVERSE } 12 ++ \text{ REVERSE } 11$$
- we set up the goal and start and induction proof on 11

Proof Script

```
val REVERSE_APPEND = prove (  
  ‘‘!11 12. REVERSE (11 ++ 12) = REVERSE 12 ++ REVERSE 11‘‘,  
  Induct
```


- the induction tactic produced two cases
- base case:

`!12. REVERSE ([] ++ 12) = REVERSE 12 ++ REVERSE []`

- induction step:

`!h 12. REVERSE (h::11 ++ 12) = REVERSE 12 ++ REVERSE (h::11)`

`!12. REVERSE (11 ++ 12) = REVERSE 12 ++ REVERSE 11`

- both goals can be easily proved by rewriting

Proof Script

```
val REVERSE_APPEND = prove (''  
!11 12. REVERSE (11 ++ 12) = REVERSE 12 ++ REVERSE 11'',  
Induct >| [  
  REWRITE_TAC[REVERSE_DEF, APPEND, APPEND_NIL],  
  ASM_REWRITE_TAC[REVERSE_DEF, APPEND, APPEND_ASSOC]  
]);
```

- let's prove via induction
$$!1. \text{ REVERSE } (\text{REVERSE } 1) = 1$$
- we set up the goal and start and induction proof on 1

Proof Script

```
val REVERSE_REVERSE = prove (  
  ‘‘!1. REVERSE (REVERSE 1) = 1‘‘,  
  Induct
```

- the induction tactic produced two cases
- base case:

`REVERSE (REVERSE []) = []`

- induction step:

`!h. REVERSE (REVERSE (h::l1)) = h::l1`

`REVERSE (REVERSE 1) = 1`

- again both goals can be easily proved by rewriting

Proof Script

```
val REVERSE_REVERSE = prove (  
  ‘‘!l. REVERSE (REVERSE l) = l‘‘,  
  Induct >| [  
    REWRITE_TAC[REVERSE_DEF],  
    ASM_REWRITE_TAC[REVERSE_DEF, REVERSE_APPEND, APPEND]  
  ]);
```

Part X

Basic Definitions



- 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

- **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** 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

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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
```

- 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

- 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)
```

- HOL allows introducing non-empty subtypes of existing types
- a predicate $P : \text{ty} \rightarrow \text{bool}$ describes a subset of an existing type ty
- ty may contain type variables
- only **non-empty** types are allowed
- therefore a non-emptiness 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

- 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: |- ?1. ALL_DISTINCT 1`
- `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`

- `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 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
 - ▶ ...

- 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 and 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
```

- 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
 - ▶ ...

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'
```

`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
```

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')
```

Enumeration type in SML

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

Enumeration type in HOL

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


`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)
```

Record type in SML

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

Record type in HOL

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

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 |>'
```

- 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 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 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

- a relation $R : 'a \rightarrow 'a \rightarrow \text{bool}$ is called **well-founded**, iff there are no infinite descending chains

$\text{wellfounded } R = \sim ?f. !n. R (f (\text{SUC } n)) (f n)$

- Example: $\$< : \text{num} \rightarrow \text{num} \rightarrow \text{bool}$ 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

- 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

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** 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
```

- **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)))  
  
|- !R M. WF R ==> !x. WFREC R M x = M (RESTRICT (WFREC R M) R x) x  
|- !f R x. RESTRICT f R x = (\y. if R y x then f y else ARB)
```

- `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** 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
- we need to understand what is meant by termination

- 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

3 characterisations of a function $f : \text{num} \rightarrow \text{num}$

- ▶ $\vdash !n. f\ n = 0$
- ▶ $\vdash (f\ 0 = 0) \wedge !n. (f\ (\text{SUC}\ n) = f\ n)$
- ▶ $\vdash (f\ 0 = 0) \wedge !n. (f\ n = f\ (\text{SUC}\ n))$

Is f terminating? All 3 theorems are equivalent.

- 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

- 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 $f : \text{num} \rightarrow \text{num}$ with the following property cannot be defined in HOL unless HOL has an inconsistency:

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

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

- 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)`
- all measures are well-founded: `|- !f. WF (measure f)`
- moreover, existing well-founded relations can be combined
 - ▶ lexicographic order **LEX**
 - ▶ list lexicographic order **LLEX**
 - ▶ ...

- 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` are intended 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))
```

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



- 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

- HOL guarantees that theorems do indeed hold
- However, does the theorem mean what you think it does?
- you can separate your development in
 - ▶ main theorems you care for
 - ▶ auxiliary stuff used to derive your main theorems
- it is essential to understand your main theorems

Guarded by HOL

- proofs checked
- internal, technical definitions
- technical lemmata
- proof tools

Manual review needed for

- meaning of main theorems
- meaning of definitions used by main theorems
- meaning of types used by 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
- checking resulting model against real artifact is vital
 - ▶ testing via e. g. **EVAL**
 - ▶ formal sanity
 - ▶ conformance testing
- wrong models are main source of error when using HOL
- proofs, auxiliary lemmata and auxiliary definitions
 - ▶ can be as technical and complicated as you like
 - ▶ correctness is guaranteed by HOL
 - ▶ reviewers don't need to care

- good definitions can shorten proofs significantly
- they improve maintainability
- 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

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 encodings



- 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 and HOL, 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) ';
```

- 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 )';
```

- often people use tuples where records would be more appropriate
- using large tuples quickly becomes awkward
 - ▶ it is easy to mix up order of tuple entries
 - ★ often types coincide, so type-checker does not help
 - ▶ no good error messages for tuples
 - ★ hard to decipher type mismatch messages for long product types
 - ★ hard to figure out which entry is missing at which position
 - ★ non-local error messages
 - ★ variable in last entry can hide missing entries
- records sometimes require slightly more proof effort
- however, records have many benefits

- using records
 - ▶ introduces field names
 - ▶ provides automatically defined accessor and update functions
 - ▶ leads to better type-checking error messages
- records improve readability
 - ▶ accessors and update functions lead to shorter code
 - ▶ field names act as documentation
- records improve maintainability
 - ▶ improved error messages
 - ▶ much easier to add extra fields

- 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  
}
```

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  
| Disconnected of disconnected  
| Connecting of connecting;  
  
type connection_info = {  
  state : connection_state,  
  server : inet_address  
}
```

Objectives

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

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

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
 - ▶ prefer 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 _ = [])'
```


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):
```

Formal Sanity

- to ensure correctness test your definitions via e. g. **EVAL**
- in HOL testing means symbolic evaluation, i. e. proving lemmata
- **formally proving sanity check lemmata** is very beneficial
 - ▶ they should express core properties of your definition
 - ▶ thereby they check your intuition against your actual definitions
 - ▶ these lemmata are often useful for following proofs
 - ▶ using them improves robustness and maintainability of your development
- I highly recommend using formal sanity checks

```
> val ALL_DISTINCT = Define '  
  (ALL_DISTINCT [] = T) /\  
  (ALL_DISTINCT (h::t) = ~MEM h t /\ ALL_DISTINCT t)';
```

Example Sanity Check Lemmata

```
|- ALL_DISTINCT []  
|- !x xs. ALL_DISTINCT (x::xs) <=> ~MEM x xs /\ ALL_DISTINCT xs  
|- !x. ALL_DISTINCT [x]  
|- !x xs. ~(ALL_DISTINCT (x::x::xs))  
|- !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
```

Formal Sanity Example II 1



```
> val ZIP_def = Define '  
  (ZIP [] ys = []) /\ (ZIP xs [] = []) /\  
  (ZIP (x::xs) (y::ys) = (x, y)::(ZIP xs ys))'
```

```
val ZIP_def =  
  |- (!ys. ZIP [] ys = []) /\ (!v3 v2. ZIP (v2::v3) [] = []) /\  
    (!ys y xs x. ZIP (x::xs) (y::ys) = (x,y)::ZIP xs ys)
```

- above definition of **ZIP** looks straightforward
- small changes cause heuristics to produce different theorems
- use formal sanity lemmata to compensate

```
> val ZIP_def = Define '  
  (ZIP xs [] = []) /\ (ZIP [] ys = []) /\  
  (ZIP (x::xs) (y::ys) = (x, y)::(ZIP xs ys))'
```

```
val ZIP_def =  
  |- (!xs. ZIP xs [] = []) /\ (!v3 v2. ZIP [] (v2::v3) = []) /\  
    (!ys y xs x. ZIP (x::xs) (y::ys) = (x,y)::ZIP xs ys0)
```

```
val ZIP_def =  
  |- (!ys. ZIP [] ys = []) /\ (!v3 v2. ZIP (v2::v3) [] = []) /\  
    (!ys y xs x. ZIP (x::xs) (y::ys) = (x,y)::ZIP xs ys)
```

Example Formal Sanity Lemmata

```
|- (!xs. ZIP xs [] = []) /\ (!ys. ZIP [] ys = []) /\  
  (!y ys x xs. ZIP (x::xs) (y::ys) = (x,y)::ZIP xs ys)  
|- !xs ys. LENGTH (ZIP xs ys) = MIN (LENGTH xs) (LENGTH ys)  
|- !x y xs ys. MEM (x, y) (ZIP xs ys) ==> (MEM x xs /\ MEM y ys)  
|- !xs1 xs2 ys1 ys2. LENGTH xs1 = LENGTH ys1 ==>  
  (ZIP (xs1++xs2) (ys1++ys2) = (ZIP xs1 ys1 ++ ZIP xs2 ys2))  
...
```

- in your proofs use sanity lemmata, not original definition
- this makes your development robust against
 - ▶ small changes to the definition required later
 - ▶ changes to [Define](#) and its heuristics
 - ▶ bugs in function definition package

Part XII

Deep and Shallow Embeddings



- often one models some kind of formal language
- important design decision: use **deep** or **shallow** embedding
- in a nutshell:
 - ▶ shallow embeddings just model semantics
 - ▶ deep embeddings model syntax as well
- a shallow embedding directly uses the HOL logic
- a deep embedding
 - ▶ defines a datatype for the syntax of the language
 - ▶ provides a function to map this syntax to a semantic

Example: Embedding of Propositional Logic I



- propositional logic is a subset of HOL
- a shallow embedding is therefore trivial

```
val sh_true_def      = Define 'sh_true = T';
val sh_var_def       = Define 'sh_var (v:bool) = v';
val sh_not_def       = Define 'sh_not b = ~b';
val sh_and_def       = Define 'sh_and b1 b2 = (b1 /\ b2)';
val sh_or_def        = Define 'sh_or b1 b2 = (b1 \/ b2)';
val sh_implies_def   = Define 'sh_implies b1 b2 = (b1 ==> b2)';
```


Example: Embedding of Propositional Logic II



- we can also define a datatype for propositional logic
- this leads to a deep embedding

```
val _ = Datatype 'bvar = BVar num'  
val _ = Datatype 'prop = d_true | d_var bvar | d_not prop  
                | d_and prop prop | d_or prop prop  
                | d_implies prop prop';
```

```
val _ = Datatype 'var_assignment = BAssign (bvar -> bool)'  
val VAR_VALUE_def = Define 'VAR_VALUE (BAssign a) v = (a v)'
```

```
val PROP_SEM_def = Define '  
  (PROP_SEM a d_true = T) /\  
  (PROP_SEM a (d_var v) = VAR_VALUE a v) /\  
  (PROP_SEM a (d_not p) = ~(PROP_SEM a p)) /\  
  (PROP_SEM a (d_and p1 p2) = (PROP_SEM a p1 /\ PROP_SEM a p2)) /\  
  (PROP_SEM a (d_or p1 p2) = (PROP_SEM a p1 \/ PROP_SEM a p2)) /\  
  (PROP_SEM a (d_implies p1 p2) = (PROP_SEM a p1 ==> PROP_SEM a p2))'
```

Shallow vs. Deep Embeddings

Shallow

- quick and easy to build
- extensions are simple

Deep

- can reason about syntax
- allows verified implementations
- sometimes tricky to define
 - ▶ e. g. bound variables

Important Questions for Deciding

- Do I need to reason about syntax?
- Do I have hard to define syntax like bound variables?
- How much time do I have?

Example: Embedding of Propositional Logic III



- with deep embedding one can easily formalise syntactic properties like
 - ▶ Which variables does a propositional formula contain?
 - ▶ Is a formula in negation-normal-form (NNF)?
- with shallow embeddings
 - ▶ syntactic concepts can't be defined in HOL
 - ▶ however, they can be defined in SML
 - ▶ no proofs about them possible

```
val _ = Define '  
  (IS_NNF (d_not d_true) = T) /\ (IS_NNF (d_not (d_var v)) = T) /\  
  (IS_NNF (d_not _) = F) /\  
  
  (IS_NNF d_true = T) /\ (IS_NNF (d_var v) = T) /\  
  (IS_NNF (d_and p1 p2) = (IS_NNF p1 /\ IS_NNF p2)) /\  
  (IS_NNF (d_or p1 p2) = (IS_NNF p1 /\ IS_NNF p2)) /\  
  (IS_NNF (d_implies p1 p2) = (IS_NNF p1 /\ IS_NNF p2))'
```

Verified Programs

- are formalised in HOL
- their properties have been proven once and for all
- all runs have proven properties
- are usually less sophisticated, since they need verification
- is what one wants ideally
- often require deep embedding

Verifying Programs

- are written in meta-language
- they produce a separate proof for each run
- only certain that current run has properties
- allow more flexibility, e. g. fancy heuristics
- good pragmatic solution
- shallow embedding fine