Program Verification: Lecture 16

José Meseguer

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign



In inductive theorem proving it often happens that our first attempt to prove a property is unsuccessful.

In inductive theorem proving it often happens that our first attempt to prove a property is unsuccessful. However, we can learn from a failed attemp to guess a lemma that will solve the unproved goal.

In inductive theorem proving it often happens that our first attempt to prove a property is unsuccessful. However, we can learn from a failed attemp to guess a lemma that will solve the unproved goal.

In the NuITP the process of guessing and applying a lemma to a goal is supported by the lemma enrichment (le) inference rule.

In inductive theorem proving it often happens that our first attempt to prove a property is unsuccessful. However, we can learn from a failed attemp to guess a lemma that will solve the unproved goal.

In the NuITP the process of guessing and applying a lemma to a goal is supported by the lemma enrichment (le) inference rule.

Of course, although the lemma thus guessed will typically prove the unproved goal, we still need to prove that the lemma we have guessed is in fact true.

・ロット (雪) ・ (日) ・ (日) ・ (日)

In inductive theorem proving it often happens that our first attempt to prove a property is unsuccessful. However, we can learn from a failed attemp to guess a lemma that will solve the unproved goal.

In the NuITP the process of guessing and applying a lemma to a goal is supported by the lemma enrichment (le) inference rule.

Of course, although the lemma thus guessed will typically prove the unproved goal, we still need to prove that the lemma we have guessed is in fact true.

Let us see an example, namely, proving commutativity of addition in the PEANO+R module.

Proving Commutativity of Addition

Our first attempt to prove addition commutative in PEANO+R yields two unproved goals:

```
NuITP> set goal X:Nat + Y:Nat = Y:Nat + X:Nat .
```

```
Initial goal set.
```

```
Goal Id: 0
Generated By: init
Skolem Ops:
    None
Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Goal:
    ($1:Nat + $2:Nat) =($2:Nat + $1:Nat)
```

```
NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on $1:Nat .
```

Proving Commutativity of Addition

Our first attempt to prove addition commutative in PEANO+R yields two unproved goals:

```
NuITP> set goal X:Nat + Y:Nat = Y:Nat + X:Nat .
```

```
Initial goal set.
```

```
Goal Id: 0
Generated By: init
Skolem Ops:
    None
Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Goal:
    ($1:Nat + $2:Nat) =($2:Nat + $1:Nat)
```

```
NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on $1:Nat .
```

Proving Commutativity of Addition (II)

(日)

```
Goal Id: 0.1.1
Generated By: EPS
Skolem Ops:
  None
Executable Hypotheses:
  None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
  None
Goal:
  $2:Nat =(0 + $2:Nat)
Goal Id: 0.2.1
Generated By: EPS
Skolem Ops:
  $3.Nat
Executable Hypotheses:
  None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
  (\$3 + \$2:Nat) = (\$2:Nat + \$3)
Goal:
  s(\$2:Nat + \$3) = (s(\$3) + \$2:Nat)
```

Proving Commutativity of Addition (II)

(日)

```
Goal Id: 0.1.1
Generated By: EPS
Skolem Ops:
  None
Executable Hypotheses:
  None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
  None
Goal:
  $2:Nat =(0 + $2:Nat)
Goal Id: 0.2.1
Generated By: EPS
Skolem Ops:
  $3.Nat
Executable Hypotheses:
  None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
  (\$3 + \$2:Nat) = (\$2:Nat + \$3)
Goal:
  s(\$2:Nat + \$3) = (s(\$3) + \$2:Nat)
```

Proving Commutativity of Addition (III)

However, we can guess from the unproved base case (goal 0.0.1): 2:Nat = (0 + 2:Nat) the lemma 0 + X = X. In the NuITP we can then apply this lemma to goal 0.0.1 as follows:

NuITP> apply le! to 0.1.1 with 0 + X:Nat = X:Nat .

```
Lemma Enrichment with Equality Predicate Simplification (LE!) applied to goal 0.1.1.
```

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goal 0.1.1.2.1 has been proved.

Goal Id: 0.1.1.1
Generated By: LE
Skolem Ops:
 None
Executable Hypotheses:
 None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
 None
Goal:
 \$3:Nat =(0 + \$3:Nat)

Proving Commutativity of Addition (III)

However, we can guess from the unproved base case (goal 0.0.1): 2:Nat = (0 + 2:Nat) the lemma 0 + X = X. In the NuITP we can then apply this lemma to goal 0.0.1 as follows:

NuITP> apply le! to 0.1.1 with 0 + X:Nat = X:Nat .

```
Lemma Enrichment with Equality Predicate Simplification (LE!) applied to goal 0.1.1.
```

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goal 0.1.1.2.1 has been proved.

Goal Id: 0.1.1.1
Generated By: LE
Skolem Ops:
 None
Executable Hypotheses:
 None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
 None
Goal:
 \$3:Nat =(0 + \$3:Nat)

Proving Commutativity of Addition (IV)

The base case has thus been proved, but we still need to prove the guessed lemma (goal 0.1.1.1). We do so as follows:

Proving Commutativity of Addition (IV)

The base case has thus been proved, but we still need to prove the guessed lemma (goal 0.1.1.1). We do so as follows:

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0.1.1.1 on \$3:Nat .

```
Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!)
  applied to goal 0.1.1.1.
Goals 0.1.1.1.1.1 and 0.1.1.1.2.1 have been proved.
Unproven goals:
Goal Id: 0.2.1
Generated By: EPS
Skolem Ops:
  $3.Nat
Executable Hypotheses:
 None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
  (\$3 + \$2:Nat) = (\$2:Nat + \$3)
Goal:
  s(\$2:Nat + \$3) = (s(\$3) + \$2:Nat)
                                              (日)
```

Proving Commutativity of Addition (V)

We still need to deal with the unproved induction step goal (0.2.1): s(2:Nat + 3) = (s(3) + 2:Nat) for which we can guess the lemma s(N) + M = s(M + N) and apply it to 0.2.1:

Proving Commutativity of Addition (V)

We still need to deal with the unproved induction step goal (0.2.1): s(\$2:Nat + \$3) = (s(\$3) + \$2:Nat) for which we can guess the lemma s(N) + M = s(M + N) and apply it to 0.2.1: NuITP> apply le! to 0.2.1 with s(N:Nat) + M:Nat = s(M:Nat + N:Nat).

```
Lemma Enrichment with Equality Predicate Simplification (LE!) applied to goal 0.2.1.
```

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goal 0.2.1.2.1 has been proved.

```
Goal Id: 0.2.1.1
Generated By: LE
Skolem Ops:
    $3.Nat
Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
    ($3 + $2:Nat) = ($2:Nat + $3)
Goal:
    s($4:Nat + $5:Nat) = (s($5:Nat) + $4:Nat)
```

Proving Commutativity of Addition (V)

We still need to deal with the unproved induction step goal (0.2.1): s(\$2:Nat + \$3) = (s(\$3) + \$2:Nat) for which we can guess the lemma s(N) + M = s(M + N) and apply it to 0.2.1: NuITP> apply le! to 0.2.1 with s(N:Nat) + M:Nat = s(M:Nat + N:Nat).

```
Lemma Enrichment with Equality Predicate Simplification (LE!) applied to goal 0.2.1.
```

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goal 0.2.1.2.1 has been proved.

```
Goal Id: 0.2.1.1
Generated By: LE
Skolem Ops:
    $3.Nat
Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
    ($3 + $2:Nat) = ($2:Nat + $3)
Goal:
    s($4:Nat + $5:Nat) = (s($5:Nat) + $4:Nat)
```

Proving Commutativity of Addition (VI)

Lastly, we need to prove the guessed lemma (0.2.1.1):

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0.2.1.1 on \$4:Nat .

```
Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!)
applied to goal 0.2.1.1.
Goal Id: 0.2.1.1.1.1
Generated By: EPS
Skolem Ops:
    $3.Nat
Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
    ($3 + $2:Nat) = ($2:Nat + $3)
Goal:
    $5:Nat = (0 + $5:Nat)
```

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Proving Commutativity of Addition (VI)

Lastly, we need to prove the guessed lemma (0.2.1.1):

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0.2.1.1 on \$4:Nat .

```
Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!)
applied to goal 0.2.1.1.
Goal Id: 0.2.1.1.1.1
Generated By: EPS
Skolem Ops:
    $3.Nat
Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
    ($3 + $2:Nat) = ($2:Nat + $3)
Goal:
    $5:Nat = (0 + $5:Nat)
```

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Proving Commutativity of Addition (VII)

・ロト ・ 四ト ・ 日ト ・ 日下

```
Goal Id: 0.2.1.1.2.1
Generated By: EPS
Skolem Ops:
    $3.Nat
    $6.Nat
Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
    ($3 + $2:Nat) = ($2:Nat + $3)
    s($6 + $5:Nat) = (s($5:Nat) + $6)
Goal:
    s($6 + $5:Nat) = (s($6) + $5:Nat)
```

Proving Commutativity of Addition (VII)

```
Goal Id: 0.2.1.1.2.1
Generated By: EPS
Skolem Ops:
    $3.Nat
    $6.Nat
Executable Hypotheses:
    None
Non-Executable Hypotheses:
    ($3 + $2:Nat) = ($2:Nat + $3)
    s($6 + $5:Nat) = (s($5:Nat) + $6)
Goal:
    s($6 + $5:Nat) = (s($6) + $5:Nat)
```

The base case for the guessed Lemma 0.1.1.1 is 5:Nat = (0 + 5:Nat), which we can prove with our previous lemma 0 + X = X, so I leave this part for the reader. For the induction step (goal 0.2.1.1.2.1) we just apply gsi to finish the proof:

(日)

Proving Commutativity of Addition (VIII)

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0.2.1.1.2.1 on \$5:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied to goal 0.2.1.1.2.1.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goals 0.2.1.1.2.1.1.1 and 0.2.1.1.2.1.2.1 have been proved.

qed

Proving Commutativity of Addition (VIII)

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0.2.1.1.2.1 on \$5:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied to goal 0.2.1.1.2.1.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goals 0.2.1.1.2.1.1.1 and 0.2.1.1.2.1.2.1 have been proved.

qed

The general heuristic to deal with unproven goals could be summarized with the motto: generalize and conquer!

Proving Commutativity of Addition (VIII)

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0.2.1.1.2.1 on \$5:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied to goal 0.2.1.1.2.1.

Goals 0.2.1.1.2.1.1.1 and 0.2.1.1.2.1.2.1 have been proved.

qed

The general heuristic to deal with unproven goals could be summarized with the motto: generalize and conquer! That, is we guess the needed lemma by generalizing the unproved goal.

Proving lemmas is tedious.

Proving lemmas is tedious. Can we do better and achieve shorter and perhaps lemmaless proofs?

Proving lemmas is tedious. Can we do better and achieve shorter and perhaps lemmaless proofs? The answer is **Yes!!** The better proof method has the motto: internalize and conquer!

Proving lemmas is tedious. Can we do better and achieve shorter and perhaps lemmaless proofs? The answer is **Yes!!** The better proof method has the motto: internalize and conquer! It is supported by the NuITP based on the Lemma Internalization Theorems 2 and 3 of Lecture 14.

(日)

Proving lemmas is tedious. Can we do better and achieve shorter and perhaps lemmaless proofs? The answer is **Yes!!** The better proof method has the motto: internalize and conquer! It is supported by the NuITP based on the Lemma Internalization Theorems 2 and 3 of Lecture 14.

(日)

This method is based on two simple ideas:

Proving lemmas is tedious. Can we do better and achieve shorter and perhaps lemmaless proofs? The answer is **Yes!!** The better proof method has the motto: internalize and conquer! It is supported by the NuITP based on the Lemma Internalization Theorems 2 and 3 of Lecture 14.

(日)

This method is based on two simple ideas:

1 Low Hanging Fruit:

Proving lemmas is tedious. Can we do better and achieve shorter and perhaps lemmaless proofs? The answer is **Yes!!** The better proof method has the motto: internalize and conquer! It is supported by the NuITP based on the Lemma Internalization Theorems 2 and 3 of Lecture 14.

This method is based on two simple ideas:

• Low Hanging Fruit: If you have to prove several properties, arrange them in order of difficulty and dependence.

(日)

Proving lemmas is tedious. Can we do better and achieve shorter and perhaps lemmaless proofs? The answer is **Yes!!** The better proof method has the motto: internalize and conquer! It is supported by the NuITP based on the Lemma Internalization Theorems 2 and 3 of Lecture 14.

This method is based on two simple ideas:

• Low Hanging Fruit: If you have to prove several properties, arrange them in order of difficulty and dependence. E.g., prove associativity of addition before commutativity, and both before associativity and commutativity of multiplication.

Proving lemmas is tedious. Can we do better and achieve shorter and perhaps lemmaless proofs? The answer is **Yes!!** The better proof method has the motto: internalize and conquer! It is supported by the NuITP based on the Lemma Internalization Theorems 2 and 3 of Lecture 14.

This method is based on two simple ideas:

• Low Hanging Fruit: If you have to prove several properties, arrange them in order of difficulty and dependence. E.g., prove associativity of addition before commutativity, and both before associativity and commutativity of multiplication.

・ロト ・ 四ト ・ 日ト ・ 日下

2 Internalize Everything!

Proving lemmas is tedious. Can we do better and achieve shorter and perhaps lemmaless proofs? The answer is **Yes!!** The better proof method has the motto: internalize and conquer! It is supported by the NuITP based on the Lemma Internalization Theorems 2 and 3 of Lecture 14.

This method is based on two simple ideas:

- Low Hanging Fruit: If you have to prove several properties, arrange them in order of difficulty and dependence. E.g., prove associativity of addition before commutativity, and both before associativity and commutativity of multiplication.
- Internalize Everything! Use every single property you have already proved to prove harder properties by internalizing it.

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト ニヨー

Let us see this method in action in an arithmetic case study:

An Example: Natural Number Arithmetic

```
fmod NATURAL-ARITH is
 sorts Nat NzNat .
 subsort NzNat < Nat .
 op 0 : -> Nat [ctor metadata "1"] .
 op s : Nat -> NzNat [ctor metadata "2"] .
 op _+_ : Nat Nat -> Nat [metadata "3"] .
 op * : Nat Nat -> Nat [metadata "4"] .
 op _*_ : NzNat NzNat -> NzNat [metadata "5"] .
 op _^_ : NzNat Nat -> NzNat [metadata "6"] . *** exponentiation
 vars n m k : Nat . vars n' k' m' : NzNat .
 eq n + 0 = n.
 eq n + s(m) = s(n + m).
 eq n * 0 = 0.
 eq n * s(m) = n + (n * m).
 eq n' = s(0).
 eq n' s(m) = n' * (n' m).
endfm
```

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

An Example: Natural Number Arithmetic

```
fmod NATURAL-ARITH is
 sorts Nat NzNat .
 subsort NzNat < Nat .
 op 0 : -> Nat [ctor metadata "1"] .
 op s : Nat -> NzNat [ctor metadata "2"] .
 op _+_ : Nat Nat -> Nat [metadata "3"] .
 op * : Nat Nat -> Nat [metadata "4"] .
 op _*_ : NzNat NzNat -> NzNat [metadata "5"] .
 op _^_ : NzNat Nat -> NzNat [metadata "6"] . *** exponentiation
 vars n m k : Nat . vars n' k' m' : NzNat .
 eq n + 0 = n.
 eq n + s(m) = s(n + m).
 eq n * 0 = 0.
 eq n * s(m) = n + (n * m).
 eq n' = s(0).
 eq n' \hat{s}(m) = n' * (n' \hat{m}).
endfm
```

This module's canonical term algebra $\mathbb{C}_{\Sigma/E,B}$ is just \mathbb{N} with the $s_{\mathbb{N}}$, $+_{\mathbb{N}}$, $*_{\mathbb{N}}$, and $(_{-})_{\mathbb{N}}^{(_{-})}$ functions.

An Example: Natural Number Arithmetic

```
fmod NATURAL-ARITH is
 sorts Nat NzNat .
 subsort NzNat < Nat .
 op 0 : -> Nat [ctor metadata "1"] .
 op s : Nat -> NzNat [ctor metadata "2"] .
 op _+_ : Nat Nat -> Nat [metadata "3"] .
 op * : Nat Nat -> Nat [metadata "4"] .
 op _*_ : NzNat NzNat -> NzNat [metadata "5"] .
 op _^_ : NzNat Nat -> NzNat [metadata "6"] . *** exponentiation
 vars n m k : Nat . vars n' k' m' : NzNat .
 eq n + 0 = n.
 eq n + s(m) = s(n + m).
 eq n * 0 = 0.
 eq n * s(m) = n + (n * m).
 eq n' = s(0).
 eq n' \hat{s}(m) = n' * (n' \hat{m}).
endfm
```

This module's canonical term algebra $\mathbb{C}_{\Sigma/E,B}$ is just \mathbb{N} with the $s_{\mathbb{N}}$, $+_{\mathbb{N}}$, $*_{\mathbb{N}}$, and $(_{-})_{\mathbb{N}}^{(-)}$ functions. Consider some properties of NATURAL-ARITH:

NATURAL-ARITH should enjoy the following arithmetic properties:

NATURAL-ARITH should enjoy the following arithmetic properties:

NATURAL-ARITH should enjoy the following arithmetic properties:

- $\textcircled{0} +_{\mathbb{N}} \text{ should be associative and commutative}$
- **2** $*_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be left and right distributive over $+_{\mathbb{N}}$

NATURAL-ARITH should enjoy the following arithmetic properties:

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日

- ${\color{black} 0} \hspace{0.1 cm} +_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be associative and commutative
- **2** $*_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be left and right distributive over $+_{\mathbb{N}}$
- **③** $*_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be associative and commutative

NATURAL-ARITH should enjoy the following arithmetic properties:

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト ニヨー

- ${\color{black} 0} \hspace{0.1 cm} +_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be associative and commutative
- ${\color{black} @ {\color{black} *_{\mathbb N}}}$ should be left and right distributive over $+_{\mathbb N}$
- $\textcircled{O}_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be associative and commutative
- (_)^(_)_N should enjoy the property: $x^{y+z} = x^y * x^z$

NATURAL-ARITH should enjoy the following arithmetic properties:

- ${\color{black} 0} \hspace{0.1 cm} +_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be associative and commutative
- **2** $*_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be left and right distributive over $+_{\mathbb{N}}$
- $\textcircled{O}_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be associative and commutative
- () () should enjoy the property: $x^{y+z} = x^y * x^z$

Reflecting on the (tedious) proof of commutativity for $+_{\mathbb{N}}$, which required the lemmas 0 + M = M and s(N) + M = s(M + N), we can see that proving commutativity of $+_{\mathbb{N}}$ would have been trivial if we had first proved and internalized that programs PEANO+R and PEANO+L (whose equations are the above lemmas) are semantically equivalent.

NATURAL-ARITH should enjoy the following arithmetic properties:

- ${\color{black} 0} \hspace{0.1 cm} +_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be associative and commutative
- **2** $*_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be left and right distributive over $+_{\mathbb{N}}$
- $\textcircled{O}_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be associative and commutative
- (_)_N^(_) should enjoy the property: $x^{y+z} = x^y * x^z$

Reflecting on the (tedious) proof of commutativity for $+_{\mathbb{N}}$, which required the lemmas 0 + M = M and s(N) + M = s(M + N), we can see that proving commutativity of $+_{\mathbb{N}}$ would have been trivial if we had first proved and internalized that programs PEANO+R and PEANO+L (whose equations are the above lemmas) are semantically equivalent. The analogous observation holds for proving commutativity of $*_{\mathbb{N}}$. Let's prove all these arithmetic properties!

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ □ - つへつ

NuITP (alpha 22) Inductive Theorem Prover for Maude Equational Theories

Copyright 2021-2023 Universitat Politècnica de València

NuITP> set module NATURAL-ARITH .

Module NATURAL-ARITH is now active.

NuITP (alpha 22) Inductive Theorem Prover for Maude Equational Theories

Copyright 2021-2023 Universitat Politècnica de València

NuITP> set module NATURAL-ARITH .

Module NATURAL-ARITH is now active.

By the Program Equivalence Theorem in Lecture 14, We can next prove the semantic equivalence between the left- and right-recursive definitions of addition if we prove the following goal by generator set induction using standard induction (SIND):

(日)

```
NuITP> set goal ((0 + Y:Nat = Y:Nat) /\ (s(X:Nat) + Y:Nat) = s(X:Nat +
Y:Nat)) .
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
  ($2:Nat =(0 + $2:Nat)) /\ s($1:Nat + $2:Nat) =(s($1:Nat) + $2:Nat)
```

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on \$2:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied to goal 0.

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ のQの

Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

qed

```
NuITP> set goal ((0 + Y:Nat = Y:Nat) /\ (s(X:Nat) + Y:Nat) = s(X:Nat +
Y:Nat)) .
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
  ($2:Nat =(0 + $2:Nat)) /\ s($1:Nat + $2:Nat) =(s($1:Nat) + $2:Nat)
NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on $2:Nat .
```

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied to goal 0.

Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

qed

The NuITP allows us to apply the Lemma Internalization Theorem 2 in Lecture 14 to internalize the just-proved semantically equivalent left-recursive equations for + we just proved by adding them to the current module as follows:

NuITP> internalize .

NuITP> internalize .

Now that we have internalized the above semantic equivalence, we prove the associativity of +, which succeeds with one blow:

```
NuITP> set goal X:Nat + (Y:Nat + Z:Nat) = (X:Nat + Y:Nat) + Z:Nat .
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
   ($1:Nat +($2:Nat + $3:Nat)) =(($1:Nat + $2:Nat) + $3:Nat)
```

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on \$3:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

qed

17/23

Proving Properties of NATURAL-ARITH (IV)

The NuITP allows us to apply the Lemma Internalization Theorem 3 of Lecture 14 to internalize associativity as an axiom, From now on, all simplification with + expressions can be done modulo associativity:

(日)



The NuITP allows us to apply the Lemma Internalization Theorem 3 of Lecture 14 to internalize associativity as an axiom, From now on, all simplification with + expressions can be done modulo associativity:

(日)

NuITP> internalize as assoc .

The NuITP allows us to apply the Lemma Internalization Theorem 3 of Lecture 14 to internalize associativity as an axiom, From now on, all simplification with + expressions can be done modulo associativity:

NuITP> internalize as assoc .

Next we prove commutativity for +, which succeeds with one blow:

The NuITP allows us to apply the Lemma Internalization Theorem 3 of Lecture 14 to internalize associativity as an axiom, From now on, all simplification with + expressions can be done modulo associativity:

NuITP> internalize as assoc .

Next we prove commutativity for +, which succeeds with one blow:

```
NuITP> set goal (X:Nat + Y:Nat = Y:Nat + X:Nat) .
```

```
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
($1:Nat + $2:Nat) = $2:Nat + $1:Nat
```

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on \$1:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied

< □ > < 同 > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ > < Ξ < </p>

Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

17/23

and

NuITP> internalize as comm .

NuITP> internalize as comm .

From now on, all simplification with + expressions can be done modulo associativity and commutativity.

NuITP> internalize as comm .

From now on, all simplification with + expressions can be done modulo associativity and commutativity. Next we prove right distributivity of * over +, which succeeds with one blow:

(日)

```
NuITP> internalize as comm .
```

```
From now on, all simplification with + expressions can be done
modulo associativity and commutativity. Next we prove right
distributivity of * over +, which succeeds with one blow:
NuITP> set goal X:Nat * (Y:Nat + Z:Nat) = (X:Nat * Y:Nat) + (X:Nat * Z:Nat) .
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
   ($1:Nat * $3:Nat + $2:Nat) = ($1:Nat * $3:Nat) + ($1:Nat * $2:Nat)
```

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on \$2:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

qed

NuITP> internalize .

To overcome *'s recursion on its second argument we proceed as for +, which succeeds with one blow:

To overcome *'s recursion on its second argument we proceed as for +, which succeeds with one blow:

```
NuITP> set goal ((0 * Y:Nat = 0) /\ (s(X:Nat) * Y:Nat) = (Y:Nat + (X:Nat * Y:Na
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
   (0 =(0 * $2:Nat)) /\(s($1:Nat) * $2:Nat) = $2:Nat +($1:Nat * $2:Nat)
```

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on \$2:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

qed

NuITP> internalize .

Next we prove left distributivity of * over +, which succeeds with one blow:

Next we prove left distributivity of * over +, which succeeds with one blow:

```
NuITP> set goal (Y:Nat + Z:Nat) * X:Nat = (Y:Nat * X:Nat) + (Z:Nat * X:Nat) .
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
        (($3:Nat + $2:Nat) * $1:Nat) =($3:Nat * $1:Nat) +($2:Nat * $1:Nat)
```

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on \$2:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

qed

NuITP> internalize .

Next we prove associativity of *, which succeeds with one blow:

Next we prove associativity of *, which succeeds with one blow:

```
NuITP> set goal X:Nat * (Y:Nat * Z:Nat) = (X:Nat * Y:Nat) * Z:Nat .
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
   ($1:Nat *($2:Nat * $3:Nat)) =(($1:Nat * $2:Nat) * $3:Nat)
```

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on \$3:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

qed

NuITP> internalize as assoc .

Next we prove commutativity of *, which succeeds with one blow:

Next we prove commutativity of *, which succeeds with one blow:

```
NuITP> set goal (X:Nat * Y:Nat = Y:Nat * X:Nat) .
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
   ($1:Nat * $2:Nat) = $2:Nat * $1:Nat
```

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on \$2:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

qed

NuITP> internalize as comm .

We finish proving all arithmetic properties (1)–(4) from slide 4 by proving the equality $x^{y+z} = x^y * x^z$ of exponentiation, which succeeds with one blow:

We finish proving all arithmetic properties (1)–(4) from slide 4 by proving the equality $x^{y+z} = x^y * x^z$ of exponentiation, which succeeds with one blow:

```
NuITP> set goal (X:NzNat ^ (Y:Nat + Z:Nat) = (X:NzNat ^ Y:Nat) * (X:NzNat ^ Z:N
...
Goal Id: 0
...
Goal:
        (($1:NzNat ^ $3:Nat) *($1:NzNat ^ $2:Nat)) =($1:NzNat ^ $3:Nat + $2:Nat)
```

NuITP> apply gsi! to 0 on \$2:Nat .

Generator Set Induction with Equality Predicate Simplification (GSI!) applied Goals 0.1.1 and 0.2.1 have been proved.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQで

qed