

Topics in Automated Deduction (CS 576)

Elsa L. Gunter

2112 Siebel Center

egunter@illinois.edu

<http://www.cs.illinois.edu/class/sp10/cs576/>

Adding Assumptions to Goals:

`subgoal_tac`

- Can always add assumption *asm* to current subgoal with
`apply (subgoal_tac "asm")`
- Statement can use Isabelle parameters
- Adds new subgoal *asm* with same assumptions as current subgoal

Adding Assumptions to Goals:

`subgoal_tac`

1. $\llbracket A_1; \dots; A_n \rrbracket \implies A$
`apply (subgoal_tac "asm")`

yields

1. $\llbracket A_1; \dots; A_n; \text{asm} \rrbracket \implies A$
2. $\llbracket A_1; \dots; A_n \rrbracket \implies \text{asm}$

Removing Assumptions: `thin_tac`

- Can remove unwanted assumption *asm* from current subgoal with

```
apply (thin_tac "asm")
```

1. $\llbracket A_1; \dots; A_{i-1}; A_i; A_{i+1}; \dots; A_n \rrbracket \implies A$
`apply (thin_tac "Ai")`

yields

1. $\llbracket A_1; \dots; A_{i-1}; A_{i+1}; \dots; A_n \rrbracket \implies A$

“Clarifying” the Goal

- `apply (intro ...)`

Repeatedly apply intro rules

Example: `apply (intro allI)`

- `apply (elim ...)`

Repeatedly apply elim rules

Example: `apply (elim conjE)`

- `apply (clarify)`

Repeatedly apply safe rules without splitting goal

- `apply (clarisimp simp add: ...)`

Combination of `clarify` and `simp`

Other Automated Proof Methods

- `blast` Isabelle's most powerful classical reasoner.
Useful for goals stated using only predicate logic and set theory
Can be extended with rules (with `[iff]` attribute) to handler broader classes of goals
- `auto`
Applies to all subgoals. Combines classical reasoning with simplification Does what it can; leaves

unfinished subgoals Splits subgoals

Other Automated Proof Methods

- `blast`

- `force`

Similar to `auto`, but only applies to one goal, and either finishes or fails.

- `safe`

Like `clarify` but also splits goals

Sets

Type 'a set: sets over type 'a

- $\{ \}$, $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, $\{x. Px\}$
- $e \in A$, $A \subseteq B$ (ascii: $e : A$, $A \leq B$)
- $A \cup B$, $A \cap B$, $A - B$, $\neg A$
- $\bigcup_{x \in A} B x$, $\bigcap_{x \in A} B x$
- $\{i. .j\}$
- $\text{insert} :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \text{ set} \Rightarrow 'a \text{ set}$
- $f ' A \equiv \{y. \exists x \in A. y = f x\}$
-

Proofs about Sets

Natural deduction proof rules:

- **equalityI**: $\llbracket A \subseteq B; B \subseteq A \rrbracket \Longrightarrow A = B$
- **equalityE**: $\llbracket A = B; \llbracket A \subseteq B; B \subseteq A \rrbracket \Longrightarrow P \rrbracket \Longrightarrow P$
- **subsetI**: $(\Lambda x. x \in A \Longrightarrow x \in B) \Longrightarrow A \subseteq B$
- **subsetD**: $\llbracket A \subseteq B; c \in A \rrbracket \Longrightarrow c \in B$

Proofs about Sets

More natural deduction proof rules:

- **IntI**: $\llbracket c \in A; c \in B \rrbracket \implies c \in A \cap B$
- **IntD1**: $c \in A \cap B \implies c \in A$
- **IntD2**: $c \in A \cap B \implies c \in B$
- **set_ext**: $(\lambda x. (x \in A) = (x \in B)) \implies A = B$
- ... (see Manual)

Bounded Quantification

- $\forall x \in A. P\ x \equiv \forall x. x \in A \longrightarrow P\ x$
- $\exists x \in A. P\ x \equiv \exists x. x \in A \wedge P\ x$
- **ballI**: $(\lambda x. x \in A \Longrightarrow P\ x) \Longrightarrow \forall x \in A. P\ x$
- **bspec**: $\llbracket \forall x \in A. P\ x; x \in A \rrbracket \Longrightarrow P\ x$
- **bexI**: $\llbracket P\ x; x \in A \rrbracket \Longrightarrow \exists x \in A. P\ x$
- **bexE**: $\llbracket \exists x \in A. P\ x; \Lambda x. \llbracket x \in A; P\ x \rrbracket \Longrightarrow Q \rrbracket \Longrightarrow Q$

Demo: Some Set Theory

Format for Inductive Set Definitions

`inductive_set S :: "τ set" where`

`[[a1,1 ∈ S; ...; a1,n ∈ S; A1,1; ...; A1,k]] ⇒ a1 ∈ S |`

`... |`

`[[am,1 ∈ S; ...; am,l ∈ S; Am,1; ...; Am,j]] ⇒ am ∈ S`

where $A_{i,j}$ are side conditions not involving S .

Example: Finite Sets

Informally

- The empty set is finite
- Adding an element to a finite set yields a finite set
- These are the only finite sets

Example: Finite Sets

In Isabelle/HOL:

```
inductive_set Finites :: 'a set set
```

– The set of all finite sets

```
{ } ∈ Finites |
```

```
A ∈ Finites ⇒ insert a A ∈ Finites
```

Example: Even Numbers

Informally

- 0 is even
- If n is even, then so is $n + 2$
- These are the only even numbers

Example: Even Numbers

In Isabelle/HOL:

```
inductive_set Ev :: nat set
```

— The set of all even numbers

```
0 ∈ Ev |
```

```
n ∈ Ev ⇒ n + 2 ∈ Ev
```

Proving Properties of Even Numbers

Easy: $4 \in \text{Ev}$

$$0 \in \text{Ev} \implies 2 \in \text{Ev} \implies 4 \in \text{Ev}$$

Trickier: $m \in \text{Ev} \implies m + m \in \text{Ev}$

Idea: induct on the length of the derivation of $m \in \text{EV}$

Better: induct on the *structure* of the derivation

Proving Properties of Even Numbers

Induction leads to two cases:

- **rule:** $0 \in \text{Ev}$

1. $0 + 0 \in \text{Ev}$ case $m = 0$

- **rule:** $n \in \text{Ev} \implies n + 2 \in \text{Ev}$

2. $\text{An.} \llbracket n \in \text{Ev}; n + n \in \text{Ev} \rrbracket \implies \text{Suc}(\text{Suc}n) + \text{Suc}(\text{Suc}n) \in \text{Ev}$

case $m = n + 2$

Rule Induction for Ev

To prove

$$n \in Ev \implies P\ n$$

by textitrule induction on $n \in Ev$ we must prove

- $P\ 0$
- $P\ n \implies P(n + 2)$

Uses rule $Ev.induct$:

$$\llbracket n \in Ev; P\ 0; \Lambda n. P\ n \implies P(n + 2) \rrbracket \implies P\ n$$

An elimination rule

Rule Induction in General

Set S is defined inductively. To prove

$$x \in S \implies P x$$

by *rule induction* on $x \in S$ we must prove for every rule

$$\llbracket a_1 \in S; \dots; a_n \in S \rrbracket \implies a \in S$$

that P is preserved:

$$\llbracket P a_1; \dots; P a_n \rrbracket \implies P a$$

In Isabelle/HOL:

```
apply(erule S.induct)
```

Demo: Inductive Set Definition

Demo: Evens are infinite

Format for Inductive Relations Definitions

`inductive R :: "τ → bool" where`

`[[R(a1,1); ...; R(a1,n); A1,1; ...; A1,k]] ⇒ R(a1) |`

`... |`

`[[R(am,1); ...; R(am,1); Am,1; ...; Am,j]] ⇒ R(am)`

where $A_{i,j}$ are side conditions not involving R .