

Automated Reasoning

Lecture 7: Introduction to Higher Order Logic in Isabelle

Jacques Fleuriot
jdf@inf.ed.ac.uk

Acknowledgement: Tobias Nipkow kindly provided some of the slides for this lecture

Recap

- ▶ Last time: Representing mathematical concepts
- ▶ This time: Higher-Order Logic (in Isabelle)

Higher-Order Logic (HOL)

In HOL, we represent sets and predicates by **functions**, often denoted by **lambda abstractions**.

Definition (Lambda Abstraction)

Lambda abstractions are **terms** that denote functions directly by the rules which define them, e.g. the square function is $\lambda x. x * x$.

This is a way of defining a function without giving it a name:

$$f(x) \equiv x * x \quad \text{vs} \quad f \equiv \lambda x. x * x$$

We can use lambda abstractions exactly as we use ordinary function symbols. E.g. $(\lambda x. x * x) 3 = 9$.

Higher-Order Functions

Using λ -notation, we can think about functions as individual objects.

E.g., we can define functions which map from and to other functions.

Example

The K -combinator maps some x to a function which sends any y to x .

$$\lambda x. \lambda y. x.$$

Example

The composition function maps two functions to their composition:

$$\lambda f. \lambda g. \lambda x. f(g x).$$

Representation of Logic in HOL I

- ▶ Types *bool*, *ind* (individuals) and $\alpha \Rightarrow \beta$ primitive. All others defined from these.
- ▶ Two primitive (families of) functions:

equality $(=_{\alpha}) : \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \Rightarrow bool$

implication $(\rightarrow) : bool \Rightarrow bool \Rightarrow bool$

All other functions defined using this, lambda abstraction and application.

- ▶ Distinction between formulas and terms is dispensed with: formulas are just terms of type *bool*.
- ▶ Predicates are represented by functions $\alpha \Rightarrow bool$. Sets are represented as predicates.

Representation of Logic in HOL II

- ▶ True is defined as:

$$\top \equiv (\lambda x. x) = (\lambda x. x)$$

- ▶ Universal quantification as function equality:

$$\forall x. \phi \equiv (\lambda x. \phi) = (\lambda x. \top).$$

This works for x of any type: *bool*, *ind* \Rightarrow *bool*, ...

- ▶ Therefore, we can **quantify over functions, predicates and sets**.
- ▶ Conjunction and disjunction are defined:

$$\begin{aligned} P \wedge Q &\equiv \forall R. (P \rightarrow Q \rightarrow R) \rightarrow R \\ P \vee Q &\equiv \forall R. (P \rightarrow R) \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R) \rightarrow R \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ Define natural numbers (\mathbb{N}), integers (\mathbb{Z}), rationals (\mathbb{Q}), reals (\mathbb{R}), complex numbers (\mathbb{C}), vector spaces, manifolds, ...

Isabelle/HOL

Higher-Order Logic is the underlying logic of Isabelle/HOL, the theorem prover we are using.

The axiomatisation is slightly different to the one described on the previous slides, and a bit more powerful (but we won't be delving into this).

We are interested in Isabelle/HOL from a functional programming and logic standpoint.

HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

HOL = Higher-Order Logic

HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

HOL = Higher-Order Logic

HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

HOL = Higher-Order Logic

HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

HOL has

- ▶ datatypes
- ▶ recursive functions
- ▶ logical operators

HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

HOL = Higher-Order Logic

HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

HOL has

- ▶ datatypes
- ▶ recursive functions
- ▶ logical operators

HOL is a programming language!

HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

HOL = Higher-Order Logic

HOL = Functional Programming + Logic

HOL has

- ▶ datatypes
- ▶ recursive functions
- ▶ logical operators

HOL is a programming language!

Higher-order = functions are values, too!

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

$$\tau ::=$$

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

$$\tau ::= (\tau)$$

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

$$\tau ::= (\tau)$$

| *bool* | *nat* | *int* | ... base types

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

$$\begin{array}{l} \tau ::= (\tau) \\ \quad | \textit{bool} \mid \textit{nat} \mid \textit{int} \mid \dots \quad \text{base types} \\ \quad | \textit{'a} \mid \textit{'b} \mid \dots \quad \text{type variables} \end{array}$$

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

τ	$::=$	(τ)	
		$bool \mid nat \mid int \mid \dots$	base types
		$'a \mid 'b \mid \dots$	type variables
		$\tau \Rightarrow \tau$	functions

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

τ	$::=$	(τ)	
		$bool \mid nat \mid int \mid \dots$	base types
		$'a \mid 'b \mid \dots$	type variables
		$\tau \Rightarrow \tau$	functions
		$\tau \times \tau$	pairs (ascii: *)

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

τ	$::=$	(τ)	
		$bool \mid nat \mid int \mid \dots$	base types
		$'a \mid 'b \mid \dots$	type variables
		$\tau \Rightarrow \tau$	functions
		$\tau \times \tau$	pairs (ascii: *)
		$\tau \textit{ list}$	lists

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

τ	$::=$	(τ)	
		$bool \mid nat \mid int \mid \dots$	base types
		$'a \mid 'b \mid \dots$	type variables
		$\tau \Rightarrow \tau$	functions
		$\tau \times \tau$	pairs (ascii: *)
		$\tau \textit{ list}$	lists
		$\tau \textit{ set}$	sets

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

τ	$::=$	(τ)	
		$bool \mid nat \mid int \mid \dots$	base types
		$'a \mid 'b \mid \dots$	type variables
		$\tau \Rightarrow \tau$	functions
		$\tau \times \tau$	pairs (ascii: *)
		$\tau \textit{ list}$	lists
		$\tau \textit{ set}$	sets
		\dots	user-defined types

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

τ	$::=$	(τ)	
		$bool \mid nat \mid int \mid \dots$	base types
		$'a \mid 'b \mid \dots$	type variables
		$\tau \Rightarrow \tau$	functions
		$\tau \times \tau$	pairs (ascii: *)
		$\tau \textit{ list}$	lists
		$\tau \textit{ set}$	sets
		\dots	user-defined types

Convention: $\tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau_3 \equiv \tau_1 \Rightarrow (\tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau_3)$

Isabelle/HOL Types

Basic syntax:

τ	$::=$	(τ)	
		$bool \mid nat \mid int \mid \dots$	base types
		$'a \mid 'b \mid \dots$	type variables
		$\tau \Rightarrow \tau$	functions
		$\tau \times \tau$	pairs (ascii: *)
		$\tau \textit{ list}$	lists
		$\tau \textit{ set}$	sets
		\dots	user-defined types

Convention: $\tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau_3 \equiv \tau_1 \Rightarrow (\tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau_3)$

A formula is simply a term of type *bool*.

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Terms can be formed as follows:

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Terms can be formed as follows:

- ▶ *Function application: ft*

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Terms can be formed as follows:

- ▶ *Function application: $f t$*
is the call of function f with argument t .

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Terms can be formed as follows:

- ▶ *Function application:* $f t$
is the call of function f with argument t .
If f has more arguments: $f t_1 t_2 \dots$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Terms can be formed as follows:

- ▶ *Function application: $f t$*

is the call of function f with argument t .

If f has more arguments: $f t_1 t_2 \dots$

Examples: $\sin \pi$, $\text{plus } x y$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Terms can be formed as follows:

- ▶ *Function application*: $f t$

is the call of function f with argument t .

If f has more arguments: $f t_1 t_2 \dots$

Examples: $\sin \pi$, $\text{plus } x y$

- ▶ *Function abstraction*: $\lambda x. t$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Terms can be formed as follows:

- ▶ *Function application*: $f t$

is the call of function f with argument t .

If f has more arguments: $f t_1 t_2 \dots$

Examples: $\sin \pi$, $\text{plus } x y$

- ▶ *Function abstraction*: $\lambda x. t$

is the function with parameter x and result t

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Terms can be formed as follows:

▶ *Function application: $f t$*

is the call of function f with argument t .

If f has more arguments: $f t_1 t_2 \dots$

Examples: $\sin \pi$, $\text{plus } x y$

▶ *Function abstraction: $\lambda x. t$*

is the function with parameter x and result t ,

i.e. " $x \mapsto t$ ".

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Terms can be formed as follows:

▶ *Function application: $f t$*

is the call of function f with argument t .

If f has more arguments: $f t_1 t_2 \dots$

Examples: $\sin \pi$, $\text{plus } x y$

▶ *Function abstraction: $\lambda x. t$*

is the function with parameter x and result t ,

i.e. " $x \mapsto t$ ".

Example: $\lambda x. \text{plus } x x$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

$$t ::=$$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

$$t ::= (t)$$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

$$t ::= (t) \\ \quad | a \quad \text{constant or variable (identifier)}$$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

t	$::=$	(t)	
		a	constant or variable (identifier)
		$t t$	function application

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

t	$::=$	(t)	
		a	constant or variable (identifier)
		$t t$	function application
		$\lambda x. t$	function abstraction

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

t	$::=$	(t)	
		a	constant or variable (identifier)
		$t t$	function application
		$\lambda x. t$	function abstraction
		...	lots of syntactic sugar

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

t	$::=$	(t)	
		a	constant or variable (identifier)
		$t t$	function application
		$\lambda x. t$	function abstraction
		...	lots of syntactic sugar

Examples: $f(g x) y$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

t	$::=$	(t)	
		a	constant or variable (identifier)
		$t t$	function application
		$\lambda x. t$	function abstraction
		...	lots of syntactic sugar

Examples: $f(g x) y$
 $h(\lambda x. f(g x))$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

t	$::=$	(t)	
		a	constant or variable (identifier)
		$t t$	function application
		$\lambda x. t$	function abstraction
		...	lots of syntactic sugar

Examples: $f(g x) y$
 $h(\lambda x. f(g x))$

Convention: $f t_1 t_2 t_3 \equiv ((f t_1) t_2) t_3$

Isabelle/HOL Terms

Basic syntax:

t	::=	(t)	
		a	constant or variable (identifier)
		$t t$	function application
		$\lambda x. t$	function abstraction
		...	lots of syntactic sugar

Examples: $f(g x) y$
 $h(\lambda x. f(g x))$

Convention: $f t_1 t_2 t_3 \equiv ((f t_1) t_2) t_3$

This language of terms is known as the *λ -calculus*.

β -reduction

The computation rule of the λ -calculus is the replacement of formal by actual parameters:

$$(\lambda x. t) u = t[u/x]$$

β -reduction

The computation rule of the λ -calculus is the replacement of formal by actual parameters:

$$(\lambda x. t) u = t[u/x]$$

where $t[u/x]$ is “ t with u substituted for x ”.

β -reduction

The computation rule of the λ -calculus is the replacement of formal by actual parameters:

$$(\lambda x. t) u = t[u/x]$$

where $t[u/x]$ is “ t with u substituted for x ”.

Example: $(\lambda x. x + 5) 3 = 3 + 5$

β -reduction

The computation rule of the λ -calculus is the replacement of formal by actual parameters:

$$(\lambda x. t) u = t[u/x]$$

where $t[u/x]$ is “ t with u substituted for x ”.

Example: $(\lambda x. x + 5) 3 = 3 + 5$

- ▶ The step from $(\lambda x. t) u$ to $t[u/x]$ is called *β -reduction*.

β -reduction

The computation rule of the λ -calculus is the replacement of formal by actual parameters:

$$(\lambda x. t) u = t[u/x]$$

where $t[u/x]$ is “ t with u substituted for x ”.

Example: $(\lambda x. x + 5) 3 = 3 + 5$

- ▶ The step from $(\lambda x. t) u$ to $t[u/x]$ is called *β -reduction*.
- ▶ Isabelle performs β -reduction automatically.

Well-typed Terms

Terms must be well-typed

Well-typed Terms

Terms must be well-typed

(the argument of every function call must be of the right type)

Well-typed Terms

Terms must be well-typed

(the argument of every function call must be of the right type)

Notation:

$t :: \tau$ means “ t is a well-typed term of type τ ”.

Well-typed Terms

Terms must be well-typed

(the argument of every function call must be of the right type)

Notation:

$t :: \tau$ means “ t is a well-typed term of type τ ”.

$$\frac{t :: \tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \quad u :: \tau_1}{t u :: \tau_2}$$

Type inference

Isabelle automatically computes the type of each variable in a term.

Type inference

Isabelle automatically computes the type of each variable in a term. This is called *type inference*.

Type inference

Isabelle automatically computes the type of each variable in a term. This is called *type inference*.

In the presence of *overloaded* functions (functions with multiple types) this is not always possible.

Type inference

Isabelle automatically computes the type of each variable in a term. This is called *type inference*.

In the presence of *overloaded* functions (functions with multiple types) this is not always possible.

User can help with *type annotations* inside the term.

Examples $f(x::nat)$
 $g(A::real\ set)$

Currying

Process of transforming a function that takes multiple arguments into:

- ▶ one that takes just a single argument, and
- ▶ returns another *function* if any arguments are still needed.

Currying

Process of transforming a function that takes multiple arguments into:

- ▶ one that takes just a single argument, and
- ▶ returns another *function* if any arguments are still needed.

Typing:

- ▶ Curried: $f :: \tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau$
- ▶ Tupled: $f' :: \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau$

Currying

Process of transforming a function that takes multiple arguments into:

- ▶ one that takes just a single argument, and
- ▶ returns another *function* if any arguments are still needed.

Typing:

- ▶ Curried: $f :: \tau_1 \Rightarrow \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau$
- ▶ Tupled: $f' :: \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau$

Advantage:

Currying allows *partial application*

$$f a_1 :: \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau \text{ where } a_1 :: \tau_1$$

Predefined syntactic sugar

- ▶ *Infix*: +, -, *, #, @, ...

Predefined syntactic sugar

- ▶ *Infix*: `+`, `-`, `*`, `#`, `@`, ...
- ▶ *Mixfix*: `if _ then _ else _`, `case _ of`, ...

Predefined syntactic sugar

- ▶ *Infix*: $+$, $-$, $*$, $\#$, $@$, ...
- ▶ *Mixfix*: *if _ then _ else _*, *case _ of*, ...

Prefix binds more strongly than infix:

$$! \quad fx + y \equiv (fx) + y \neq f(x + y) \quad !$$

Predefined syntactic sugar

- ▶ *Infix*: $+$, $-$, $*$, $\#$, $@$, ...
- ▶ *Mixfix*: *if _ then _ else _*, *case _ of*, ...

Prefix binds more strongly than infix:

$$! \quad fx + y \equiv (fx) + y \neq f(x + y) \quad !$$

Enclose *if* and *case* in parentheses:

$$! \quad (if_then_else_)\quad !$$

Example: Type *bool*

datatype *bool* = *True* | *False*

Example: Type *bool*

datatype *bool* = *True* | *False*

Predefined functions:

$\wedge, \vee, \longrightarrow, \dots :: \textit{bool} \Rightarrow \textit{bool} \Rightarrow \textit{bool}$

Example: Type *bool*

datatype *bool* = *True* | *False*

Predefined functions:

$\wedge, \vee, \longrightarrow, \dots :: \textit{bool} \Rightarrow \textit{bool} \Rightarrow \textit{bool}$

A formula is a term of type bool

Example: Type *bool*

datatype *bool* = *True* | *False*

Predefined functions:

$\wedge, \vee, \longrightarrow, \dots :: \textit{bool} \Rightarrow \textit{bool} \Rightarrow \textit{bool}$

A *formula* is a term of type *bool*

if-and-only-if: =

Example: Type *nat*

datatype *nat* = 0 | Suc *nat*

Example: Type *nat*

datatype *nat* = 0 | Suc *nat*

Values of type *nat*: 0, Suc 0, Suc(Suc 0), ...

Example: Type *nat*

datatype *nat* = 0 | *Suc nat*

Values of type *nat*: 0, *Suc 0*, *Suc(Suc 0)*, ...

Predefined functions: +, *, ... :: *nat* ⇒ *nat* ⇒ *nat*

Example: Type *nat*

datatype *nat* = 0 | *Suc nat*

Values of type *nat*: 0, *Suc* 0, *Suc*(*Suc* 0), ...

Predefined functions: +, *, ... :: *nat* ⇒ *nat* ⇒ *nat*

! Numbers and arithmetic operations are overloaded:

0, 1, 2, ... :: 'a, + :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a

Example: Type *nat*

datatype *nat* = 0 | *Suc nat*

Values of type *nat*: 0, *Suc* 0, *Suc*(*Suc* 0), ...

Predefined functions: +, *, ... :: *nat* ⇒ *nat* ⇒ *nat*

! Numbers and arithmetic operations are overloaded:

0, 1, 2, ... :: 'a, + :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a

You need type annotations: 1 :: *nat*, x + (y::*nat*)

Example: Type *nat*

datatype *nat* = 0 | *Suc nat*

Values of type *nat*: 0, *Suc* 0, *Suc*(*Suc* 0), ...

Predefined functions: +, *, ... :: *nat* ⇒ *nat* ⇒ *nat*

! Numbers and arithmetic operations are overloaded:

0, 1, 2, ... :: 'a, + :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a

You need type annotations: 1 :: *nat*, x + (y::*nat*)

unless the context is unambiguous: *Suc* z

More on Isabelle/HOL

If you are really keen, look at the chapter “Higher-Order Logic” in the “logics” document in the Isabelle documentation.

Or the file `src/HOL/HOL.thy` in the Isabelle installation.

Exercise (only if you are interested!): why can't Russell's paradox happen in HOL?

Summary

- ▶ General introduction to Higher-Order Logic
- ▶ Types and Terms in Isabelle/HOL