

The Isabelle/Pure framework

Pure syntax and primitive rules

\Rightarrow	::	$(type, type) \ type$	function type constructor
\wedge	::	$(\alpha \Rightarrow prop) \Rightarrow prop$	universal quantifier
\implies	::	$prop \Rightarrow prop \Rightarrow prop$	implication

$$\frac{[x :: \alpha] \quad b(x) :: \beta}{\lambda x. b(x) :: \alpha \Rightarrow \beta} (\Rightarrow I) \quad \frac{b :: \alpha \Rightarrow \beta \quad a :: \alpha}{b a :: \beta} (\Rightarrow E)$$

$$\frac{[x] \quad B(x)}{\wedge x. B(x)} (\wedge I) \quad \frac{\wedge x. B x}{B a} (\wedge E)$$

$$\frac{[A] \quad B}{A \implies B} (\implies I) \quad \frac{A \implies B \quad A}{B} (\implies E)$$

Pure equality

$\equiv :: \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \Rightarrow prop$

Axioms for $t \equiv u$: $\alpha, \beta, \eta, refl, subst, ext, iff$

Unification: solving equations modulo $\alpha\beta\eta$

- Huet: full higher-order unification (infinitary enumeration!)
- Miller: higher-order patterns (unique result)

Hereditary Harrop Formulas

Define the following sets:

x	variables
A	atomic formulae (without \wedge/\Rightarrow)
$\bigwedge x^*. A^* \Rightarrow A$	Horn Clauses
$H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge x^*. H^* \Rightarrow A$	Hereditary Harrop Formulas (HHF)

Conventions for results:

- outermost quantification $\bigwedge x. B x$ is rephrased via schematic variables $B ?x$
- equivalence $(A \Rightarrow (\bigwedge x. B x)) \equiv (\bigwedge x. A \Rightarrow B x)$ produces canonical HHF

Representing Natural Deduction rules

Examples:

$$\frac{P \quad Q}{P \wedge Q}$$

$$\bigwedge P\ Q.\ P \implies Q \implies P \wedge Q$$

$$\frac{[P] \quad \vdots \quad Q}{P \rightarrow Q}$$

$$\bigwedge P\ Q.\ (P \implies Q) \implies P \rightarrow Q$$

$$\frac{P\ 0 \quad P\ (\text{Suc } n)}{P\ n} \quad [n][P\ n]$$

$$\bigwedge P\ n.\ P\ 0 \implies (\bigwedge n.\ P\ n \implies P\ (\text{Suc } n)) \implies P\ n$$

Rule composition (back-chaining)

$$\frac{\overline{A} \implies B \quad \overline{B}' \implies C \quad B\theta = B'\theta}{\overline{A}\theta \implies C\theta} (\text{compose})$$

$$\frac{\overline{A} \implies B}{(\overline{H} \implies \overline{A}) \implies (\overline{H} \implies B)} (\implies\text{-lift})$$

$$\frac{\overline{A} \; \overline{a} \implies B \; \overline{a}}{(\bigwedge \overline{x}. \; \overline{A} \; (\overline{a} \; \overline{x})) \implies (\bigwedge \overline{x}. \; B \; (\overline{a} \; \overline{x}))} (\wedge\text{-lift})$$

General higher-order resolution

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \text{rule: } \overline{A} \ \overline{a} \implies B \ \overline{a} \\ \text{goal: } (\bigwedge \overline{x}. \overline{H} \ \overline{x} \implies B' \ \overline{x}) \implies C \\ \text{goal unifier: } (\lambda \overline{x}. B \ (\overline{a} \ \overline{x})) \theta = B' \theta \end{array}}{(\bigwedge \overline{x}. \overline{H} \ \overline{x} \implies \overline{A} \ (\overline{a} \ \overline{x})) \theta \implies C \theta} \text{ (resolution)}$$
$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \text{goal: } (\bigwedge \overline{x}. \overline{H} \ \overline{x} \implies A \ \overline{x}) \implies C \\ \text{assm unifier: } A \theta = H_i \theta \text{ (for some } H_i\text{)} \end{array}}{C \theta} \text{ (assumption)}$$

Both inferences are omnipresent in Isabelle/Isar:

- *resolution*: e.g. *OF* attribute, *rule* method, **also** command
- *assumption*: e.g. *assumption* method, implicit proof ending