

# Viewing Proofs

Joe Hurd

ARG Lunch

25 January 2000

1. Goals
2. Concepts
3. Difficulties
4. Results

## Goals

1. Users browsing HOL proofs at the right level of detail for their purpose.
2. Avoiding repeatedly invoking costly search tactics by ‘rewriting them out of the proof’.
3. Obtaining the primitive inferences that created a theorem.

## Concepts

Regard tactics, conversions, tacticals, etc. as rules of inference (i.e., having type `thm list -> thm`). For tactics this is simply the justification function.

Whenever we create a theorem we tag it with the rule of inference (in this expanded sense) that produced it, including the argument theorems.

This creates a proof tree:

`thm1` was proved by `STRIP_TAC` which used (produced a subgoal of) `thm2` which was proved by `CONJ_TAC` which used `thm3` and `thm4`...

with an option to ‘see inside’ any (non-primitive) proof step:

`thm1` was proved by `STRIP_TAC` which invoked `GEN_TAC` which invoked `GEN`...

## Difficulty 1

### Naming:

The name of STRIP\_TAC is “STRIP\_TAC”.

What is the name of SPEC\_TAC ‘‘x:num’’?

How about

STRIP\_TAC ORELSE SPEC\_TAC ‘‘x:num’’?

Decision: names should be as close as possible to what the user typed in.

## Difficulty 2

THEN Infixes to the Left:

This means

STRIP\_TAC THEN CONJ\_TAC THEN PROVE\_TAC []  
will split (exist on the proof level directly below)  
as

STRIP\_TAC THEN CONJ\_TAC

then

PROVE\_TAC []

This is counter-intuitive!

Decision: re-infixed THEN to the right, to produce better splitting of proofs.

## Difficulty 3

### Unnatural Splitting of the Proof Tree:

`CONJ_TAC` and `SUBGOAL_THEN` always produce 2 subgoals, even if one is relatively trivial.

Mathematics textbooks seem to try and keep proofs linear (probably because they are read in that way) using such devices as ‘it is sufficient to prove X since Y’.

Solution: introduce a new tactical `TRIVIAL`, whereby `tac1 TRIVIAL tac2` will apply `tac2` to the first subgoal of `tac1`, hopefully solving it and thus pushing it down to a lower level of the proof tree.

## Results

- Good for seeing subgoals that appear in the top-level tactic proof.
- Things become incoherent at lower levels (especially the primitive inferences).
- Major change to the HOL system, just annotating all tactics, conversions, etc. Also require changing proofs so that THEN can safely infix to the right, and tactics really need a different type to make tracking names a lot cleaner.
- Future work: add in conversions and rules, and make theorems reference each other properly (i.e., the proper name and an accompanying hyperlink, not just printing the sequent).