three wishes

Freek Wiedijk Radboud University Nijmegen

future of ITP workshop University of Cambridge 2009 08 24, 09:30

why wish?

why ITP?

- for mathematics
 - correctness
 - explicitness
 - mathematical objects in the physical world
- for programming
 - correctness pprox no bugs
 - carefree programming
 - the *pleasure* of crafting a fully correct program

wishes for mathematics

almost-wish: ITP I can sell to the mathematicians

- strong and user programmable automation (HOL)
- integrated declarative proofs and tactic scripts (Isabelle)
- full classical ZFC style set theory (Mizar)
- partiality taken seriously (PVS)
- dependent and empty types (Coq)
- small kernel implementing small foundations (Metamath)
- mathematical and programming language identical (ACL2)

 $\left(\frac{1}{0}\right)^2 \ge 0$

almost-wish: DNA for formal math

- type theoretical lambda terms
- traces of HOL derivations
- LF
- de Bruijn's $\Delta \Lambda$, aka $\Lambda \Delta$, aka AUT-SL

 $\mathcal{T} ::= * \mid x \mid (\lambda x : \mathcal{T} . \mathcal{T}) \mid (\mathcal{T}\mathcal{T})$

identification of λ and Π , no definitions or let-bindings unlabeled graphs with four kinds of nodes and two kinds of edges

• weaker version of $\Delta\Lambda$

no convertibility check

no difference between definitional equality and 'book equality'

problem:

'the category of groups' is not a set

how to talk about 'large categories' in ZFC style set theory?

('universes' are not a nice solution)

almost-wish: 'very large scale formalization' project

• all of undergraduate mathematics will take about 140 man · years

or:

• classification of finite simple groups

or:



almost-wish: formal library infrastructure

- made by a whole community, but not well integrated
 - Coq's contribs
 - Isabelle's AFP
 - Mizar's MML
- beautifully integrated, but made by an isolated genius
 - John Harrison's HOL Light library
 - Georges Gonthier's Ssreflect library

Nijmegen's MathWiki project just started

1 postdoc + 1 PhD student

```
'Wikipedia for math' + formalizations + 'Proof General on the Web' Coq + Isabelle + ...
```

progress in proof assistant technology:

- automation of formalized primary school math = 'arithmetic'
- automation of formalized high school math = 'calculus'
- automation of formalized university math

HIGH_SCHOOL_STUDENT_TAC 'computer algebra under hypotheses'

$$x \neq 0 \land |\ln|x|| > 2 \land \int_0^{|x|} t \, dt \le 1 \implies -\frac{1}{e^2} < x < \frac{1}{e^2}$$

should run in less than a second should run without any arguments

wishes for programming

almost-wish: self-verified ITP

• Coq in Coq

Bruno Barras

not about the code of the actual system

• HOL in HOL

John Harrison

about the code of the actual system, but currently

- code has been a bit simplified (no definitions/polymorphism)
- no formal relation between OCaml code and its HOL rendering
- no proofs about parsing/printing (Randy's complaint)

miniML++

features beyond Coq:

- exceptions
- state

(just global ref variables is enough)

- non-terminating functions
 (my computer has a ^C !)
- input/output other OS related functions

almost-wish: nice system for proving C correct

philosophical question: what should I imagine 'correctness' of

- LATEX
- Mozilla

to mean?

from the quotes file:

V7 /bin/mail source: 554 lines. 1989 X.400 specs: 2200+ pages.

a program and a specification are the same kind of thing? so what does it mean to prove a specification correct?

strictly conforming =

program runs the same on all machines =
no undefined behavior, no unspecified behavior

- no dereferenced NULL pointers
- no dereferenced dangling pointers
- no array accesses outside the bounds
- no meaningless casts
- no integer overflow
- no dependence on evaluation order
- etcetera

proving correctness without specification

i = i++;

why wish?

needed?

- **first wish** (automated high school mathematics) computer algebra under hypotheses
- **second wish** (ML verification)

Hoare logic for higher order programs in the presence of side effects

• third wish (C strict conformance) Hoare logic for proving strict conformance