

# **An Introduction to IMPS**

**Dr. William M. Farmer**

**November 30, 1999**

# What is IMPS?

- IMPS is an **Interactive Mathematics Proof System** developed at The MITRE Corporation by W. Farmer, J. Guttman, and J. Thayer Fábrega
- Principal goals:
  - Mechanize mathematical reasoning
  - Be useful to a wide range of people
- Approach:
  - Support traditional mathematical techniques
  - Human oriented instead of machine oriented
- Main application areas:
  - Mathematics education
  - Hardware and software development

# What is Mathematical Reasoning?

- Process for investigating those aspects of the world that concern such things as time, measure, pattern, and logical consequence
- The process consists of two intertwined activities:
  - Formulating mathematical models
  - Exploring these mathematical models by stating and proving conjectures and by performing calculations

# What is Mechanized Mathematics?

- Goal: To produce computer systems that support and improve mathematical reasoning
- Types of mechanized mathematics systems:
  1. **Computer algebra systems**  
Examples: Macsyma, Maple, Mathematica
  2. **Theorem proving systems**  
Examples: Coq, EVES, HOL, IMPS, Isabelle, Mizar, Nqthm, Nuprl, Otter, PVS
  3. **Interactive Mathematics Laboratories**  
Examples: IMPS is a partial IML

# Distinguishing Characteristics of IMPS

- Logic that admits partial functions and undefined terms
  - Closely corresponds to mathematical practice
- Proofs that combine deduction and calculation
  - IMPS proof system is eclectic
  - Calculation plays an essential role in IMPS proofs
- Little theories method for organizing mathematics
  - Essential for formalizing large portions of mathematics

# Goals for the IMPS Logic

- Familiarity: 2-valued, classical, predicate logic
- Expressiveness: higher-order quantification
- Support for functions:
  - Higher-order and partial functions
  - $\lambda$ -notation
  - Definite description operator
- Simple type system:
  - No explicit polymorphism
  - Subtype system for classifying expressions by value

# LUTINS, the Logic of IMPS

- Satisfies all the goals for the IMPS logic
- A version of Church's simple type theory with:
  - Traditional approach to partial functions and undefinedness
  - Additional constructors, including a definite description operator
  - Sort system for classifying expressions by value
- Laws of predicate logic are modified slightly
  - Instantiation and beta-reduction are restricted to defined expressions
  - Undefined expressions are indiscernible

# Traditional Approach to Partial Functions and Undefinedness

- **Expressions may be undefined**
  - Constants, variables,  $\lambda$ -expressions are always defined
  - Definite descriptions may be undefined:  
( $\lambda x : \mathbf{R} . x * x = 2$ )
  - Functions may be partial and thus their applications may be undefined:  $1/0$ ,  $\sqrt{-1}$
  - An application of a function is undefined if any argument is undefined:  $0 * (1/0)$
- **Formulas are always true or false**
  - Predicates must be total
  - An application of a predicate is false if any argument is undefined:  $1/0 = 1/0$



# Sorts in LUTINS

- A **sort**  $\alpha$  is a syntactic object intended to denote a nonempty set  $D_\alpha$  of values
- Hierarchy of sorts
  - **Atomic sorts** like **N, Z, Q, R**
  - **Compound sorts** of the form  $\alpha_1 \times \dots \times \alpha_n \rightarrow \beta$
- A compound sort  $\alpha_1 \times \dots \times \alpha_n \rightarrow \beta$  denotes the set of partial functions from  $D_{\alpha_1} \times \dots \times D_{\alpha_n}$  to  $D_\beta$ 
  - Sorts are **covariant** with respect  $\rightarrow$ :  
If  $\alpha \ll \alpha'$  and  $\beta \ll \beta'$ , then  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta \ll \alpha' \rightarrow \beta'$
- Every expression  $E$  is assigned a sort  $\bar{\sigma}(E)$  according to its syntax (regardless of whether it is defined or not)
  - $\bar{\sigma}(E) = \alpha$  means the value of  $E$  is in  $D_\alpha$  if  $E$  is defined

# Conjecture Proving in IMPS

- Goals:
  - User controls deductive process
  - Intelligible proofs and proof attempts
- Proofs are a blend of deduction and calculation
  - High-level reasoning orchestrated by the user
  - Low-level reasoning done automatically
- Inference steps can be large
  - Proof commands
  - Theory-specific simplification
  - Semi-automatic theorem application
  - Procedural proof scripts
- Proofs are represented in multiple ways

# Simplification

- Motivation
  - Users do not want to do low-level reasoning
  - Users are generally not interested in low-level details
  - Definedness checking should not be a burden
- Simplification is used systematically in IMPS
  - To simplify subgoals in the course of a proof
  - To recognize “immediately grounded” subgoals
  - To discharge definition and interpretation obligations
- Theory specific; tailored by user
  - Algebraic and order simplification
  - Application of rewrite rules
  - Definedness checking

# Macetes ( “Clever Tricks” )

- **Macetes** are procedures for:
  - Applying theorems to a subgoal
  - Finding which theorems are applicable
- Supplement simplification
  - Offer more control than simplification
  - Flexible way to “compute with theorems”
- **Atomic macetes**
  - Apply individual theorems (**theorem macetes**)
  - Apply special procedures: simplify, beta-reduce
- **Compound macetes**
  - Apply collections of theorems in useful patterns
  - Constructed from atomic macetes using a few simple **macete constructors**

# Proof Scripts

- **Deduction graphs** can be created both “by hand” and “by script”
- **Proof scripts** are used like other kinds of tactics:
  - To create new proof commands
  - To represent executable proof sketches
  - To store proofs in a compact, replayable form
- They provide an effective way to formalize and apply procedural knowledge
  - Automatically generated from deduction graphs
  - Utilize a default way of traveling through the graph
  - Can be modified by simple text editing
  - Have control structures for programming
  - Use formula patterns and “blocks” for robustness

# Little Theories Method

- A complex body of mathematics is represented as a **network of axiomatic theories**
  - Bigger theories are composed of smaller theories
  - Theories are linked by interpretations
  - Reasoning is distributed over the network
- Benefits:
  - Theorems are proved at the right level of abstraction
  - Emphasizes reuse: if  $A$  is a theorem of  $T$ , then  $A$  may be reused in any “instance” of  $T$
  - Allows multiple perspectives and parallel development
- IMPS provides stronger support for little theories than any other contemporary theorem proving system

# Theory Interpretations

- A **theory interpretation** of  $T$  to  $T'$  is a mapping of the expressions of  $T$  to the expressions of  $T'$  such that theorems are mapped to theorems
- Interpretations enable theorems and definitions to be transported from abstract theories to more concrete theories or indeed to equally abstract theories
- **Interpretations are information conduits!**

# General Conclusions about IMPS

- IMPS has introduced and tested many new ideas
- IMPS has demonstrated that good system engineering is as important as good logical and deductive machinery
- IMPS is inaccessible to most mathematics practitioners
- IMPS indicates the profound impact that mechanized mathematics systems can have on mathematics practice



# General Conclusions about Mechanized Mathematics Systems

- Computer algebra systems are not based on a firm logical foundation but are widely used
- Theorem proving systems are not widely used but are based on a firm logical foundation
- The capabilities of computer algebra systems and theorem proving systems will be combine in future interactive mathematics laboratories
- In the next century, interactive mathematics laboratories will transform how mathematics is learned and practiced

# Availability of IMPS

- The IMPS system is available to the public without fee under a public license
  - System includes documentation and source code
  - Web site: <http://imps.mcmaster.ca>
- Newest version: IMPS 2.0
  - Written in Common Lisp
  - Runs on Unix platforms
  - User interface requires X Windows and XEmacs