

State Spaces: The Locale Way

Norbert Schirmer

June 21, 2010

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Distinctness of Names in a Binary Tree	2
2.1	The Binary Tree	2
2.2	Distinctness of Nodes	2
2.3	Containment of Trees	3
3	State Space Representation as Function	15
4	Setup for State Space Locales	17
5	Syntax for State Space Lookup and Update	17
6	Examples	18

1 Introduction

These theories introduce a new command called **statespace**. It's usage is similar to **records**. However, the command does not introduce a new type but an abstract specification based on the locale infrastructure. This leads to extra flexibility in composing state space components, in particular multiple inheritance and renaming of components.

The state space infrastructure basically manages the following things:

- distinctness of field names
- projections / injections from / to an abstract *value* type
- syntax translations for lookup and update, hiding the projections and injections
- simplification procedure for lookups / updates, similar to records

Overview In Section 2 we define distinctness of the nodes in a binary tree and provide the basic prover tools to support efficient distinctness reasoning for field names managed by state spaces. The state is represented as a function from (abstract) names to (abstract) values as introduced in Section 3. The basic setup for state spaces is in Section 4. Some syntax for lookup and updates is added in Section 5. Finally Section 6 explains the usage of state spaces by examples.

2 Distinctness of Names in a Binary Tree

```
theory DistinctTreeProver
imports Main
uses (distinct-tree-prover.ML)
begin
```

A state space manages a set of (abstract) names and assumes that the names are distinct. The names are stored as parameters of a locale and distinctness as an assumption. The most common request is to proof distinctness of two given names. We maintain the names in a balanced binary tree and formulate a predicate that all nodes in the tree have distinct names. This setup leads to logarithmic certificates.

2.1 The Binary Tree

```
datatype 'a tree = Node 'a tree 'a bool 'a tree | Tip
```

The boolean flag in the node marks the content of the node as deleted, without having to build a new tree. We prefer the boolean flag to an option type, so that the ML-layer can still use the node content to facilitate binary search in the tree. The ML code keeps the nodes sorted using the term order. We do not have to push ordering to the HOL level.

2.2 Distinctness of Nodes

```
consts set-of:: 'a tree  $\Rightarrow$  'a set
primrec
set-of Tip = {}
set-of (Node l x d r) = (if d then {} else {x})  $\cup$  set-of l  $\cup$  set-of r

consts all-distinct:: 'a tree  $\Rightarrow$  bool
primrec
all-distinct Tip = True
all-distinct (Node l x d r) = ((d  $\vee$  (x  $\notin$  set-of l  $\wedge$  x  $\notin$  set-of r))  $\wedge$ 
  set-of l  $\cap$  set-of r = {}  $\wedge$ 
  all-distinct l  $\wedge$  all-distinct r)
```

Given a binary tree t for which *all-distinct* holds, given two different nodes contained in the tree, we want to write a ML function that generates a logarithmic certificate that the content of the nodes is distinct. We use the following lemmas to achieve this.

lemma *all-distinct-left*:

all-distinct (Node $l\ x\ b\ r$) \implies *all-distinct* l

by *simp*

lemma *all-distinct-right*: *all-distinct* (Node $l\ x\ b\ r$) \implies *all-distinct* r

by *simp*

lemma *distinct-left*: $\llbracket \text{all-distinct (Node } l\ x\ \text{False } r); y \in \text{set-of } l \rrbracket \implies x \neq y$

by *auto*

lemma *distinct-right*: $\llbracket \text{all-distinct (Node } l\ x\ \text{False } r); y \in \text{set-of } r \rrbracket \implies x \neq y$

by *auto*

lemma *distinct-left-right*: $\llbracket \text{all-distinct (Node } l\ z\ b\ r); x \in \text{set-of } l; y \in \text{set-of } r \rrbracket$

$\implies x \neq y$

by *auto*

lemma *in-set-root*: $x \in \text{set-of (Node } l\ x\ \text{False } r)$

by *simp*

lemma *in-set-left*: $y \in \text{set-of } l \implies y \in \text{set-of (Node } l\ x\ \text{False } r)$

by *simp*

lemma *in-set-right*: $y \in \text{set-of } r \implies y \in \text{set-of (Node } l\ x\ \text{False } r)$

by *simp*

lemma *swap-neq*: $x \neq y \implies y \neq x$

by *blast*

lemma *neq-to-eq-False*: $x \neq y \implies (x=y) \equiv \text{False}$

by *simp*

2.3 Containment of Trees

When deriving a state space from other ones, we create a new name tree which contains all the names of the parent state spaces and assume the predicate *all-distinct*. We then prove that the new locale interprets all parent locales. Hence we have to show that the new distinctness assumption on all names implies the distinctness assumptions of the parent locales. This proof is implemented in ML. We do this efficiently by defining a kind of containment check of trees by 'subtraction'. We subtract the parent tree from the new tree. If this succeeds we know that *all-distinct* of the new tree implies *all-distinct* of the parent tree. The resulting certificate is of the

order $n * \log m$ where n is the size of the (smaller) parent tree and m the size of the (bigger) new tree.

consts *delete* :: 'a \Rightarrow 'a tree \Rightarrow 'a tree option

primrec

delete x *Tip* = *None*

delete x (*Node* l y d r) = (case *delete* x l of
 Some $l' \Rightarrow$
 (case *delete* x r of
 Some $r' \Rightarrow$ *Some* (*Node* l' y ($d \vee (x=y)$) r')
 | *None* \Rightarrow *Some* (*Node* l' y ($d \vee (x=y)$) r)
 | *None* \Rightarrow
 (case (*delete* x r) of
 Some $r' \Rightarrow$ *Some* (*Node* l y ($d \vee (x=y)$) r')
 | *None* \Rightarrow if $x=y \wedge \neg d$ then *Some* (*Node* l y *True* r)
 else *None*))

lemma *delete-Some-set-of*: $\bigwedge t'. \text{delete } x \ t = \text{Some } t' \implies \text{set-of } t' \subseteq \text{set-of } t$

proof (*induct* t)

 case *Tip* **thus** ?case **by** *simp*

next

 case (*Node* l y d r)

have *del*: *delete* x (*Node* l y d r) = *Some* t' **by** *fact*

show ?case

proof (*cases* *delete* x l)

 case (*Some* l')

note x - l -*Some* = *this*

with *Node.hyps*

have l' - l : *set-of* $l' \subseteq$ *set-of* l

by *simp*

show ?thesis

proof (*cases* *delete* x r)

 case (*Some* r')

with *Node.hyps*

have *set-of* $r' \subseteq$ *set-of* r

by *simp*

with l' - l *Some* x - l -*Some* *del*

show ?thesis

by (*auto split: split-if-asm*)

next

 case *None*

with l' - l *Some* x - l -*Some* *del*

show ?thesis

by (*fastsimp split: split-if-asm*)

qed

next

 case *None*

note x - l -*None* = *this*

show ?thesis

```

proof (cases delete x r)
  case (Some r')
  with Node.hyps
  have set-of r'  $\subseteq$  set-of r
    by simp
  with Some x-l-None del
  show ?thesis
    by (fastsimp split: split-if-asm)
next
  case None
  with x-l-None del
  show ?thesis
    by (fastsimp split: split-if-asm)
qed
qed
qed

lemma delete-Some-all-distinct:
 $\bigwedge t'. \llbracket \text{delete } x \ t = \text{Some } t'; \text{ all-distinct } t \rrbracket \implies \text{all-distinct } t'$ 
proof (induct t)
  case Tip thus ?case by simp
next
  case (Node l y d r)
  have del: delete x (Node l y d r) = Some t' by fact
  have all-distinct (Node l y d r) by fact
  then obtain
    dist-l: all-distinct l and
    dist-r: all-distinct r and
    d:  $d \vee (y \notin \text{set-of } l \wedge y \notin \text{set-of } r)$  and
    dist-l-r: set-of l  $\cap$  set-of r = {}
    by auto
  show ?case
  proof (cases delete x l)
    case (Some l')
    note x-l-Some = this
    from Node.hyps (1) [OF Some dist-l]
    have dist-l': all-distinct l'
      by simp
    from delete-Some-set-of [OF x-l-Some]
    have l'-l: set-of l'  $\subseteq$  set-of l.
    show ?thesis
    proof (cases delete x r)
      case (Some r')
      from Node.hyps (2) [OF Some dist-r]
      have dist-r': all-distinct r'
        by simp
      from delete-Some-set-of [OF Some]
      have set-of r'  $\subseteq$  set-of r.

```

```

    with  $\text{dist-}l' \text{ dist-}r' \text{ } l'-l \text{ Some } x\text{-}l\text{-Some del } d \text{ dist-}l\text{-}r$ 
    show ?thesis
      by fastsimp
  next
    case None
    with  $l'-l \text{ dist-}l' \text{ } x\text{-}l\text{-Some del } d \text{ dist-}l\text{-}r \text{ dist-}r$ 
    show ?thesis
      by fastsimp
  qed
next
  case None
  note  $x\text{-}l\text{-None} = \text{this}$ 
  show ?thesis
  proof (cases delete  $x$   $r$ )
    case (Some  $r'$ )
    with Node.hyps (2) [OF Some  $\text{dist-}r$ ]
    have  $\text{dist-}r'$ : all-distinct  $r'$ 
      by simp
    from delete-Some-set-of [OF Some]
    have  $\text{set-of } r' \subseteq \text{set-of } r$ .
    with Some  $\text{dist-}r' \text{ } x\text{-}l\text{-None del dist-}l \text{ } d \text{ dist-}l\text{-}r$ 
    show ?thesis
      by fastsimp
  next
    case None
    with  $x\text{-}l\text{-None del dist-}l \text{ dist-}r \text{ } d \text{ dist-}l\text{-}r$ 
    show ?thesis
      by (fastsimp split: split-if-asm)
  qed
qed
qed
qed

lemma delete-None-set-of-conv: delete  $x$   $t = \text{None} = (x \notin \text{set-of } t)$ 
proof (induct  $t$ )
  case Tip thus ?case by simp
next
  case (Node  $l \text{ } y \text{ } d \text{ } r$ )
  thus ?case
    by (auto split: option.splits)
qed

lemma delete-Some- $x$ -set-of:
 $\bigwedge t'. \text{delete } x \text{ } t = \text{Some } t' \implies x \in \text{set-of } t \wedge x \notin \text{set-of } t'$ 
proof (induct  $t$ )
  case Tip thus ?case by simp
next
  case (Node  $l \text{ } y \text{ } d \text{ } r$ )
  have del: delete  $x$  (Node  $l \text{ } y \text{ } d \text{ } r$ ) = Some  $t'$  by fact
  show ?case

```

```

proof (cases delete x l)
  case (Some l')
    note x-l-Some = this
    from Node.hyps (1) [OF Some]
    obtain x-l:  $x \in \text{set-of } l \text{ } x \notin \text{set-of } l'$ 
      by simp
    show ?thesis
  proof (cases delete x r)
    case (Some r')
      from Node.hyps (2) [OF Some]
      obtain x-r:  $x \in \text{set-of } r \text{ } x \notin \text{set-of } r'$ 
        by simp
      from x-r x-l Some x-l-Some del
      show ?thesis
        by (clarsimp split: split-if-asm)
    next
      case None
      then have  $x \notin \text{set-of } r$ 
        by (simp add: delete-None-set-of-conv)
      with x-l None x-l-Some del
      show ?thesis
        by (clarsimp split: split-if-asm)
    qed
  next
    case None
    note x-l-None = this
    then have x-notin-l:  $x \notin \text{set-of } l$ 
      by (simp add: delete-None-set-of-conv)
    show ?thesis
  proof (cases delete x r)
    case (Some r')
      from Node.hyps (2) [OF Some]
      obtain x-r:  $x \in \text{set-of } r \text{ } x \notin \text{set-of } r'$ 
        by simp
      from x-r x-notin-l Some x-l-None del
      show ?thesis
        by (clarsimp split: split-if-asm)
    next
      case None
      then have  $x \notin \text{set-of } r$ 
        by (simp add: delete-None-set-of-conv)
      with None x-l-None x-notin-l del
      show ?thesis
        by (clarsimp split: split-if-asm)
    qed
  qed
qed

```

```

consts subtract :: 'a tree  $\Rightarrow$  'a tree  $\Rightarrow$  'a tree option
primrec
subtract Tip t = Some t
subtract (Node l x b r) t =
  (case delete x t of
    Some t'  $\Rightarrow$  (case subtract l t' of
      Some t''  $\Rightarrow$  subtract r t''
      | None  $\Rightarrow$  None)
  | None  $\Rightarrow$  None)

lemma subtract-Some-set-of-res:
 $\bigwedge t_2 t. \text{subtract } t_1 t_2 = \text{Some } t \implies \text{set-of } t \subseteq \text{set-of } t_2$ 
proof (induct t1)
  case Tip thus ?case by simp
next
  case (Node l x b r)
  have sub: subtract (Node l x b r) t2 = Some t by fact
  show ?case
proof (cases delete x t2)
  case (Some t2')
  note del-x-Some = this
  from delete-Some-set-of [OF Some]
  have t2'-t2: set-of t2'  $\subseteq$  set-of t2 .
  show ?thesis
proof (cases subtract l t2')
  case (Some t2'')
  note sub-l-Some = this
  from Node.hyps (1) [OF Some]
  have t2''-t2': set-of t2''  $\subseteq$  set-of t2' .
  show ?thesis
proof (cases subtract r t2'')
  case (Some t2''')
  from Node.hyps (2) [OF Some]
  have set-of t2'''  $\subseteq$  set-of t2'' .
  with Some sub-l-Some del-x-Some sub t2''-t2' t2'-t2
  show ?thesis
  by simp
next
  case None
  with del-x-Some sub-l-Some sub
  show ?thesis
  by simp
qed
next
  case None
  with del-x-Some sub
  show ?thesis
  by simp
qed

```



```

next
  case None
  with sub show ?thesis by simp
qed
qed

lemma subtract-Some-set-of:
   $\bigwedge t_2 t. \text{subtract } t_1 \ t_2 = \text{Some } t \implies \text{set-of } t_1 \subseteq \text{set-of } t_2$ 
proof (induct t1)
  case Tip thus ?case by simp
next
  case (Node l x d r)
  have sub: subtract (Node l x d r) t2 = Some t by fact
  show ?case
  proof (cases delete x t2)
    case (Some t2')
    note del-x-Some = this
    from delete-Some-set-of [OF Some]
    have t2'-t2: set-of t2'  $\subseteq$  set-of t2 .
    from delete-None-set-of-conv [of x t2] Some
    have x-t2: x  $\in$  set-of t2
    by simp
    show ?thesis
    proof (cases subtract l t2')
      case (Some t2'')
      note sub-l-Some = this
      from Node.hyps (1) [OF Some]
      have l-t2': set-of l  $\subseteq$  set-of t2' .
      from subtract-Some-set-of-res [OF Some]
      have t2''-t2': set-of t2''  $\subseteq$  set-of t2' .
      show ?thesis
      proof (cases subtract r t2'')
        case (Some t2''')
        from Node.hyps (2) [OF Some]
        have r-t2'': set-of r  $\subseteq$  set-of t2'' .
        from Some sub-l-Some del-x-Some sub r-t2'' l-t2' t2'-t2 t2''-t2' x-t2
        show ?thesis
        by auto
      next
        case None
        with del-x-Some sub-l-Some sub
        show ?thesis
        by simp
      qed
    qed
  next
    case None
    with del-x-Some sub
    show ?thesis
    by simp
  qed
next
  case None
  with del-x-Some sub
  show ?thesis
  by simp

```

```

    qed
  next
    case None
    with sub show ?thesis by simp
  qed
qed

lemma subtract-Some-all-distinct-res:
   $\bigwedge t_2 t. \llbracket \text{subtract } t_1 \ t_2 = \text{Some } t; \text{all-distinct } t_2 \rrbracket \implies \text{all-distinct } t$ 
proof (induct  $t_1$ )
  case Tip thus ?case by simp
next
  case (Node  $l \ x \ d \ r$ )
  have sub:  $\text{subtract } (\text{Node } l \ x \ d \ r) \ t_2 = \text{Some } t$  by fact
  have dist-t2:  $\text{all-distinct } t_2$  by fact
  show ?case
  proof (cases delete  $x \ t_2$ )
    case (Some  $t_2'$ )
    note del-x-Some = this
    from delete-Some-all-distinct [OF Some dist-t2]
    have dist-t2':  $\text{all-distinct } t_2'$ .
    show ?thesis
    proof (cases subtract  $l \ t_2'$ )
      case (Some  $t_2''$ )
      note sub-l-Some = this
      from Node.hyps (1) [OF Some dist-t2']
      have dist-t2'':  $\text{all-distinct } t_2''$ .
      show ?thesis
      proof (cases subtract  $r \ t_2''$ )
        case (Some  $t_2'''$ )
        from Node.hyps (2) [OF Some dist-t2'']
        have dist-t2''':  $\text{all-distinct } t_2'''$ .
        from Some sub-l-Some del-x-Some sub
          dist-t2'''
        show ?thesis
        by simp
      next
        case None
        with del-x-Some sub-l-Some sub
        show ?thesis
        by simp
      qed
    next
      case None
      with del-x-Some sub
      show ?thesis
      by simp
    qed
  next
    case None
    with del-x-Some sub
    show ?thesis
    by simp
  qed
next

```

```

    case None
    with sub show ?thesis by simp
  qed
qed

lemma subtract-Some-dist-res:
   $\bigwedge t_2 t. \text{subtract } t_1 \ t_2 = \text{Some } t \implies \text{set-of } t_1 \cap \text{set-of } t = \{\}$ 
proof (induct t1)
  case Tip thus ?case by simp
next
  case (Node l x d r)
  have sub: subtract (Node l x d r) t2 = Some t by fact
  show ?case
  proof (cases delete x t2)
    case (Some t2')
    note del-x-Some = this
    from delete-Some-x-set-of [OF Some]
    obtain x-t2:  $x \in \text{set-of } t_2$  and x-not-t2':  $x \notin \text{set-of } t_2'$ 
    by simp
    from delete-Some-set-of [OF Some]
    have t2'-t2:  $\text{set-of } t_2' \subseteq \text{set-of } t_2$  .
    show ?thesis
    proof (cases subtract l t2')
      case (Some t2'')
      note sub-l-Some = this
      from Node.hyps (1) [OF Some]
      have dist-l-t2'':  $\text{set-of } l \cap \text{set-of } t_2'' = \{\}$  .
      from subtract-Some-set-of-res [OF Some]
      have t2''-t2':  $\text{set-of } t_2'' \subseteq \text{set-of } t_2'$  .
      show ?thesis
      proof (cases subtract r t2'')
        case (Some t2'')
        from Node.hyps (2) [OF Some]
        have dist-r-t2''':  $\text{set-of } r \cap \text{set-of } t_2''' = \{\}$  .
        from subtract-Some-set-of-res [OF Some]
        have t2'''-t2'':  $\text{set-of } t_2''' \subseteq \text{set-of } t_2''$  .

        from Some sub-l-Some del-x-Some sub t2'''-t2'' dist-l-t2'' dist-r-t2'''
          t2''-t2' t2'-t2 x-not-t2'
        show ?thesis
        by auto
      next
        case None
        with del-x-Some sub-l-Some sub
        show ?thesis
        by simp
      qed
    next
  qed

```

```

    case None
    with del-x-Some sub
    show ?thesis
    by simp
qed
next
case None
with sub show ?thesis by simp
qed
qed

lemma subtract-Some-all-distinct:
 $\bigwedge t_2 t. \llbracket \text{subtract } t_1 \ t_2 = \text{Some } t; \text{all-distinct } t_2 \rrbracket \implies \text{all-distinct } t_1$ 
proof (induct t1)
case Tip thus ?case by simp
next
case (Node l x d r)
have sub: subtract (Node l x d r) t2 = Some t by fact
have dist-t2: all-distinct t2 by fact
show ?case
proof (cases delete x t2)
case (Some t2')
note del-x-Some = this
from delete-Some-all-distinct [OF Some dist-t2]
have dist-t2': all-distinct t2'.
from delete-Some-set-of [OF Some]
have t2'-t2: set-of t2'  $\subseteq$  set-of t2.
from delete-Some-x-set-of [OF Some]
obtain x-t2: x  $\in$  set-of t2 and x-not-t2': x  $\notin$  set-of t2'
by simp

show ?thesis
proof (cases subtract l t2')
case (Some t2'')
note sub-l-Some = this
from Node.hyps (1) [OF Some dist-t2']
have dist-l: all-distinct l.
from subtract-Some-all-distinct-res [OF Some dist-t2']
have dist-t2'': all-distinct t2''.
from subtract-Some-set-of [OF Some]
have l-t2': set-of l  $\subseteq$  set-of t2'.
from subtract-Some-set-of-res [OF Some]
have t2''-t2': set-of t2''  $\subseteq$  set-of t2'.
from subtract-Some-dist-res [OF Some]
have dist-l-t2'': set-of l  $\cap$  set-of t2'' = {}.
show ?thesis
proof (cases subtract r t2'')
case (Some t2'')
from Node.hyps (2) [OF Some dist-t2'']

```

```

    have dist-r: all-distinct r .
    from subtract-Some-set-of [OF Some]
    have r-t2'': set-of r  $\subseteq$  set-of t2'' .
    from subtract-Some-dist-res [OF Some]
    have dist-r-t2''': set-of r  $\cap$  set-of t2''' = {}.

    from dist-l dist-r Some sub-l-Some del-x-Some r-t2'' l-t2' x-t2 x-not-t2'
      t2''-t2' dist-l-t2'' dist-r-t2'''
    show ?thesis
      by auto
  next
    case None
    with del-x-Some sub-l-Some sub
    show ?thesis
      by simp
  qed
next
  case None
  with del-x-Some sub
  show ?thesis
    by simp
  qed
next
  case None
  with sub show ?thesis by simp
qed
qed

```

```

lemma delete-left:
  assumes dist: all-distinct (Node l y d r)
  assumes del-l: delete x l = Some l'
  shows delete x (Node l y d r) = Some (Node l' y d r)
proof -
  from delete-Some-x-set-of [OF del-l]
  obtain x  $\in$  set-of l
    by simp
  moreover with dist
  have delete x r = None
    by (cases delete x r) (auto dest:delete-Some-x-set-of)

  ultimately
  show ?thesis
    using del-l dist
    by (auto split: option.splits)
qed

```

```

lemma delete-right:
  assumes dist: all-distinct (Node l y d r)

```

```

    assumes del-r: delete x r = Some r'
    shows delete x (Node l y d r) = Some (Node l y d r')
  proof -
    from delete-Some-x-set-of [OF del-r]
    obtain x ∈ set-of r
      by simp
    moreover with dist
    have delete x l = None
      by (cases delete x l) (auto dest:delete-Some-x-set-of)

    ultimately
    show ?thesis
      using del-r dist
      by (auto split: option.splits)
  qed

```

```

lemma delete-root:
  assumes dist: all-distinct (Node l x False r)
  shows delete x (Node l x False r) = Some (Node l x True r)
  proof -
    from dist have delete x r = None
      by (cases delete x r) (auto dest:delete-Some-x-set-of)
    moreover
    from dist have delete x l = None
      by (cases delete x l) (auto dest:delete-Some-x-set-of)
    ultimately show ?thesis
      using dist
      by (auto split: option.splits)
  qed

```

```

lemma subtract-Node:
  assumes del: delete x t = Some t'
  assumes sub-l: subtract l t' = Some t''
  assumes sub-r: subtract r t'' = Some t'''
  shows subtract (Node l x False r) t = Some t'''
  using del sub-l sub-r
  by simp

```

```

lemma subtract-Tip: subtract Tip t = Some t
  by simp

```

Now we have all the theorems in place that are needed for the certificate generating ML functions.

```

use distinct-tree-prover.ML

```

```

end

```

3 State Space Representation as Function

theory *StateFun* **imports** *DistinctTreeProver*
begin

The state space is represented as a function from names to values. We neither fix the type of names nor the type of values. We define lookup and update functions and provide simprocs that simplify expressions containing these, similar to HOL-records.

The lookup and update function get constructor/destructor functions as parameters. These are used to embed various HOL-types into the abstract value type. Conceptually the abstract value type is a sum of all types that we attempt to store in the state space.

The update is actually generalized to a map function. The map supplies better compositionality, especially if you think of nested state spaces.

definition *K-statefun* :: $'a \Rightarrow 'b \Rightarrow 'a$ **where** $K\text{-statefun } c \ x \equiv c$

lemma *K-statefun-apply* [simp]: $K\text{-statefun } c \ x = c$
by (simp add: *K-statefun-def*)

lemma *K-statefun-comp* [simp]: $(K\text{-statefun } c \circ f) = K\text{-statefun } c$
by (rule ext) (simp add: *K-statefun-apply comp-def*)

lemma *K-statefun-cong* [cong]: $K\text{-statefun } c \ x = K\text{-statefun } c \ x$
by (rule refl)

definition *lookup*:: $('v \Rightarrow 'a) \Rightarrow 'n \Rightarrow ('n \Rightarrow 'v) \Rightarrow 'a$
where $lookup \ destr \ n \ s = destr \ (s \ n)$

definition *update*::
 $('v \Rightarrow 'a1) \Rightarrow ('a2 \Rightarrow 'v) \Rightarrow 'n \Rightarrow ('a1 \Rightarrow 'a2) \Rightarrow ('n \Rightarrow 'v) \Rightarrow ('n \Rightarrow 'v)$
where $update \ destr \ constr \ n \ f \ s = s(n := constr \ (f \ (destr \ (s \ n))))$

lemma *lookup-update-same*:
 $(\bigwedge v. destr \ (constr \ v) = v) \implies lookup \ destr \ n \ (update \ destr \ constr \ n \ f \ s) =$
 $f \ (destr \ (s \ n))$
by (simp add: *lookup-def update-def*)

lemma *lookup-update-id-same*:
 $lookup \ destr \ n \ (update \ destr' \ id \ n \ (K\text{-statefun} \ (lookup \ id \ n \ s')) \ s) =$
 $lookup \ destr \ n \ s'$
by (simp add: *lookup-def update-def*)

lemma *lookup-update-other*:
 $n \neq m \implies lookup \ destr \ n \ (update \ destr' \ constr \ m \ f \ s) = lookup \ destr \ n \ s$

```

by (simp add: lookup-def update-def)

lemma id-id-cancel: id (id x) = x
  by (simp add: id-def)

lemma destr-const-str-comp-id:
  ( $\bigwedge v. \text{destr } (\text{const } v) = v$ )  $\implies \text{destr} \circ \text{const} = \text{id}$ 
  by (rule ext) simp

lemma block-conj-cong:  $(P \wedge Q) = (P \wedge Q)$ 
  by simp

lemma conj1-False:  $(P \equiv \text{False}) \implies (P \wedge Q) \equiv \text{False}$ 
  by simp

lemma conj2-False:  $\llbracket Q \equiv \text{False} \rrbracket \implies (P \wedge Q) \equiv \text{False}$ 
  by simp

lemma conj-True:  $\llbracket P \equiv \text{True}; Q \equiv \text{True} \rrbracket \implies (P \wedge Q) \equiv \text{True}$ 
  by simp

lemma conj-cong:  $\llbracket P \equiv P'; Q \equiv Q' \rrbracket \implies (P \wedge Q) \equiv (P' \wedge Q')$ 
  by simp

lemma update-apply:  $(\text{update destr constr } n \ f \ s \ x) =$ 
   $(\text{if } x=n \text{ then constr } (f \ (\text{destr } (s \ n))) \text{ else } s \ x)$ 
  by (simp add: update-def)

lemma ex-id:  $\exists x. \text{id } x = y$ 
  by (simp add: id-def)

lemma swap-ex-eq:
   $\exists s. f \ s = x \equiv \text{True} \implies$ 
   $\exists s. x = f \ s \equiv \text{True}$ 
  apply (rule eq-reflection)
  apply auto
  done

lemmas meta-ext = eq-reflection [OF ext]

lemma update d c n (K-statespace (lookup d n s)) s = s
  apply (simp add: update-def lookup-def)
  apply (rule ext)
  apply simp

```


oops

end

4 Setup for State Space Locales

```
theory StateSpaceLocale imports StateFun  
uses state-space.ML state-fun.ML  
begin
```

```
setup StateFun.setup
```

For every type that is to be stored in a state space, an instance of this locale is imported in order convert the abstract and concrete values.

```
locale project-inject =  
  fixes project :: 'value  $\Rightarrow$  'a  
  and inject:: 'a  $\Rightarrow$  'value  
  assumes project-inject-cancel [statefun-simp]: project (inject x) = x
```

```
lemma (in project-inject)  
  ex-project [statefun-simp]:  $\exists v. \text{project } v = x$   
  apply (rule-tac x= inject x in exI)  
  apply (simp add: project-inject-cancel)  
  done
```

```
lemma (in project-inject)  
  project-inject-comp-id [statefun-simp]: project  $\circ$  inject = id  
  by (rule ext) (simp add: project-inject-cancel)
```

```
lemma (in project-inject)  
  project-inject-comp-cancel[statefun-simp]: f  $\circ$  project  $\circ$  inject = f  
  by (rule ext) (simp add: project-inject-cancel)
```

end

5 Syntax for State Space Lookup and Update

```
theory StateSpaceSyntax  
imports StateSpaceLocale
```

```
begin
```

The state space syntax is kept in an extra theory so that you can choose if you want to use it or not.

```
syntax
```

```

-statespace-lookup :: ('a ⇒ 'b) ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'c (--- [60, 60] 60)
-statespace-update :: ('a ⇒ 'b) ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'c ⇒ ('a ⇒ 'b)
-statespace-updates :: ('a ⇒ 'b) ⇒ updbinds ⇒ ('a ⇒ 'b) (-<-> [900, 0] 900)

```

translations

```

-statespace-updates f (-updbinds b bs) ==
  -statespace-updates (-statespace-updates f b) bs
s<x:=y> == -statespace-update s x y

```

parse-translation (advanced)

```

⟨⟨
  [(@{syntax-const -statespace-lookup}, StateSpace.lookup-tr),
   (@{syntax-const -statespace-update}, StateSpace.update-tr)]
⟩⟩

```

print-translation (advanced)

```

⟨⟨
  [(@{const-syntax lookup}, StateSpace.lookup-tr'),
   (@{const-syntax update}, StateSpace.update-tr')]
⟩⟩

```

end

6 Examples

```

theory StateSpaceEx
imports StateSpaceLocale StateSpaceSyntax

```

begin

Did you ever dream about records with multiple inheritance. Then you should definitely have a look at statespaces. They may be what you are dreaming of. Or at least almost...

Isabelle allows to add new top-level commands to the system. Building on the locale infrastructure, we provide a command **statespace** like this:

```

statespace vars =
  n::nat
  b::bool

print-locale vars-namespace
print-locale vars-valuetypes
print-locale vars

```

This resembles a **record** definition, but introduces sophisticated locale in-

frastructure instead of HOL type schemes. The resulting context postulates two distinct names n and b and projection / injection functions that convert from abstract values to nat and $bool$. The logical content of the locale is:

```

locale vars' =
  fixes n::'name and b::'name
  assumes distinct [n, b]

  fixes project-nat::'value  $\Rightarrow$  nat and inject-nat::nat  $\Rightarrow$  'value
  assumes  $\bigwedge n. project\text{-}nat\ (inject\text{-}nat\ n) = n$ 

  fixes project-bool::'value  $\Rightarrow$  bool and inject-bool::bool  $\Rightarrow$  'value
  assumes  $\bigwedge b. project\text{-}bool\ (inject\text{-}bool\ b) = b$ 

```

The HOL predicate *distinct* describes distinctness of all names in the context. Locale *vars'* defines the raw logical content that is defined in the state space locale. We also maintain non-logical context information to support the user:

- Syntax for state lookup and updates that automatically inserts the corresponding projection and injection functions.
- Setup for the proof tools that exploit the distinctness information and the cancellation of projections and injections in deductions and simplifications.

This extra-logical information is added to the locale in form of declarations, which associate the name of a variable to the corresponding projection and injection functions to handle the syntax transformations, and a link from the variable name to the corresponding distinctness theorem. As state spaces are merged or extended there are multiple distinctness theorems in the context. Our declarations take care that the link always points to the strongest distinctness assumption. With these declarations in place, a lookup can be written as $s \cdot n$, which is translated to $project\text{-}nat\ (s\ n)$, and an update as $s \langle n := 2 \rangle$, which is translated to $s(n := inject\text{-}nat\ 2)$. We can now establish the following lemma:

lemma (in vars) foo: $s \langle n := 2 \rangle \cdot b = s \cdot b$ **by** simp

Here the simplifier was able to refer to distinctness of b and n to solve the equation. The resulting lemma is also recorded in locale *vars* for later use and is automatically propagated to all its interpretations. Here is another example:

statespace 'a varsX = vars [n=N, b=B] + vars + x::'a

The state space *varsX* imports two copies of the state space *vars*, where one has the variables renamed to upper-case letters, and adds another variable x

of type $'a$. This type is fixed inside the state space but may get instantiated later on, analogous to type parameters of an ML-functor. The distinctness assumption is now *distinct* $[N, B, n, b, x]$, from this we can derive both *distinct* $[N, B]$ and *distinct* $[n, b]$, the distinction assumptions for the two versions of locale *vars* above. Moreover we have all necessary projection and injection assumptions available. These assumptions together allow us to establish state space *varsX* as an interpretation of both instances of locale *vars*. Hence we inherit both variants of theorem *foo*: $s\langle N := 2 \rangle \cdot B = s \cdot B$ as well as $s\langle n := 2 \rangle \cdot b = s \cdot b$. These are immediate consequences of the locale interpretation action.

The declarations for syntax and the distinctness theorems also observe the morphisms generated by the locale package due to the renaming $n = N$:

lemma (in *varsX*) *foo*: $s\langle N := 2 \rangle \cdot x = s \cdot x$ **by** *simp*

To assure scalability towards many distinct names, the distinctness predicate is refined to operate on balanced trees. Thus we get logarithmic certificates for the distinctness of two names by the distinctness of the paths in the tree. Asked for the distinctness of two names, our tool produces the paths of the variables in the tree (this is implemented in SML, outside the logic) and returns a certificate corresponding to the different paths. Merging state spaces requires to prove that the combined distinctness assumption implies the distinctness assumptions of the components. Such a proof is of the order $m \cdot \log n$, where n and m are the number of nodes in the larger and smaller tree, respectively.

We continue with more examples.

statespace $'a$ *foo* =
 $f :: nat \Rightarrow nat$
 $a :: int$
 $b :: nat$
 $c :: 'a$

lemma (in *foo*) *foo1*:
shows $s\langle a := i \rangle \cdot a = i$
by *simp*

lemma (in *foo*) *foo2*:
shows $(s\langle a := i \rangle) \cdot a = i$
by *simp*

lemma (in *foo*) *foo3*:
shows $(s\langle a := i \rangle) \cdot b = s \cdot b$
by *simp*

```

lemma (in foo) foo4:
  shows ( $s\langle a:=i, b:=j, c:=k, a:=x \rangle = (s\langle b:=j, c:=k, a:=x \rangle)$ )
  by simp

```

```

statespace bar =
  b::bool
  c::string

```

```

lemma (in bar) bar1:
  shows ( $s\langle b:=True \rangle \cdot c = s \cdot c$ )
  by simp

```

You can define a derived state space by inheriting existing state spaces, renaming of components if you like, and by declaring new components.

```

statespace ('a, 'b) loo = 'a foo + bar [b=B, c=C] +
  X::'b

```

```

lemma (in loo) loo1:
  shows ( $s\langle a:=i \rangle \cdot B = s \cdot B$ )
proof –
  thm foo1

```

The Lemma *foo1* from the parent state space is also available here:

$$?s\langle a := ?i \rangle \cdot a = ?i$$

.

```

have  $s\langle a:=i \rangle \cdot a = i$ 
  by (rule foo1)
thm bar1

```

Note the renaming of the parameters in Lemma *bar1*:

$$?s\langle B := True \rangle \cdot C = ?s \cdot C$$

.

```

have  $s\langle B:=True \rangle \cdot C = s \cdot C$ 
  by (rule bar1)
show ?thesis
  by simp
qed

```

```

statespace 'a dup = 'a foo [f=F, a=A] + 'a foo +
  x::int

```

```

lemma (in dup)
shows ( $s\langle a := i \rangle \cdot x = s \cdot x$ )
by simp

```

```
lemma (in dup)  
shows  $s < A := i > \cdot a = s \cdot a$   
by simp
```

```
lemma (in dup)  
shows  $s < A := i > \cdot x = s \cdot x$   
by simp
```

Hmm, I hoped this would work now...

There are known problems with syntax-declarations. They currently only work, when the context is already built. Hopefully this will be implemented correctly in future Isabelle versions.

It would be nice to have nested state spaces. This is logically no problem. From the locale-implementation side this may be something like an 'includes' into a locale. When there is a more elaborate locale infrastructure in place this may be an easy exercise.

end