

# Fun With Tilings

Tobias Nipkow and Lawrence Paulson

December 12, 2009

## Abstract

Tilings are defined inductively. It is shown that one form of mutilated chess board cannot be tiled with dominoes, while another one can be tiled with L-shaped tiles.

Sections 1 and 2 are by Paulson and described elsewhere [1]. Section 3 is by Nipkow and formalizes a well-known argument from the literature [2].

Please add further fun examples of this kind!

**theory** *Tilings* **imports** *Main* **begin**

## 1 Inductive Tiling

**inductive-set**

*tiling* :: 'a set set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set set

**for** *A* :: 'a set set **where**

*empty* [*simp*, *intro*]:  $\{\} \in \text{tiling } A$  |

*Un* [*simp*, *intro*]:  $\llbracket a \in A; t \in \text{tiling } A; a \cap t = \{\} \rrbracket$   
 $\implies a \cup t \in \text{tiling } A$

**lemma** *tiling-UnI* [*intro*]:

$\llbracket t \in \text{tiling } A; u \in \text{tiling } A; t \cap u = \{\} \rrbracket \implies t \cup u \in \text{tiling } A$   
(*proof*)

**lemma** *tiling-Diff1E*:

**assumes**  $t - a \in \text{tiling } A$  **and**  $a \in A$  **and**  $a \subseteq t$

**shows**  $t \in \text{tiling } A$

(*proof*)

**lemma** *tiling-finite*:

**assumes**  $\bigwedge a. a \in A \implies \text{finite } a$

**shows**  $t \in \text{tiling } A \implies \text{finite } t$

(*proof*)

## 2 The Mutilated Chess Board Cannot be Tiled by Dominoes

The originator of this problem is Max Black, according to J A Robinson. It was popularized as the *Mutilated Checkerboard Problem* by J McCarthy.

**inductive-set** *domino* :: (nat × nat) set set **where**  
*horiz* [*simp*]: {(i, j), (i, Suc j)} ∈ *domino* |  
*vertl* [*simp*]: {(i, j), (Suc i, j)} ∈ *domino*

**lemma** *domino-finite*: d ∈ *domino* ⇒ finite d  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**declare** *tiling-finite*[OF *domino-finite*, *simp*]

Sets of squares of the given colour

**definition**  
*coloured* :: nat ⇒ (nat × nat) set **where**  
*coloured* b = {(i, j). (i + j) mod 2 = b}

**abbreviation**  
*whites* :: (nat × nat) set **where**  
*whites* ≡ *coloured* 0

**abbreviation**  
*blacks* :: (nat × nat) set **where**  
*blacks* ≡ *coloured* (Suc 0)

Chess boards

**lemma** *Sigma-Suc1* [*simp*]:  
 {0..< Suc n} × B = ({n} × B) ∪ ({0..<n} × B)  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *Sigma-Suc2* [*simp*]:  
 A × {0..< Suc n} = (A × {n}) ∪ (A × {0..<n})  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *dominoes-tile-row* [*intro!*]: {i} × {0..< 2\*n} ∈ *tiling domino*  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *dominoes-tile-matrix*: {0..<m} × {0..< 2\*n} ∈ *tiling domino*  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

*coloured* and Dominoes

**lemma** *coloured-insert* [*simp*]:  
*coloured* b ∩ (*insert* (i, j) t) =  
 (if (i + j) mod 2 = b then *insert* (i, j) (*coloured* b ∩ t)  
 else *coloured* b ∩ t)

*<proof>*

**lemma** *domino-singletons*:

$d \in \text{domino} \implies$   
 $(\exists i j. \text{whites} \cap d = \{(i, j)\}) \wedge$   
 $(\exists m n. \text{blacks} \cap d = \{(m, n)\})$

*<proof>*

Tilings of dominoes

**declare**

*Int-Un-distrib* [*simp*]  
*Diff-Int-distrib* [*simp*]

**lemma** *tiling-domino-0-1*:

$t \in \text{tiling domino} \implies \text{card}(\text{whites} \cap t) = \text{card}(\text{blacks} \cap t)$

*<proof>*

Final argument is surprisingly complex

**theorem** *gen-mutil-not-tiling*:

$t \in \text{tiling domino} \implies$   
 $(i + j) \bmod 2 = 0 \implies (m + n) \bmod 2 = 0 \implies$   
 $\{(i, j), (m, n)\} \subseteq t$   
 $\implies (t - \{(i, j)\} - \{(m, n)\}) \notin \text{tiling domino}$

*<proof>*


Apply the general theorem to the well-known case

**theorem** *mutil-not-tiling*:

$t = \{0..< 2 * \text{Suc } m\} \times \{0..< 2 * \text{Suc } n\}$   
 $\implies t - \{(0, 0)\} - \{(\text{Suc } (2 * m), \text{Suc } (2 * n))\} \notin \text{tiling domino}$

*<proof>*

### 3 The Mutilated Chess Board Can be Tiled by Ls

Remove a arbitrary square from a chess board of size  $2^n \times 2^n$ . The result can be tiled by L-shaped tiles: . The four possible L-shaped tiles are obtained by dropping one of the four squares from  $\{(x, y), (x + 1, y), (x, y + 1), (x + 1, y + 1)\}$ :

**definition** *L2*  $(x::\text{nat}) (y::\text{nat}) = \{(x, y), (x+1, y), (x, y+1)\}$

**definition** *L3*  $(x::\text{nat}) (y::\text{nat}) = \{(x, y), (x+1, y), (x+1, y+1)\}$

**definition** *L0*  $(x::\text{nat}) (y::\text{nat}) = \{(x+1, y), (x, y+1), (x+1, y+1)\}$

**definition** *L1*  $(x::\text{nat}) (y::\text{nat}) = \{(x, y), (x, y+1), (x+1, y+1)\}$

All tiles:

**definition** *Ls* ::  $(\text{nat} * \text{nat}) \text{ set set}$  **where**

$Ls \equiv \{ L0 \ x \ y \mid x \ y. \ \text{True} \} \cup \{ L1 \ x \ y \mid x \ y. \ \text{True} \} \cup$   
 $\{ L2 \ x \ y \mid x \ y. \ \text{True} \} \cup \{ L3 \ x \ y \mid x \ y. \ \text{True} \}$

**lemma** *LinLs*:  $L0\ i\ j : Ls \ \&\ L1\ i\ j : Ls \ \&\ L2\ i\ j : Ls \ \&\ L3\ i\ j : Ls$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Square  $2^n \times 2^n$  grid, shifted by  $i$  and  $j$ :

**definition** *square2* ( $n::nat$ ) ( $i::nat$ ) ( $j::nat$ ) =  $\{i..< 2^n+i\} \times \{j..< 2^n+j\}$

**lemma** *in-square2*[*simp*]:

$(a,b) : square2\ n\ i\ j \iff i \leq a \wedge a < 2^n+i \wedge j \leq b \wedge b < 2^n+j$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *square2-Suc*:  $square2\ (Suc\ n)\ i\ j =$

$square2\ n\ i\ j \cup square2\ n\ (2^n + i)\ j \cup square2\ n\ i\ (2^n + j) \cup$   
 $square2\ n\ (2^n + i)\ (2^n + j)$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *square2-disj*:  $square2\ n\ i\ j \cap square2\ n\ x\ y = \{\} \iff$

$(2^n+i \leq x \vee 2^n+x \leq i) \vee (2^n+j \leq y \vee 2^n+y \leq j)$  (**is**  $?A = ?B$ )  
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Some specific lemmas:

**lemma** *pos-pow2*:  $(0::nat) < 2^n(n::nat)$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**declare** *nat-zero-less-power-iff*[*simp del*] *zero-less-power*[*simp del*]

**lemma** *Diff-insert-if*: **shows**

$B \neq \{\} \implies a:A \implies A - insert\ a\ B = (A-B - \{a\})$  **and**  
 $B \neq \{\} \implies a \sim: A \implies A - insert\ a\ B = A-B$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *DisjI1*:  $A\ Int\ B = \{\} \implies (A-X)\ Int\ B = \{\}$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**lemma** *DisjI2*:  $A\ Int\ B = \{\} \implies A\ Int\ (B-X) = \{\}$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

The main theorem:

**declare** [[*max-clauses* = 200]]

**theorem** *Ls-can-tile*:  $i \leq a \implies a < 2^n + i \implies j \leq b \implies b < 2^n + j$   
 $\implies square2\ n\ i\ j - \{(a,b)\} : tiling\ Ls$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**corollary** *Ls-can-tile00*:

$a < 2^n \implies b < 2^n \implies square2\ n\ 0\ 0 - \{(a, b)\} \in tiling\ Ls$   
 ⟨*proof*⟩

**end**

## References

- [1] Lawrence C. Paulson. A simple formalization and proof for the mutilated chess board. *Logic J. of the IGPL*, 9(3), 2001.
- [2] Velleman. *How to Prove it*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.