

CS313K: Logic, Sets, and Functions

J Strother Moore
Department of Computer Sciences
University of Texas at Austin

Lecture 14 – Chap 4 (4.6, 4.7, 4.8)

Announcement

The book says problems 194, 199, 215, 216, 219 are due on March 16. Wrong!

They're due on March 23 – the Tuesday after Spring Break.

Lemmas are like methods (!). They allow you to avoid doing the same work repeatedly.

... (app (cons e a) b) ...

\longleftrightarrow {def app}

... (if (endp (cons e a))
 b
 (cons (first (cons e a))
 (app (rest (cons e a)) b))) ...

\longleftrightarrow {endp-cons}

... (if nil
 b
 (cons (first (cons e a))
 (app (rest (cons e a)) b))) ...

\longleftrightarrow {if-ax-2}
 ... (cons (first (cons e a))
 (app (rest (cons e a)) b)) ...
 \longleftrightarrow {first-cons}
 ... (cons e
 (app (rest (cons e a)) b)) ...
 \longleftrightarrow {rest-cons}
 ... (cons e
 (app a b)) ...
 ...

You have to repeat this work every time you expand
(app (cons) ...), *unless* you prove the
lemma:

Lemma app-cons:

$$(\text{app } (\text{cons } x \ y) \ z) = (\text{cons } x \ (\text{app } y \ z))$$

... (app (cons e a) b) ...	
↔	{def app}
... (if (endp (cons e a)) ...) ...	
↔	{endp-cons}
... (if nil ...) ...	
↔	{if-ax-2}
... (cons (first (cons e a)) ...) ...	
↔	{first-cons}
... (cons e (app (rest (cons e a)) b)) ...	
↔	{rest-cons}
... (cons e (app a b)) ...	
...	

... (app (cons e a) b) ...

\longleftrightarrow

... (cons e (app a b)) ...

...

{app-cons}

In your homework, use lemmas! Don't just grind out the same sequence of steps over and over again.

Proof Advice

“Promote and Forward Chain!”

$((A \rightarrow (B \wedge C))$

\wedge

$(B \rightarrow D)$

\wedge

$(C \rightarrow E))$

\rightarrow

$(A \rightarrow (D \wedge E))$

Writing Down Cases

Suppose you want to prove γ using a case split justified by $\alpha \vee \beta$.

Case 1: $(\alpha \rightarrow \gamma)$

...

Case 2: $(\beta \rightarrow \gamma)$

...

Proving Something by Rewriting to T

Remember, to prove γ you can show how to rewrite γ to t , i.e., you prove $\gamma \leftrightarrow t$.

Writing Down Cases

Suppose you want to prove γ using a case split justified by $\alpha \vee \beta$.

Case 1:

$$(\alpha \rightarrow \gamma)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma')$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma'')$$

...

$$\Leftrightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow t)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow t$$

Case 2: ...

Writing Down Cases

Suppose you want to prove γ using a case split justified by $\alpha \vee \beta$.

Case 1:

$$(\alpha \rightarrow \gamma)$$

$$\iff (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma')$$

$$\iff (\alpha \rightarrow \gamma'')$$

...

$$\iff (\alpha \rightarrow t)$$

$$\iff t$$

Case 2: ...

Writing Down Cases

Suppose you want to prove γ using a case split justified by $\alpha \vee \beta$.

Case 1: α

γ

$\iff \gamma'$

$\iff \gamma''$

...

$\iff t$

Case 2: ...

Writing Down Cases

Suppose you want to prove γ using a case split justified by $\alpha \vee \beta$.

Case 1: α (*Remember: α is a hypothesis!*)

γ

$\longleftrightarrow \gamma'$

$\longleftrightarrow \gamma''$

...

$\longleftrightarrow t$

Case 2: ...

Setup

When I refer to the “basic axioms” below I mean the axioms about `if`, `t`, `nil`, `consp`, `cons`, `first`, `rest`, `endp`, etc in Section 4.3.