

CS3234 – Logic for Proofs and Programs  
AY24/25, Y2S2  
Notes

**Sim Ray En Ryan** (A0273780X, e1123183@u.nus.edu)

December 3, 2025

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Soundness, Completeness, and Functional Programming</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Soundness and Completeness . . . . .	4
1.2	Functional Programming . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Accumulators, Polymorphism, and Logical Statements</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Accumulators . . . . .	4
2.2	Polymorphism . . . . .	4
2.3	Logical Statements . . . . .	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Formal Proofs</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Informal proofs . . . . .	4
3.2	The intro tactic . . . . .	4
3.3	The revert tactic . . . . .	4
3.4	Formal proofs in tCPA . . . . .	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Proofs with Structural Induction</b>	<b>4</b>
4.1	The rewrite tactic . . . . .	4
4.2	The exists tactic . . . . .	4
4.3	Structural induction over binary trees . . . . .	4
<b>5</b>	<b>Week 5</b>	<b>4</b>
5.1	Leibniz Equality . . . . .	4
5.1.1	Reflexivity . . . . .	5
5.1.2	Symmetry . . . . .	5
5.1.3	Transitivity . . . . .	5
5.2	The clear tactic . . . . .	5
5.3	Using specifications to state other specifications . . . . .	5
5.4	More on soundness and completeness . . . . .	5
5.4.1	Eureka Lemma . . . . .	5
5.4.2	The injection tactic . . . . .	5
5.4.3	The discriminate tactic . . . . .	5
5.4.4	The contradiction tactic . . . . .	6
5.5	Proving Correctness of Unit Tests . . . . .	6
5.5.1	The compute tactic . . . . .	6
5.6	Backward and forward proofs . . . . .	6
5.7	The fold and unfold tactics . . . . .	6
<b>6</b>	<b>Structuring Proofs</b>	<b>7</b>

<b>7</b>	<b>Lists in tCPA</b>	<b>7</b>
7.1	Equality Predicate for lists . . . . .	7
7.2	Length . . . . .	7
7.3	Copy . . . . .	7
7.4	Append . . . . .	7
7.5	Reverse . . . . .	7
7.6	Map . . . . .	7
7.7	List Fold Functions . . . . .	8
7.7.1	Sketches of LFR and LFL . . . . .	8
7.7.2	Function implemented using LFR and LFL . . . . .	8
7.7.3	Properties proven about LFR and LFL . . . . .	9
<b>8</b>	<b>Existential Proofs</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Resetting the accumulator</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Isometries in the equilateral triangle</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Streams and Lazy Lists</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Observational Equivalence and coinduction</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Extracting programs from proofs and Delimited Continuations</b>	<b>9</b>

# 1 Soundness, Completeness, and Functional Programming

## 1.1 Soundness and Completeness

## 1.2 Functional Programming

# 2 Accumulators, Polymorphism, and Logical Statements

## 2.1 Accumulators

## 2.2 Polymorphism

## 2.3 Logical Statements

# 3 Formal Proofs

## 3.1 Informal proofs

## 3.2 The intro tactic

## 3.3 The revert tactic

## 3.4 Formal proofs in tCPA

# 4 Proofs with Structural Induction

## 4.1 The rewrite tactic

## 4.2 The exists tactic

## 4.3 Structural induction over binary trees

# 5 Week 5

## 5.1 Leibniz Equality

When there is an  $=$ , both sides can be equivalent using:

- Reflexivity
- Symmetry
- Transitivity

### 5.1.1 Reflexivity

$\forall A, A = A$  reflexivity

### 5.1.2 Symmetry

$A = B \Rightarrow B = A$  symmetry in  $H_j : j = 1$

### 5.1.3 Transitivity

## 5.2 The clear tactic

## 5.3 Using specifications to state other specifications

For example, the recursive specification of multiplication relies on the recursive specification of addition.

## 5.4 More on soundness and completeness

**Soundness:**  $\text{add } i \ j = k \rightarrow k = i + j$

**Completeness:**  $i + j = k \rightarrow k = \text{add } i \ j$

### 5.4.1 Eureka Lemma

```
Lemma about_a_recursive_addition :  
  forall add : nat -> nat -> nat,  
    recursive_specification_of_addition add ->  
    forall i j : nat,  
      add i j = i + j.
```

This lemma can be proved by induction, and makes two propositions about soundness and completeness that follow.

### 5.4.2 The injection tactic

Creates a chain of implications about a pair, depth first, from left to right.

`injection H_ij as H_i H_j.`

### 5.4.3 The discriminate tactic

Used when an assumption is an equality involving distinct data constructors  $0 = 1$ . Since 0 is O and 1 is S (O), they use different constructors and can thus be discriminated. Now that the hypothesis is false, the implication is vacuously true.

#### 5.4.4 The contradiction tactic

Used when an assumption can imply false. Once that is done, the discriminate tactic can be used to prove. Note that this is not related to proof by contradiction.

### 5.5 Proving Correctness of Unit Tests

Unit tests are sound whenever they always succeed for an implementation that satisfies the specification of the function to test. Unit test functions are sound if it succeeds given a function that satisfies the given specification.

#### 5.5.1 The compute tactic

Use it to compute mathematical equations, such as `(2 =? 2) && (2 =? 2) && (4 =? 4)` to `true`. It systematically unfolds all functions that are called, then simplifies it.

### 5.6 Backward and forward proofs

Usually, proofs are proved backward in tCPA (from final goal to initial hypothesis).

- Backwards

```
– apply H_C_implies_D. -> C
– apply H_B_implies_C. -> B
– apply H_C_implies_D. -> A
– apply H_A -> QED
```

- Forwards

```
– assert (H_B := H_A_implies_B H_A).
– assert (H_C := H_B_implies_C H_B).
– exact (H_C_implies_D H_C).
```

### 5.7 The fold and unfold tactics

Use `fold_unfold_tactic`, but only in the proofs of fold-unfold lemmas.

## 6 Structuring Proofs

## 7 Lists in tCPA

### 7.1 Equality Predicate for lists

Is sound and complete given the completeness and soundness of the equality predicate of  $V$ .

### 7.2 Length

Can be implemented recursively using  $S (\text{length } vs')$ , or with an accumulator  $\text{length\_acc } vs' (S a)$ .

### 7.3 Copy

Can be implemented recursively using  $v :: \text{copy } vs'$ , or simply by returning  $vs$ . Copy is idempotent, meaning that applying it twice, or any amount of times, is the same as applying it once. In the case of copy, it is also the same as applying it zero times since it is its own inverse. Copying a list preserves its length, and in tCPA, is exactly the same. This is not true for languages that can have references to two different objects.

### 7.4 Append

Implemented using  $v1 :: \text{append } v1s' v2s$ . Nil is left and right neutral for append, is associative, but not commutative. It commutes with copy. Concatenating two lists preserves the length of the sum of the two lists.  $\text{append } vs \text{ nil}$  is the same as copy, and  $\text{append nil } vs$  is the same as simple copy.

### 7.5 Reverse

Implemented recursively using  $\text{append } (\text{reverse } vs) (v :: \text{nil})$ . It is involuntary, meaning that applying it twice produces the original value. Reversing a list preserves its length, and commutes with append. A accumulator version can be implemented using  $\text{reverse\_} vs' (v :: a)$ .

### 7.6 Map

Implemented recursively using  $f v :: \text{map } f vs'$ . Can implement the copy function using an identity function for  $f$ . It preserves length, and is commutative with list append, list reverse.

## 7.7 List Fold Functions

LFR is also known as reduce, and LFL is also known as accumulate. LFR traverses a list recursively, while LFL traverses a list tail recursively with an accumulator.

```
Fixpoint list_fold_right (V W : Type) (nil_case : W) (cons_case : V -> W -> W) (vs :
  list V) : W :=
  match vs with
  | nil =>
    nil_case
  | v :: vs' =>
    cons_case v (list_fold_right V W nil_case cons_case vs')
  end.
```

```
Fixpoint list_fold_left (V W : Type) (nil_case : W) (cons_case : V -> W -> W) (vs :
  list V) : W :=
  match vs with
  | nil =>
    nil_case
  | v :: vs' =>
    list_fold_left V W (cons_case v nil_case) cons_case vs'
  end.
```

Both functions take in two types  $V$  and  $W$ , a nil case of type  $W$ , and a cons case which is a function that takes in a  $V$  and  $W$  and outputs a  $W$ , and a list containing elements of type  $V$ . The idea of both functions is to take an element of the list (from the right or the left respectively), transform the nil case into something else of type  $W$  based on the element and cons case.

### 7.7.1 Sketches of LFR and LFL

**LFR**  $\text{LFR } n \ c \ [v1, v2, v3, \text{nil}] = c \ v1 \ (c \ v2 \ (c \ v3 \ n))$

**Length with LFR**  $\text{LFR } 0 \ (v \ n: S \ n) \ [v1, v2, v3, \text{nil}] = 3$

**LFL**  $\text{LFL } n \ c \ [v1, v2, v3, \text{nil}] = c \ v3 \ (c \ v2 \ (c \ v1 \ n))$

**Length with LFL**  $\text{LFR } 0 \ (v \ n: S \ n) \ [v1, v2, v3, \text{nil}] = 3$

### 7.7.2 Function implemented using LFR and LFL

**LFR** `list.length`

**LFL** `list.length_acc`



### **7.7.3 Properties proven about LFR and LFL**

If the arguments are the same (such as with list length), then the function is left permutative.

## **8 Existential Proofs**

## **9 Resetting the accumulator**

## **10 Isometries in the equilateral triangle**

## **11 Streams and Lazy Lists**

## **12 Observational Equivalence and coinduction**

## **13 Extracting programs from proofs and Delimited Continuations**