

Avigad, Heuele, Nawrocki, Logic and mechanized reasoning

Matteo Bianchetti

February 24, 2025

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Mathematical background	3
2.1	Induction and recursion on the natural numbers	3
2.2	Complete induction	4
2.3	Generalized induction and recursion	5
2.4	Invariants	8
2.5	Exercises	9
A	Errata	14

Preface

I solve some exercises and prove some statements from Avigad et al., *Logic and mechanized reasoning* (v 0.1). In the appendix, I list the errata that I have found.

Notation

Chapter 1

Introduction

The authors lists three ideas that, it seems, are jointly found for the first time in the work of Ramon Llull (1232?-1316):¹

1. Symbols can stand for ideas.
2. One can generate complex ideas by combining simpler ones.
3. Mechanical devices can serve as aids to reasoning.

¹The author spells the monk's last name as "Lull".

Chapter 2

Mathematical background

Key concepts:

1. proof by induction (p. 3)
 2. definition by recursion (p. 4)
 3. proof by complete induction (p. 5)
 4. definition by course-of-values recursion (p. 5)
 5. inductive definition (p. 6)
 6. invariant (p. 9)
-

2.1 Induction and recursion on the natural numbers

Theorem 2.1. *The solution to the Towers-of-Hanoi (ToH) problem given on page 4 (of Avigad's book) requires $2^n - 1$ moves.*

Proof. I call the three towers, from left to right, A , B , C . At the beginning, all the disks are on peg A . Let $T(n)$ be the number of moves that it takes to solve ToH with the given algorithm. The base case is $n = 0$ and the statement holds in this case: the solution requires 0 moves and $T(0) = 2^0 - 1 = 1 - 1 = 0$. For the induction hypothesis, suppose that the statement holds for n . For the inductive step, observe the following:

1. by induction hypothesis, it takes exactly $T(n)$ steps to move all the disks except the largest one to peg C using auxiliary peg B ;
2. then, it takes 1 move to move the largest disk from peg A to peg B ;
3. then, by induction hypothesis, it takes exactly $T(n)$ steps to move the disks from peg C to peg B using auxiliary peg A .

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 T(n+1) &= T(n) + 1 + T(n) \\
 &= 2T(n) + 1 \\
 &= 2(2^n - 1) + 1 \quad [\text{by induct. hyp.}] \\
 &= 2^{n+1} - 2 + 1 \\
 &= 2^{n+1} - 1
 \end{aligned}$$

□

2.2 Complete induction

On p. 5, the authors define the following function recursively:

$$f(n, k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0 \text{ or } k = n \\ f(n-1, k) + f(n-1, k-1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where n and k are natural numbers and $k \leq n$. One more usually write the above function as

$$\binom{n}{k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0 \text{ or } k = n \\ \binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{n-1}{k-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here $\binom{n}{k}$ indicates the number of ways of choosing k objects out of n without repetition. The equation in the second case, i.e.

$$\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{n-1}{k-1}$$

is called *Pascal's identity*. Its intuitive justification is as follows. Let x be an object among the n -many objects that are given. Then, if you do not choose x , you have to choose k objects from the now $n-1$ -many given objects. If you do choose x , then you have to continue by selecting $k-1$ objects from the now $n-1$ -many objects. Since every selection of k objects from the given n objects either include or does not include x , then the total number of ways of choosing k objects out of n without repetition is the sum of the ways of selecting k objects from $n-1$ objects (when you do not choose x) and the number of ways of selecting $k-1$ objects from $n-1$ objects (when you choose x).

Theorem 2.2. $\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}$

Proof. I reason by induction. The statement is true for $n = 0$. Now, suppose that it holds for $n-1$.

I show that it holds for n too. The following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{n}{k} &= \binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{n-1}{k-1} && \text{[by definition]} \\
&= \frac{(n-1)!}{k!(n-1-k)!} + \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-1-(k-1))!} && \text{[by induction]} \\
&= \frac{(n-1)!}{k!(n-1-k)!} + \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-1-k+1)!} \\
&= \frac{(n-1)!}{k!(n-1-k)!} + \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-k)!} \\
&= \frac{(n-1)!}{k(k-1)!(n-1-k)!} + \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-k)(n-1-k)!} \\
&= \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-1-k)!} \left[\frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{(n-k)} \right] \\
&= \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-1-k)!} \left[\frac{n-k+k}{k(n-k)} \right] \\
&= \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-1-k)!} \left[\frac{n}{k(n-k)} \right] \\
&= \frac{n(n-1)!}{k(k-1)!(n-k)(n-1-k)!} \\
&= \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}
\end{aligned}$$

□

2.3 Generalized induction and recursion

Given two lists ℓ and m , I write

$$\ell + m$$

as a shortcut for

$$\text{append}(\ell, m).$$

Theorem 2.3. *The operation append is associative.*¹

Proof. Given two lists, l_1 and l_2 , I will write $l_1 + l_2$ to indicate $\text{append}(l_1, l_2)$. I prove that, for every list l_1, l_2, l_3 ,

$$(l_1 + l_2) + l_3 = l_1 + (l_2 + l_3).$$

I reason by induction. For the base step, let $l_1 = []$. Therefore,

$$[] + (l_2 + l_3) = l_2 + l_3 = ([] + l_2) + l_3.$$

Now, suppose that associativity holds for $l_1 = l$. I prove that it holds for $(a :: l)$, l_2 , l_3 . I will use the following property from the definition of $::$:²

$$(a :: m) + n = a :: (m + n)$$

¹ The authors define append on page 6.

² The authors define $::$ on page 6.

where a is an element and m and n are lists. The the proof continues as follow:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (a :: l) + (l_2 + l_3) &= a :: (l + (l_2 + l_3)) && \text{[by defin. of ::]} \\
 &= a :: ((l + l_2) + l_3) && \text{[by induct. hyp.]} \\
 &= (a :: (l + l_2)) + l_3 && \text{[by defin. of ::]} \\
 &= ((a :: l) + l_2) + l_3 && \text{[by defin. of ::]}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.4. *For every element a and list ℓ ,*

$$a :: \ell = [a] + \ell.$$

Proof. For the base case, observe

$$a :: [] = [a] = [a] + [].$$

For the inductive hypothesis, assume

$$a :: \ell = [a] + \ell.$$

For the inductive step, let b be an element:

$$\begin{aligned}
 a :: (b :: \ell) &= a :: ([b] + \ell) && \text{[by induct. hyp.]} \\
 &= (a :: [b]) + \ell && \text{[by defin. of +]} \\
 &= ([a] + [b]) + \ell && \text{[by induct. hyp.]} \\
 &= [a] + ([b] + \ell) && \text{[by assoc. of +]}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.5. *For every list ℓ , $\ell + [] = \ell$.*

Proof. For the base step, observe

$$[] + [] = [].$$

For the induction hypothesis, assume $\ell + [] = \ell$. For the inductive step, observe

$$\begin{aligned}
 (a :: \ell) + [] &= ([a] + \ell) + [] && \text{[by theorem 2.4]} \\
 &= [a] + (\ell + []) && \text{[by assoc. of +]} \\
 &= [a] + \ell && \text{[by induct. hyp.]} \\
 &= a :: \ell && \text{[by theorem 2.4]}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.6. *For every list ℓ and element a , $\text{appendl}(\ell, a) = \ell + [a]$.*

Proof. I reason by induction. For the base case,

$$\text{appendl}([], a) = [a] = [] + [a].$$

Now, as the induction hypothesis, suppose that $\text{appendl}(\ell, a) = \ell + [a]$. Then, let b to be an element and consider the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{appendl}(b :: \ell, a) &= b :: \text{appendl}(\ell, a) && \text{[by defin. of appendl]} \\
 &= b :: (\ell + [a]) && \text{[by induct. hyp.]} \\
 &= (b :: \ell) + [a] && \text{[by defin. of +]}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.7. *For every list ℓ and m ,*

$$\text{reverse}(\ell + m) = \text{reverse}(m) + \text{reverse}(\ell).$$

Proof. I reason by induction. Let $\ell = []$. Therefore

$$\text{reverse}([] + m) = \text{reverse}(m) = \text{reverse}(m) + \text{reverse}([]).$$

Now, as the inductive step, suppose that, for l and m ,

$$\text{reverse}(\ell + m) = \text{reverse}(m) + \text{reverse}(\ell).$$

Let a be an element. The following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reverse}((a :: l) + m) &= \text{reverse}(a :: (\ell + m)) && \text{[by defin. of +]} \\ &= \text{appendl}(\text{reverse}(\ell + m), a) && \text{[by defin. of reverse]} \\ &= \text{append}(\text{reverse}(m) + \text{reverse}(\ell), a) && \text{[by induct. hyp.]} \\ &= (\text{reverse}(m) + \text{reverse}(\ell)) + [a] && \text{[by theorem 2.6]} \\ &= \text{reverse}(m) + (\text{reverse}(\ell) + [a]) && \text{[by assoc. of +]} \\ &= \text{reverse}(m) + \text{appendl}(a, \text{reverse}(\ell)) && \text{[by theorem 2.6]} \\ &= \text{reverse}(m) + \text{reverse}(a :: \ell) && \text{[by defin. of reverse]} \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.8. *For every list ℓ , $\text{reverse}(\text{reverse}(\ell)) = \ell$.*

Proof. I reason by induction. For the base step, observe:

$$\text{reverse}(\text{reverse}([])) = \text{reverse}([]) = [].$$

For the induction hypothesis, assume that $\text{reverse}(\text{reverse}(\ell)) = \ell$. For the inductive step, observe:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reverse}(\text{reverse}(a :: \ell)) &= \text{reverse}(\text{appendl}(\text{reverse}(\ell), a)) && \text{[by defin. of reverse]} \\ &= \text{reverse}(\text{reverse}(\ell) + [a]) && \text{[by theorem 2.6]} \\ &= \text{reverse}([a] + \text{reverse}(\text{reverse}(\ell))) && \text{[by theorem 2.7]} \\ &= \text{reverse}([a] + \ell) && \text{[by induct. hyp.]} \\ &= [a] + \ell && \text{[by property of reverse]} \\ &= a :: \ell && \text{[by defin. of ::]} \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.9. *For every list ℓ , $\text{reverse}(\ell) = \text{reverse}'(\ell)$.*

Proof. For the base case, observe

$$\text{reverse}([]) = [] = \text{reverseAux}([], []) = \text{reverse}'([]).$$

For the inductive hypothesis, assume

$$\text{reverse}(\ell) = \text{reverse}'(\ell)/$$

For the inductive step, observe

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{reverse}(a :: \ell) &= \text{reverse}(\ell) + \text{reverse}([a]) && [\text{by theorem 2.7}] \\
 &= \text{reverse}(\ell) + [a] && [\text{by property of reverse}] \\
 &= \text{reverseAux}(\ell, a :: []) && [\text{by defin. of reverseAux}] \\
 &= \text{reverseAux}(a :: \ell, []) && [\text{by defin. of reverseAux}] \\
 &= \text{reverse}'(a :: \ell) && [\text{by defin. of reverse}']
 \end{aligned}$$

□

2.4 Invariants

From p. 9:

“The following puzzle, called the *MU puzzle*, comes from the book *Gödel, Escher, Bach* by Douglas Hofstadter. It concerns strings consisting of the letters *M*, *I*, and *U*. Starting with the string *MI*, we are allowed to apply any of the following rules:

1. Replace *sI* by *sIU*, that is, add a *U* to the end of any string that ends with *I*.
2. Replace *Ms* by *Mss*, that is, double the string after the initial *M*.
3. Replace *sIII* by *sUt*, that is, replace any three consecutive *I*s with a *U*.
4. Replace *sUUt* by *st*, that is, delete any consecutive pair of *U*s.”

Theorem 2.10. *A string is derivable in Hofstadter’s system if and only if it consists of an *M* followed by any number of *I*s and *U*s as long as the number of *I*s is not divisible by 3.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) First, I prove that if a string is derivable, then it consists of an *M* followed by any number of *I*s and *U*s as long as the number of *I*s is not divisible by 3. I reason by induction. The base case is *MI* and the statement is true for this case. Now, suppose that the statement is true after n applications of the rules. I show that the statement remains true after we apply any of the rules above.

1. Rule 1 does not change the number of *I* in the string. So the statement remains true.
2. Rule 2 doubles the number of *I* in the string. Since the number of strings before the application of rule 2 was either $1 \bmod 3$ or $2 \bmod 3$. In the first case, the number of *I* becomes $2 \bmod 3$ and in the second case it becomes $1 \bmod 3$. In both cases the statement remains true.
3. Rule 3 reduces the number of *I* by 3. Since we start with the number of *I* being $k \not\equiv 0 \bmod 3$, also $k - 3 \not\equiv 0 \bmod 3$ and the statement remains true.
4. Rule 4 does not affect the number of *I* in the string. Therefore, the statement remains true.

(\Leftarrow) Now, I prove that if a string

(C1) consists of an *M*

(C2) followed by any number of *I*s and *U*s

(C3) as long as the number of *I*s is not divisible by 3,

then that string is derivable.

To be continued.

□

2.5 Exercises

Exercise 1. For $n \geq 1$, prove that

$$\sum_{i < n} ar^i = \frac{a(r^n - 1)}{r - 1}.$$

Proof. I reason by induction. For $n = 1$,

$$\sum_{i < 1} ar^0 = a = \frac{a(r^1 - 1)}{r - 1}.$$

By induction hypothesis, suppose that the statement holds for n . Now, consider the following

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i < n+1} ar^i &= \left(\sum_{i < n} ar^i \right) + ar^n \\ &= \frac{a(r^n - 1)}{r - 1} + ar^n && \text{[by induct. hyp.]} \\ &= \frac{a(r^n - 1) + ar^n(r - 1)}{r - 1} \\ &= \frac{ar^n - a + ar^{n+1} - ar^n}{r - 1} \\ &= \frac{a(r^{n+1} - 1)}{r - 1} \end{aligned}$$

□

Exercise 2.

Proof. I reason by induction. The base case is $n=5$:

$$5! = 120 > 32 = 2^5.$$

As the induction hypothesis, suppose that the statement is true for n . For the inductive step, consider

$$\begin{aligned} (n+1)! &= (n+1)n! \\ &> 2(2^n) && \text{[because } n+1 > 2 \text{ and, by induct. hyp., } n! > 2^n] \\ &= 2^{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

□

Exercise 3.

Proof. Using summation notation, the expression to prove is the following:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n(n+1)} = \frac{n}{n+1}$$

The base case is $n = 1$ and the statement holds:

$$\sum_{i=1}^1 \frac{1}{1 \cdot 2} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

For the inductive hypothesis, suppose that the statements holds for n . For the inductive step, consider

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \frac{1}{n(n+1)} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n(n+1)} + \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+2)} \\
 &= \frac{n}{n+1} + \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+2)} \quad [\text{by induct. hyp.}] \\
 &= \frac{n(n+2)}{(n+1)(n+2)} \\
 &= \frac{n^2 + 2n + 1}{(n+1)(n+2)} \\
 &= \frac{(n+1)^2}{(n+1)(n+2)} \\
 &= \frac{n+1}{n+2}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Exercise 4.

Proof. See the proof of theorem 2.1 for the notation. The statement holds for the base case $n = 0$: $2^0 - 1 = 1 - 1 = 0$. For the inductive hypothesis, suppose that the statement holds for n . For the inductive step, I show that the statement holds for $n + 1$. I reason as follows:

1. to move n disks (i.e. all the disks except the largest one) from peg A to peg C requires at least $2^n - 1$ steps (by induction hypothesis);
2. to move the largest disk from peg A to peg B requires 1 step;
3. to move the n disks on peg C to peg B requires at least $2^n - 1$ steps (by induction hypothesis).

Therefore, the entire process requires

$$2^n - 1 + 1 + 2^n - 1$$

steps, which is equal to $2^{n+1} - 1$, i.e. equal to $T(n+1)$ (see proof of theorem 2.1). Therefore, the algorithm given in the book is optimal. □

Exercise 5. The goal of the modified ToH problem is to move the disks from peg A to peg C . The exercise requires the following:

1. recursive procedure for solving ToH
2. proof that the procedure requires $3^n - 1$ moves
3. proof that the bound $3^n - 1$ is optimal
4. proof that, as one carries out the sequence of moves from the initial configuration to the final configuration, they visit every legal arrangement of the n disks exactly once.

Proof. First, I provide the recursive procedure:

1. If $n = 0$, return

2. Else:

- (a) move $n - 1$ disks (all but the one at the bottom on peg A) from peg A to peg C using auxiliary peg B ;
- (b) move 1 disk (the one remained on peg A) to peg B ;
- (c) move $n - 1$ disks from peg C to peg A using auxiliary peg B ;
- (d) move 1 disk from peg B to peg C ;
- (e) move $n - 1$ disks from peg A to peg C .

Now, I prove that the procedure requires exactly $3^n - 1$ steps. The statement holds for $n = 0$ because $3^0 - 1 = 1 - 1 = 0$. For the induction hypothesis, suppose that the statement holds for $n - 1$. For the inductive steps, consider the following:

- (a) moving $n - 1$ disks from A to C requires exactly $3^{n-1} - 1$ steps (by the induction hypothesis);
- (b) moving 1 disk from A to B requires exactly 1 step;
- (c) moving $n - 1$ disks from C to A requires exactly $3^{n-1} - 1$ steps (by the induction hypothesis);
- (d) moving 1 disk from B to C requires exactly 1 step;
- (e) moving $n - 1$ disks from A to C requires exactly $3^{n-1} - 1$ steps (by the induction hypothesis).

In sum, moving n disks from A to C using auxiliary B , requires exactly

$$(3^{n-1} - 1) + 1 + (3^{n-1} - 1) + 1 + (3^{n-1} - 1) = 3^{n-1} \cdot 3 - 1 = 3^n - 1$$

steps.

Now, I prove the bound $3^n - 1$ is optimal. The statement holds for $n = 0$. As the induction hypothesis, suppose that the statement holds for $n - 1$. I show that it holds for n . I reason as follows:

- (a) to move $n - 1$ disks from A to C using auxiliary B takes at least $3^n - 1$ steps (by the induction hypothesis);
- (b) to move 1 disk from A to B requires 1 step;
- (c) to move $n - 1$ disks from C to A using auxiliary B requires at least $3^n - 1$ steps (by the induction hypothesis);
- (d) to move 1 disk from B to C requires 1 step;
- (e) to move $n - 1$ disks from A to C using auxiliary B requires $3^n - 1$ steps (by the induction hypothesis).

Therefore, moving n disks from A to C using auxiliary B requires at least $3^n - 1$ steps.

Now, I prove that, while carrying out the steps, one goes through all the 3^n legal positions of the disks exactly once. Notice that the statement says two things:

- 1. no legal arrangement is skipped;

2. no legal arrangement is repeated.

The statement holds for $n = 0$. Suppose that the statement holds for $n - 1$. For the inductive step, notice the following:

When the largest disk is on peg X (for $X \in \{A, B, C\}$), the other $n - 1$ disks goes through all the legal arrangements exactly once (by the induction hypothesis).

Therefore, the statement holds for n . □

Exercise 6.

Proof. □

Exercise 7.

Proof. The principle of complete induction (PCI) says that every natural number n has a property P if the following condition is true:

(C) for every n , for every $i < n$, $P(i)$.

I prove by ordinary (weak) induction that, if (C) holds, then, for all natural numbers, $P(n)$ holds. Let Q be a property on the natural numbers. Let us define, for all n ,

$$Q(n) \text{ iff } \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} P(i).$$

In words, $Q(n)$ holds if and only if $P(i)$ holds for all $i < n$. As the base case, $Q(0)$ holds because there are no natural numbers strictly below 0. Therefore, $P(0)$ holds. Now, suppose that $Q(n)$ holds. Therefore, $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} P(i)$. By (C), also $P(n)$ holds. Therefore, $Q(n + 1)$ holds as well. Therefore, by ordinary induction, $Q(n)$ holds for every natural number n . Therefore, $P(n)$ also holds for every n . □

Exercise 8.

Proof. Part (1).

The solutions to $x^2 = x + 1$ are $\alpha = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ and $\beta = \frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$. So, the statement holds for $n = 0$ because

$$\frac{\alpha^0 - \beta^0}{\sqrt{5}} = 0$$

For the inductive hypothesis, suppose that the statement holds for n . For the inductive step,

consider:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\alpha^{n+1} - \beta^{n+1}}{\sqrt{5}} &= \frac{\alpha^{2+n-1} - \beta^{2+n-1}}{\sqrt{5}} \\
&= \frac{\alpha^2 \alpha^{n-1} - \beta^2 \beta^{n-1}}{\sqrt{5}} \\
&= \frac{(\alpha + 1)\alpha^{n-1} - (\beta + 1)\beta^{n-1}}{\sqrt{5}} \quad [\text{because } x^2 = x + 1] \\
&= \frac{\alpha^n + \alpha^{n-1} - \beta^n - \beta^{n-1}}{\sqrt{5}} \\
&= \frac{(\alpha^n - \beta^n) + (\alpha^{n-1} - \beta^{n-1})}{\sqrt{5}} \\
&= \frac{\alpha^n - \beta^n}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{\alpha^{n-1} - \beta^{n-1}}{\sqrt{5}} \\
&= F_n + F_{n-1} \quad [\text{by induct. hyp.}] \\
&= F_{n+1} \quad [\text{by defin. of } F_{n+1}]
\end{aligned}$$

To conclude, I show that interchanging α and β does not change the result. Let $\alpha = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ and $\beta = \frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$. Since the inductive step does not use the definitions of α and β , it is enough to observe that, with the new definitions of α and β , the statement holds for $n = 0$.

Part (2).

I reason by induction. For $n = 0$, $\sum_{i=0}^0 F_i$ is an empty sum, which, by definition, is 0. So, the statement holds for $n = 0$. Now, as the inductive hypothesis, suppose that the statement holds for n . For the inductive step $n + 1$, consider:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i < n} F_i &= \left(\sum_{i < n-1} F_i \right) + F_n \\
&= F_{n+1} - 1 + F_n \quad [\text{by induct. hyp.}] \\
&= F_{n+2} - 1 \quad [\text{by defin. of } F_n]
\end{aligned}$$

Part(3).

I reason by induction. The statement holds for $n = 0$. As the inductive hypothesis, suppose that the statement holds for n . For the inductive step, consider:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \leq n+1} F_i &= \left(\sum_{i \leq n} F_i \right) + F_{n+1}^2 \\
&= F_n F_{n+1} + F_{n+1}^2 \quad [\text{by induct. hyp.}] \\
&= F_{n+1}(F_n + F_{n+1}) \\
&= F_{n+1} F_{n+2} \quad [\text{by defin. of } F_n]
\end{aligned}$$

□

Exercise 9.

Proof. Identical to exercise 8 part (1).

□

Appendix A

Errata

page	exercise	errata	corrigé
6	5	we principles	we apply the principles
7		there is part	there is a part
11		is requires	it requires

Table A.1: Errata

Comments:

1. The statement of exercise 5 in chapter 2 (p. 10) should include that the goal of the modified Hanoi is to move the disks from peg 1 to peg 3.
2. The statement of exercise 6 in chapter 2 (p. 10) should specify whether the goal is to move the disks to peg 2 or to peg 3.
3. Exercise 9 is identical to exercise 8.a.