

1. Prove  $LIST(SEXP_{FG}) \subseteq SEXP_{FG}$

I will be using the following equations from p.116 of the textbook:

$$(2.1) LIST(A) = \{ '() \} \cup \{ (cons \ a \ as) \mid a \in A \wedge as \in LIST(A) \}$$

$$(2.3) SEXP_{FG} = ATOM \cup \{ (cons \ v_1 \ v_2) \mid v_1 \in SEXP_{FG} \wedge v_2 \in SEXP_{FG} \}$$

$$(2.2) ATOM = BOOL \cup NUM \cup SYM \cup \{ '() \}$$

I will be proving that if  $x \in LIST(SEXP_{FG})$ , then  $x \in SEXP_{FG}$

Base case

Let  $x = '()$ . According to the EMPTYLIST rule:  $\frac{}{'() \in LIST(SEXP_{FG})}$

Using equations 2.2 and 2.3, we see that  $'()$  is an atom, and an atom is a  $SEXP_{FG}$ . Therefore, we have if  $'() \in LIST(SEXP_{FG}) \Rightarrow '() \in SEXP_{FG}$

Inductive case

Let  $x = (cons \ y \ ys)$ . According to the CONSLIST rule:  $\frac{y \in SEXP_{FG} \quad ys \in LIST(SEXP_{FG})}{(cons \ y \ ys) \in LIST(SEXP_{FG})}$

Given equation 2.1, we know that  $ys \in LIST(SEXP_{FG})$  by the inductive hypothesis. Therefore, using equation 2.3, we see that  $(cons \ y \ ys)$  is an  $SEXP_{FG}$  because  $y \in SEXP_{FG}$  and  $ys \in LIST(SEXP_{FG})$ . Therefore, we have if  $(cons \ y \ ys) \in LIST(SEXP_{FG}) \Rightarrow (cons \ y \ ys) \in SEXP_{FG}$ .

Our proof by induction is now complete after proving the base case and inductive case.

35. Prove:  $(\text{length}(\text{reverse } xs)) = (\text{length } xs)$

I will be utilizing the reverse-simple-reverse law:

$$(\text{reverse } xs) = (\text{simple-reverse } xs)$$

Base case  $xs = '()$

$$(\text{length}(\text{reverse } '()))$$

= {reverse-empty law}

$$(\text{length } '()) = (\text{length}(\text{reverse } '())) \checkmark$$

Inductive case  $xs = (\text{cons } y \ ys)$

$$(\text{length}(\text{reverse}(\text{cons } y \ ys)))$$

= {reverse-cons law}

$$(\text{length}(\text{append}(\text{reverse } ys) (\text{cons } y \ '()))))$$

= {length-append law}

$$(+ (\text{length}(\text{reverse } ys)) (\text{length}(\text{cons } y \ '()))))$$

= {induction hypothesis}

$$(+ (\text{length } ys) (\text{length}(\text{cons } y \ '()))))$$

= {length-cons law}

$$(+ (\text{length } ys) (+1 (\text{length } '()))))$$

= {length-null law}

$$(+ (\text{length } ys) (+1 \ 0))$$

= {commutative property of addition}

$$(+1 (\text{length } ys))$$

= {length-cons law}

$$(\text{length}(\text{cons } y \ ys)) = (\text{length}(\text{reverse}(\text{cons } y \ ys))) \checkmark$$

A. a.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{CDR} \frac{\frac{\text{CONS} \frac{\langle \text{cons}, p, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PRIM}(\text{cons}), p, \sigma \rangle \quad \frac{\text{VAR} \frac{x \in \text{dom } p \quad p(x) \in \text{dom } \sigma}{\langle \text{VAR}(x), p, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma(p(x)), \sigma \rangle} \quad \frac{\text{VAR} \frac{x \in \text{dom } p \quad p(xs) \in \text{dom } \sigma}{\langle \text{VAR}(xs), p, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma(p(xs)), \sigma \rangle}}{\langle \text{APP}(\text{cons}, \text{VAR}(x), \text{VAR}(xs)), p, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PAIR}(l_1, l_2), \sigma \models l_1 \mapsto \sigma(p(x)), l_2 \mapsto \sigma(p(xs)) \rangle} \quad \begin{array}{l} l_1 \notin \text{dom } \sigma \\ l_2 \notin \text{dom } \sigma \\ l_1 \neq l_2 \end{array}}{\langle \text{APP}(\text{cdr}, \text{APP}(\text{cons}, \text{VAR}(x), \text{VAR}(xs))), p, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma(p(xs)), \sigma \rangle}
 \end{array}$$

$$\text{VAR} \frac{x \in \text{dom } p \quad p(xs) \in \text{dom } \sigma}{\langle \text{VAR}(xs), p, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma(p(xs)), \sigma \rangle}$$

The operational semantics of  $(\text{cdr}(\text{cons } x \text{ } xs))$  and  $xs$  separately, show that the two expressions evaluate to the same value on the lower-right of the trees:  $\sigma(p(xs))$ .

A.b. I will be proving that  $(\text{cdr}(\text{cons } e_1, e_2)) = e_2$  is a false conjecture.

Let  $e_1 = (\text{set } x \ 3)$  Initial state:  $\rho = \{x \mapsto 1\}$   
 $e_2 = (= \ x \ 3)$   $\sigma = \{1 \mapsto 2\}$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{CDR} \frac{\langle \text{cdr}, \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PRIM}(\text{cdr}), \sigma \rangle \quad \langle \text{APP}(\text{cons}, \text{SET}(\text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma) \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PAIR}(l_1, l_2), \sigma \rangle \quad \langle \text{PAIR}(l_1, l_2), \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#t), \sigma \rangle}{\langle \text{APP}(\text{cdr}, \text{APP}(\text{cons}, \text{SET}(\text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3))), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#t), \sigma \rangle} \\ \text{CONS} \frac{\langle \text{cons}, \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PRIM}(\text{cons}), \sigma \rangle \quad \langle \text{SET}(\text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle 3, \sigma \rangle \quad \langle \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#t), \sigma \rangle}{\langle \text{APP}(\text{cons}, \text{SET}(\text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3))), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PAIR}(l_1, l_2), \sigma \rangle} \\ \text{ASSIGN} \frac{x \in \text{dom } \rho \quad \rho(x) = l \quad \langle \text{LIT}(3), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle 3, \sigma \rangle}{\langle \text{SET}(\text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle 3, \sigma \rangle} \\ \text{VAR} \frac{x \in \text{dom } \rho \quad \rho(x) \in \text{dom } \sigma \quad \langle \text{VAR}(x), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma(\rho(x)), \sigma \rangle \quad v_1 \equiv v_2}{\langle \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#t), \sigma \rangle} \\ \text{PRIM} \frac{\langle \text{PRIM}(=), \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PRIM}(=), \sigma \rangle \quad \langle \text{LIT}(3), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle 3, \sigma \rangle}{\langle \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#t), \sigma \rangle} \\ \text{LIT} \frac{\langle \text{LIT}(3), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle 3, \sigma \rangle}{\langle \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#t), \sigma \rangle} \\ \text{APP} \frac{\langle \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#t), \sigma \rangle}{\langle \text{APP}(\text{cdr}, \text{APP}(\text{cons}, \text{SET}(\text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3))), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#t), \sigma \rangle} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{APP} \frac{\langle \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#f), \sigma \rangle \quad \langle \text{PAIR}(l_1, l_2), \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PAIR}(l_1, l_2), \sigma \rangle}{\langle \text{APP}(\text{cdr}, \text{APP}(\text{cons}, \text{SET}(\text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3))), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PAIR}(l_1, l_2), \sigma \rangle} \\ \text{PRIM} \frac{\langle \text{PRIM}(=), \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{PRIM}(=), \sigma \rangle \quad \langle \text{LIT}(3), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle 3, \sigma \rangle}{\langle \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#f), \sigma \rangle} \\ \text{VAR} \frac{x \in \text{dom } \rho \quad \rho(x) \in \text{dom } \sigma \quad \langle \text{VAR}(x), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \sigma(\rho(x)), \sigma \rangle \quad v_1 \neq v_2}{\langle \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#f), \sigma \rangle} \\ \text{LIT} \frac{\langle \text{LIT}(3), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle 3, \sigma \rangle}{\langle \text{APP}(=, \text{VAR}(x), \text{LIT}(3)), \rho, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{BOOLV}(\#f), \sigma \rangle} \end{array}$$

The operational semantics of  $(\text{cdr}(\text{cons } e_1, e_2))$  and  $e_2$ , show that the conjecture  $(\text{cdr}(\text{cons } e_1, e_2)) = e_2$  is false, because they evaluate to different values on the lower right of the trees.