

Appendix B

Tutorial

The ELFE system allows for verifying mathematical proofs. In this tutorial, we will take a look at its language features.

Formulas

In order to make mathematical statements, we use a language that is similar to first-order logic. Concretely, we have the following syntax constructs at our disposal:

for all <i>var.</i> <i>formula</i>	– an universally quantified statement
exists <i>var.</i> <i>formula</i>	– an existentially quantified statement
<i>formula</i> iff <i>formula</i>	– if and only if
<i>formula</i> implies <i>formula</i>	– an implication
<i>formula</i> and <i>formula</i>	– both should be true
<i>formula</i> or <i>formula</i>	– either one is true
not <i>formula</i>	– a negation
contradiction	– corresponds to a \perp in first-order logic

We can use alphanumeric strings as variables. In order to introduce mathematical properties, we will use atoms inside a formula. We can construct atoms as follows:

var* is *predicate
var* is not *predicate
term* = *term
***predicate*(*term*, ... , *term*)**

For example, we may say 'R is symmetric' or 'symmetric(R)'. Terms can be variables or more complex – for example, the union of two sets A and B. This can be written down similar with 'union(A,B)'. Alternatively, we can use syntactic sugar: $A \cup B$. The libraries contain several different sugars. Note that we need to insert brackets when nesting sugars: ' $((A \cup B)^C) = ((A^C) \cap (B^C))$ '.

Top level commands

On the top level, we have six possible commands. The following three allow us to introduce mathematical statements:

Definition <i>formula</i> .	– define a statement
Proposition <i>formula</i> .	– derive a statement without proof
Lemma <i>formula</i> . Proof: <i>proof</i> Qed.	– make a proved statement

Definitions and propositions can be used to introduce facts to a proof. Lemmas are the interesting part since here we can test our proofs – we will see in the next section how to write a proof.

Besides these three statements, we can use the following statements to shorten our proofs:

Include <i>file</i>.	– includes a file of the library
Let <i>var</i> be <i>predicate</i>.	– defines a meta-variable
Notation <i>predicate</i>: <i>pattern</i>.	– introduces a notation

The inclusion command allows us to use background libraries. With the second command we can assign a property to a variable for the whole text. For example, if we define several properties about sets, we will write in the beginning 'Let A be set' and use 'A' afterwards. The last command allows us to introduce own syntactic sugars.

```

Include relations.
Notation disjunction: A ∪ B.
Let A,B be relation.
Definition disjunctionDef: (A ∪ B)[x,y] iff A[x,y] or B[x,y] and not (A[x,y] and B[x,y]).
Proposition: A ∪ B is relation.
Lemma disjunctionAssociative: A ∪ B = B ∪ A.
Proof:
  ...
qed.

```

TEXT B.1: Exemplary use of top sections

Proof structures

There are three ways to prove a goal within ELFE.

Splitting the goal

In order to simplify a goal, we will often make several proofs that imply the original goal:

Proof <i>formula</i>: <i>proof</i> Qed.	– make several sub proofs
Case <i>formula</i>: <i>proof</i> Qed.	– make case distinctions

The sub proofs can be completely unconnected – important is that the background theory proves that all sub proofs together imply the original goal. Within a case distinction, the specified formula is assumed and we want to derive the original goal.

Unfolding the structure of the goal

Often, we will want to make assumptions in a proof.

Assume <i>formula</i>. <i>proof</i>	– proof an implication
--	------------------------

Hence *formula*.

In order to prove an universally quantified statement, we can fix a particular element:

Fix *var*. – fix an universally quantified variable

Deriving intermediary steps

We can derive cornerstones for a proof with the following statement:

Then *formula*. – derive a cornerstone

We will often want to retrieve a specific element that we use afterwards in our proof. This can be done with this construction:

Take *var* such that *formula*. – fix an existing variable

```
...
Lemma disjunctionAssociative: A ∨ B = B ∨ A.
Proof:
  Assume (A ∨ B)[x,y].
  Case A[x,y]:
    Then not B[x,y].
    Then (B ∨ A)[x,y].
  qed.
  Case B[x,y]:
    Then not A[x,y].
    Then (B ∨ A)[x,y].
  qed.
  Hence (B ∨ A)[x,y].
qed.
```

TEXT B.2: Exemplary proof