CPSC-354 Report

Sarah Yoon Chapman University

September 8, 2024

Abstract

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Week by Week 2.1 Week 1 2.2 Week 2 2.3	1 1 3 7
3	Lessons from the Assignments	7
4	Conclusion	7
1	Introduction	
2	Week by Week	
2.	1 Week 1	
No	otes	
Le	arned about some tactics and theorems	
rw one two	a tactic that proves theorems that take the form of $X = X$: a tactic that rewrites a proof e-eq_succ_zero: a theorem that proves $1 = \text{succ } 0$ (there are also other similar existing theorems lip_eq_succ_one and so on) d_zero: a theorem that proves $a + 0 = a$. d_succ: a theorem that proves $a + \text{succ } b = \text{succ}(a + b)$	ke
suc	cc_{eq} add_one: a theorem that proves succ $a = a + 1$	

Homework

Problem 5:

a b c are in the set of natural numbers.

Prove that both sides are equal to each other.

```
a + (b + 0) + (c + 0) = a + b + c
```

rw [add_zero] - uses the add_zero theorem to prove that b + 0 = b

This is rewritten to:

$$a + b + (c + 0) = a + b + c$$

rw [add_zero] - this is done again to prove that c + 0 = c

This is rewritten to:

$$a + b + c = a + b + c$$

rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other

Problem 6:

This is the same problem as 5 but will be approached in a different manner.

$$a + (b + 0) + (c + 0) = a + b + c$$

rw [add_zero c] - specifically applies the add_zero theorem to c, making c + 0 into c This is rewritten to:

$$a + (b + 0) + c = a + b + c$$

rw [add_zero b] - specifically applies the add_zero theorem to b, making b + 0 into b This is rewritten to:

$$a + b + c = a + b + c$$

rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other

Problem 7:

n is in the set of natural numbers.

Prove that both sides are equal to each other.

succ n = n + 1 rw[one_eq_succ_zero] - rewrite 1 into successor 0 This is rewritten to:

succ n = n + succ 0

 $rw[add_succ]$ - uses the add_succ theorem to change $n + succ \ 0$ into succ(n + 0)

This is rewritten to:

succ n = succ (n + 0)

 $rw[add_zero]$ - uses the add_zero theorem to prove that n + 0 = n

This is rewritten to:

succ n = succ n

rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other

Problem 8:

Prove that both sides are equal to each other.

$$2 + 2 = 4$$

rw[two_eq_succ_one] - rewrites 2 into succ 1

This is rewritten to:

succ 1 + succ 1 = 4

rw[one_eq_succ_zero] - rewrites 1 into succ 0

This is rewritten to:

succ (succ 0) + succ (succ 0) = 4

rw[four_eq_succ_three] - rewrites 4 into succ 3

This is rewritten to:

succ (succ 0) + succ (succ 0) = succ 3

rw[three_eq_succ_two] - rewrites 3 into succ 2

This is rewritten to:

succ (succ 0) + succ (succ 0) = succ (succ 2)

rw[two_eq_succ_one] - rewrites 2 into succ 1

This is rewritten to:

```
succ (succ 0) + succ (succ 0) = succ (succ (succ 1))
rw[one\_eq\_succ\_zero] - rewrites 1 into succ 0
This is rewritten to:
succ (succ 0) + succ (succ 0) = succ (succ (succ (succ 0)))
rw[add\_succ] - changes succ (succ 0) + succ (succ 0) into succ (succ (succ 0) + succ 0)
This is rewritten to:
succ (succ (succ 0) + succ 0) = succ (succ (succ (succ 0)))
rw[add\_succ] - changes succ (succ (succ 0) + succ 0) into succ (succ (succ (succ 0) + 0))
This is rewritten to:
succ (succ (succ (succ 0) + 0)) = succ (succ (succ (succ 0)))
rw[add\_zero] - changes succ (succ 0) + 0 into
This is rewritten to:
succ (succ (succ (succ (succ 0))) = succ (succ (succ (succ 0)))
rr[add\_zero] - changes succ (succ 0) + 0 into
This is rewritten to:
succ (succ (succ (succ (succ 0))) = succ (succ (succ (succ 0)))
rr[add\_zero] - changes succ (succ 0) + 0 into
```

For level 5: add_zero is a Lean proof that a+0=a (a representing any number). In mathematics, there are laws for arithmic. One of them is called the identity which applies to addition and multiplication. For addition, it states that m+0=m=0+m. This is the exact same as the Lean proof, a+0=a, which can also be written as a=0+a.

Comments and Questions

Learning the root of mathematics is very eye-opening, and I am confident it will be the same for programming languages. It provides another perspective for elementary functions like 2 + 2 equals 4, which is different from just knowing it through memorization. I feel as though this is why people have been able to expand mathematically. This makes me wonder: how can looking through the core of programming help us better current languages (e.g. python, rust)?

2.2 Week 2

Notes

Recursion as a concept using the Towers of Hanoi: It is broken down into: moving a tower of n disks from x to y moving a tower of n+1 disks when it is already known how to move a tower of n disks The algorithm is made up of a bunch of "pushs" and "pops" The logic overall is a bunch of back and forth movement of the disks

Lean: induction proof with: induction n with d hd succ_add: proves that succ $a+b=succ\ (a+b)$ add_comm x y: proves that x+y=y+x add_assoc: proves that a+b+c=a+(b+c) add_right_comm a b c: proves that a+b+c=a+c+b

Homework

```
Problem 1: n is in the natural number set 
Prove 0+n=n. induction n with d hd - starting a proof by induction 
Now our first goal is: 0+0=0 rw[add_zero] - proves that 0+0=0 This is rewritten to: 0=0 rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
```

```
Now, we prove our second goal
hd: 0 + d = d
0 + \operatorname{succ} d = \operatorname{succ} d
rw[add\_succ] - proves that 0 + succ d = succ (0 + d)
This is rewritten to:
succ (0 + d) = succ d
rw[hd] - this replaces 0 + d with d
This is rewritten to:
succ d = succ d
rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
Problem 2:
a b is in the set of natural numbers
Prove succ a + b = succ (a + b)
inductin b with d hd - starting a proof by induction
Now our first goal is:
\operatorname{succ} a + 0 = \operatorname{succ} (a + 0)
rw[add\_zero] - proves that succ a + 0 = succ a
This is rewritten to:
succ a = succ(a + 0)
rw[add\_zero] - proves that succ (a + 0) = succ a
This is rewritten to:
succ a = succ a
rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
Now, we prove our second goal
hd: succ a + d = succ (a + d)
succ a + succ d = succ (a + succ d)
rw[add\_succ] - proves that succ a + succ d = succ (succ a + d)
This is rewritten to:
succ (succ a + d) = succ (a + succ d)
rw[hd] - this replaces succ a + d with succ (a + d)
This is rewritten to:
succ (succ (a + d)) = succ (a + succ d)
rw[add\_succ] - proves that succ (a + succ d) = succ (succ (a + d))
This is rewritten to:
succ (succ (a + d)) = succ (succ (a + d))
rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
Problem 3:
a b is in the set of natural numbers
Prove a + b = b + a
induction b with hd - starting a proof by induction
Now our first goal is:
a + 0 = 0 + a
rw[zero\_add] - proves that 0 + a = a
This is rewritten to:
a + 0 = a
rw[add\_zero] - proves that a + 0 = a
This is rewritten to:
a = a
```

```
rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
Now, we prove our second goal
n_{ih}: a + hd = hd + a
a + succ hd = succ hd + a
rw[add\_succ] - proves that a + succ hd = succ (a + hd)
This is rewritten to:
succ (a + hd) = succ hd + a
rw[succ\_add] - proves that succ hd + a = succ (hd + a)
This is rewritten to:
succ (a + hd) = succ (hd + a)
rw[n_ih] - replaces succ (a + hd) with succ (hd + a)
This is rewritten to:
\operatorname{succ} (\operatorname{hd} + \operatorname{a}) = \operatorname{succ} (\operatorname{hd} + \operatorname{a})
rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
Problem 4:
a b c is in the set of natural numbers
Prove a + b + c = a + (b + c)
induction a with hd - starting a proof by induction
Now our first goal is:
0 + b + c = 0 + (b + c)
rw[zero\_add] - proves that 0 + b = b
This is rewritten to:
b + c = 0 + (b + c)
rw[zero\_add] - proves that 0 + (b + c) = b + c
This is rewritten to:
b + c = b + c
rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
Now, we prove our second goal
n_i: hd + b + c = hd + (b + c)
succ hd + b + c = succ hd + (b + c)
rw[succ\_add] - proves that succ hd + b + c = succ (hd + b) + c
This is rewritten to:
succ (hd + b) + c = succ hd + (b + c)
rw[succ\_add] - proves that succ(hd + b) + c = succ(hd + b + c)
This is rewritten to:
succ (hd + b + c) = succ hd + (b + c)
rw[n_i] - replaces succ (hd + b + c) with succ (hd + (b + c))
This is rewritten to:
\operatorname{succ} (\operatorname{hd} + (\operatorname{b} + \operatorname{c})) = \operatorname{succ} \operatorname{hd} + (\operatorname{b} + \operatorname{c})
rw[succ\_add] - proves succ hd + (b + c) = succ (hd + (b + c))
This is rewritten to:
succ (hd + (b + c)) = succ (hd + (b + c))
rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
Problem 5:
a b c is in the set of natural numbers
Prove a + b + c = a + c + b
induction c with hd - starting a proof by induction
Now our first goal is:
```

```
a + b + 0 = a + 0 + b
rw[add\_zero] - proves that b + 0 = b
This is rewritten to:
a + b = a + 0 + b
rw[add\_zero] 0 proves that a + 0 = a
This is rewritten to:
a + b = a + b
rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
Now, we prove our second goal
n_{i}: a + b + hd = a + hd + b
a + b + succ hd = a + succ hd + b
rw[add\_succ] - proves that a + b + succ hd = succ (a + b + hd)
This is rewritten to:
\operatorname{succ} (a + b + hd) = a + \operatorname{succ} hd + b
rw[add\_succ] - proves that a + succ hd + b = succ (a + hd) + b
This is rewritten to:
\operatorname{succ} (a + b + hd) = \operatorname{succ} (a + hd) + b
rw[succ\_add] - proves that succ(a + hd) + b = succ(a + hd + b)
This is rewritten to:
\operatorname{succ} (a + b + hd) = \operatorname{succ} (a + hd + b)
rw[n_i] - replaces a + b + hd with a + hd + b
This is rewritten to
succ (a + hd + b) = succ (a + hd + b)
rfl - this proves that both sides that look the same are equal to each other
Problem 5 Proof in Mathematics:
a + b + c = a + (b + c)
0 + b + c = 0 + (b + c) - Basis
b + c = 0 + (b + c) - Addition Identity
b + c = b + c - Addition Identity
Inductive Step:
k + b + c = k + (b + c)
The goal is to prove that Sk + b + c = Sk + (b + c)
S(k + b + c) = Sk + (b + c) - Definition of Addition
S(k + b + c) = S(k + (b + c)) - Definition of Addition
S(k + (b + c)) = S(k + (b + c)) - Inductive Hypothesis
Therefore, by the Axiom of induction a + b + c = a + (b + c) for all a in the natural numbers set
Math to Lean
Basis: induction a with hd
Addition Identity: zero_add
Definition of Addition: succ_add
```

Comments and Questions

Inductive Hypothesis: n_ih

The Towers of Hanoi reminded me of solving certain problems by simply using recursion. I also remember applying this method to the Fibonacci sequence. This makes me wonder how it transfers to math. How does recursion appear in mathematics or, specifically, in Lean?

2.3 ...

. . .

- 3 Lessons from the Assignments
- 4 Conclusion

References

 $[{\rm BLA}]~$ Author, Title, Publisher, Year.