

CalcCheck Manual

(Covering CalcCheck-0.2.24 and CalcStyleV9)

Wolfram Kahl

17 January 2012

Abstract

This document describes the use of the prototype proof checker CalcCheck and the accompanying \LaTeX package CalcStyle for checking and typesetting the calculational proofs of Gries and Schneider’s “Logical Approach to Discrete Math”.

1 Preamble

A \LaTeX preamble like the following is recommended:

```
\documentclass[11pt]{article}
\usepackage[hmargin=20mm,vmargin=15mm]{geometry} % Fill more of the paper
\usepackage{CalcStyleV8} % Special macros for math in COMP SCI 1FC3
```

2 Quantification

Quantification is written in the following way:

```
( \star\ x : t \with R \spot E )
( \star\ x : t \withspot E )
```

$$(\star x : t \mid R \bullet E)$$
$$(\star x : t \mid \bullet E)$$

The same patterns are used for **set comprehension**:

```
\{ x : t \with R \spot E \}
\{ x : t \withspot E \}
\{ x : t \with R \}
```

$$\{x : t \mid R \bullet E\}$$
$$\{x : t \mid \bullet E\}$$
$$\{x : t \mid R\}$$

3 Declarations

For declarations, inside the `decls` environment the following special macros are available:

- `\declType` for type declarations (type annotations in other contexts just use “:”).
- `\declEquiv` for definition of propositions and predicates
- `\declEqu` for definition of other constants and functions
- `\remark` for remarks at the end of a line
- `\also` to separate multiple declarations
- `\BREAK` for line breaks in long right-hand sides

```

\begin{decls}
  P \declEqu \mbox{set of persons}
\also
  A \declType P \remark{Alex}
\also
  J \declType P
\also
  J \declEqu \mbox{Jane}
\end{decls}

```

```

P := set of persons
A : P — Alex
J : P
J := Jane

```

```

\begin{decls}
  called \declType P \times P \tfun \BB
\also
  called(p,q)
\declEquiv
  \mbox{\$p\$ called \$q\$}
\also
  lonely \declType P \tfun \BB
\also
  lonely . p
\declEquiv
  \lnot (\exists \ q : P
          \BREAK \strut\;
          \withspot called(q,p) )
\end{decls}

```

```

called      : P × P → ℬ
called(p,q) ≡ p called q
lonely      : P → ℬ
lonely.p    ≡ ¬(∃ q : P
                |• called(q,p))

```

```

\begin{decls}
  father \declType P \tfun P
\also
  father . p
\declEqu
  \mbox{the father of \$p\$}
\also
  grandfather \declType P \tfun P
\also
  grandfather . p
\declEqu
  father(father . p)
\end{decls}

```

```

father      : P → P
father.p    := the father of p
grandfather : P → P
grandfather.p := father(father.p)

```

4 Symbols

For the symbols listed here, always use the L^AT_EX macros indicated:

Propositional logic:

L ^A T _E X	Output	
<code>\false</code>	<i>false</i>	Boolean constant <i>false</i>
<code>\true</code>	<i>true</i>	Boolean constant <i>true</i>
<code>\land</code>	∧	conjunction
<code>\lor</code>	∨	disjunction
<code>\implies</code>	⇒	implication
<code>\equiv</code>	≡	equivalence
<code>\nequiv or \not\equiv</code>	≠	inequivalence
<code>\lnot</code>	¬	Boolean negation

Types:

L ^A T _E X	Output	
<code>\BB</code>	\mathbb{B}	type/set of Boolean values; $\mathbb{B} = \{false, true\}$
<code>\NN</code>	\mathbb{N}	type/set of natural numbers
<code>\ZZ</code>	\mathbb{Z}	type/set of integers
<code>\QQ</code>	\mathbb{Q}	type/set of rational numbers
<code>\RR</code>	\mathbb{R}	type/set of real numbers
<code>\CC</code>	\mathbb{C}	type/set of complex numbers
<code>\times</code>	\times	Cartesian product of sets/types
<code>\tfun</code>	\rightarrow	type/set of total functions
<code>\SET{t}</code>	$set(t)$	type of sets with elements of type t

For commonly used quantification operators, there are alternative symbols:

L ^A T _E X	Output	
<code>\forall</code>	\forall	quantification with \wedge
<code>\exists</code>	\exists	quantification with \vee
<code>\Sigma</code>	Σ	quantification with $+$
<code>\Pi</code>	Π	quantification with \cdot

Set theory:

L ^A T _E X	Output	
<code>\in</code>	\in	element-of
<code>\notin</code> or <code>\not\in</code>	\notin	not-element-of
<code>\emptyset</code>	\emptyset	Alternative notation for the empty set $\{\}$
<code>\Universe</code>	\mathbf{U}	the “universe” or domain of discourse (context-dependent!)
<code>\intersection</code>	\cap	set intersection
<code>\union</code>	\cup	set union
<code>-</code>	$-$	set difference
<code>\compl</code>	\sim	set complement
<code>\SET{t}</code>	$set(t)$	the type of sets with elements of type t
<code>\power</code>	\mathbb{P}	the (unary) power set operator
<code>\#</code>	$\#$	size operator for finite sets: $\# : set(t) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$
<code>\subseteq</code>	\subseteq	subset
<code>\subset</code>	\subset	proper subset
<code>\supseteq</code>	\supseteq	superset
<code>\supset</code>	\supset	proper superset
<code>\not\subseteq</code>	$\not\subseteq$	negation of subset relation
<code>\not\subset</code>	$\not\subset$	negation of proper subset relation
<code>\not\supseteq</code>	$\not\supseteq$	negation of superset relation
<code>\not\supset</code>	$\not\supset$	negation of proper superset relation

Cartesian Products and Relations:

L ^A T _E X	Output	
<code>\times</code>	\times	Cartesian product of sets (and of types)
<code>\langle x, y \rangle</code>	$\langle x, y \rangle$	pair with constituents x and y
<code>\fst</code>	fst	first pair projection. Typing: $\text{fst} : (t_1 \times t_2) \rightarrow t_1$
<code>\snd</code>	snd	second pair projection. Typing: $\text{snd} : (t_1 \times t_2) \rightarrow t_2$
<code>\rel</code>	\leftrightarrow	relation set (and type) constructor: $A \leftrightarrow B = \mathbb{P}(A \times B)$
<code>\relId . A</code>	$\mathbb{I}.A$	identity relation on set A . Typing: $\mathbb{I} : \mathbb{P} t \rightarrow (t \leftrightarrow t)$
<code>\relDom . R</code>	$\text{Dom}.R$	domain of relation R . Typing: $\text{Dom} : (t \leftrightarrow u) \rightarrow \mathbb{P} t$
<code>\relRan . R</code>	$\text{Ran}.R$	range of relation R . Typing: $\text{Ran} : (t \leftrightarrow u) \rightarrow \mathbb{P} u$
<code>R \converse</code>	R^\sim	converse of relation R
<code>\fcmp</code>	$\mathbin{;}$	(forward) relation composition. $\mathbin{;} : (t_1 \leftrightarrow t_2) \times (t_2 \leftrightarrow t_3) \rightarrow (t_1 \leftrightarrow t_3)$
<code>R^+</code>	R^+	transitive closure of relation R
<code>R^*</code>	R^*	reflexive-transitive closure of relation R

Other functions and operators:

L ^A T _E X	Output	
<code>\becomes</code>	$:=$	in substitutions, and later for assignment
<code>\id</code>	id	identity function
<code>\max</code>	\uparrow	binary infix maximum operator
<code>\min</code>	\downarrow	binary infix minimum operator

5 Examples

In the following examples, we show L^AT_EX source to the left, and the resulting output to the right.

5.1 Henry VIII had one son and Cleopatra had two.

```
We declare:
\begin{decls}
  h \declEquiv \mbox{Henry VIII had one son}
\also
  c \declEquiv \mbox{Cleopatra had two sons}
\end{decls}
Then the original sentence is formalised as:
\begin{calc}
  h \land c
\end{calc}
```

```
We declare:
      h := Henry VIII had one son
      c := Cleopatra had two sons
Then the original sentence is formalised as:
      h ∧ c
```

5.2 Substitution

```
\begin{calc}
  (x + y)[x, y \becomes y - 3, z + 2]
\CalcStep{=}{performing substitution}
  ((y - 3) + (z + 2))
\CalcStep{=}{removing
              unnecessary parentheses}
  y - 3 + z + 2
\end{calc}
```

```
(x + y)[x, y := y - 3, z + 2]
=   ⟨performing substitution⟩
  ((y - 3) + (z + 2))
=   ⟨removing unnecessary parentheses⟩
  y - 3 + z + 2
```

5.3 A Problem due to Wim Feijen [Gries 1991]

Is the following true or false ,
and how do you prove it?

```
\begin{calc}
  x + y \; \geq \; x \max y
  \quad \equiv \quad
  x \geq 0 \; \land \; y \geq 0
\end{calc}
```

\noindent

To solve the problem,
calculate beginning with the LHS:

```
\begin{calc}
  x + y \; \geq \; x \max y
  \CalcStep{=}{Definition of $\max$}
  x + y \geq x
  \quad \land \quad
  x + y \geq y
  \CalcStep{=}{Arithmetic}
  y \geq 0
  \quad \land \quad
  x \geq 0
  \CalcStep{=}{Symmetry of $\land$}
  x \geq 0
  \quad \land \quad
  y \geq 0
\end{calc}
```

Is the following true or false, and how do you prove it?

$$x + y \geq x \uparrow y \quad \equiv \quad x \geq 0 \wedge y \geq 0$$

To solve the problem, calculate beginning with the LHS:

$$\begin{aligned} & x + y \geq x \uparrow y \\ = & \quad \langle \text{Definition of } \uparrow \rangle \\ & x + y \geq x \quad \wedge \quad x + y \geq y \\ = & \quad \langle \text{Arithmetic} \rangle \\ & y \geq 0 \quad \wedge \quad x \geq 0 \\ = & \quad \langle \text{Symmetry of } \wedge \rangle \\ & x \geq 0 \quad \wedge \quad y \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

5.4 Proving a Goal

```
\begin{calc}[(3.5) Reflexivity of $\equiv$,
  $p \equiv p$
  $]
  p \equiv p
  \CalcStep{=}{(3.3) Identity of $\equiv$}
  \true
  \ThisIs{(3.4)}
\end{calc}
```

Proving (3.5) Reflexivity of \equiv , $p \equiv p$:

$$\begin{aligned} & p \equiv p \\ = & \quad \langle (3.3) \text{ Identity of } \equiv \rangle \\ & \text{true} \quad \text{--- This is (3.4)} \end{aligned}$$

5.5 Substitution Theorem

To avoid having L^AT_EX misinterpret the closing] of substitution as part of a goal as end of the goal, enclose the goal theorem in braces { ... } inside the \$...\$.

```
\begin{calc}[(3.84a) ${(e = f) \land E[z \text{ becomes } e] \equiv
(e = f) \land E[z \text{ becomes } f]}$]
  (e = f) \implies (E[z \text{ becomes } e] \equiv E[z \text{ becomes } f])
\ThisIs{(3.83) Leibniz Axiom}
\CalcStep{=}{Definition of $\implies$ (3.60)}
  (e = f) \land (E[z \text{ becomes } e] \equiv E[z \text{ becomes } f]) \equiv (e = f)
\CalcStep{=}{(3.49)}
  (e = f) \land E[z \text{ becomes } e] \equiv (e = f) \land E[z \text{ becomes } f]
\end{calc}
```

Proving (3.84a) $(e = f) \wedge E[z := e] \equiv (e = f) \wedge E[z := f]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (e = f) \Rightarrow (E[z := e] \equiv E[z := f]) \quad \text{— This is (3.83) Leibniz Axiom} \\
 = & \quad \langle \text{Definition of } \Rightarrow \text{ (3.60)} \rangle \\
 & (e = f) \wedge (E[z := e] \equiv E[z := f]) \equiv (e = f) \\
 = & \quad \langle (3.49) \rangle \\
 & (e = f) \wedge E[z := e] \equiv (e = f) \wedge E[z := f]
 \end{aligned}$$