

### For the record: A beautiful derivation

On page 67 of [0], the authors point out that instead of postulating:

$$(0) \quad [ \langle \forall x : [x = y] : f.x \rangle \equiv f.y ] \quad ,$$

and then deriving the theorem:

$$(1) \quad \langle \forall x : [x = y] : \mathbf{false} \rangle \equiv \mathbf{false} \quad ,$$

one could, in reverse, postulate (1) and derive (0) as a theorem. The authors “suggest the use of Leibniz’s Rule” .

Not having much experience with serious manipulation of the predicate calculus, I couldn’t resist taking the authors up on their challenge. Here is my proof, with heuristics:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \langle \forall x : [x = y] : f.x \rangle \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{In order to exploit (1), we need to get } \mathbf{false} \text{ into the term. This can} \\
 & \quad \text{be done simply, using the fact that } \mathbf{false} \text{ is the unit of } \vee . \} \\
 & \langle \forall x : [x = y] : f.x \vee \mathbf{false} \rangle \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{Now that } \mathbf{false} \text{ has been introduced, we need to get rid of } f.x \text{, and} \\
 & \quad \text{since we also need to have } f.x \text{ conjoined with } [x = y] \text{ to use Leibniz’s} \\
 & \quad \text{rule, shunting is called for.} \} \\
 & \langle \forall x : [x = y] \wedge \neg f.x : \mathbf{false} \rangle \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{As planned, we introduce } f.y \text{ of our goal, using Leibniz.} \} \\
 & \langle \forall x : [x = y] \wedge \neg f.y : \mathbf{false} \rangle \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{So far, so good! We are almost ready to use (1), but first we have} \\
 & \quad \text{to remove } f.y \text{ from the quantification. This should be possible, since} \\
 & \quad f.y \text{ does not depend on } x \text{. Preparing to use the distributivity of } \vee \\
 & \quad \text{over } \forall \text{, we trade } f.y \text{ back into the term.} \} \\
 & \langle \forall x : [x = y] : f.y \vee \mathbf{false} \rangle \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{As planned, we use the fact that } \vee \text{ distributes over } \forall . \} \\
 & f.y \vee \langle \forall x : [x = y] : \mathbf{false} \rangle \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \text{Now we are ready to use (1) ...} \} \\
 & f.y \vee \mathbf{false} \\
 \equiv & \quad \{ \dots \text{ and } \mathbf{false} \text{ leaves as it entered.} \} \\
 & f.y \quad .
 \end{aligned}$$

JAW8-1

This derivation is perhaps too simple to merit a JAW , which is why this is just “for the record” .

[0] Edsger W. Dijkstra & Carel S. Scholten: “Predicate Calculus and Program Semantics” , Springer-Verlag, New York Inc., 1990

Bus 16 in Santa Cruz, 23 November 2004

Revised: NYC, 28 December 2010

Jeremy Weissmann  
jeremy@mathmeth.com