

Inductive predicates

Jean-François Monin

2013-08-08



<http://sts.thss.tsinghua.edu.cn/Coqschool2013>



Predicates

Given a type T , how to **select** elements of T satisfying some property p ?

Let us consider a **predicate**

$$p : T \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$$

Let u be an inhabitant of T .

We say that u is **selected** when

- ▶ we can prove $p\ u$
- ▶ there is a proof tree in $p\ u$
- ▶ $p\ u$ is inhabited

Otherwise u is **not selected**

Predicates, relations

Given a type T , how to **select** elements of T satisfying some property ?

General type to be considered: $T \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$

Sometimes, the answer can be **computed**

Then we can also use: $T \rightarrow \mathbf{bool}$

Note that $T \rightarrow \mathbf{color}$ works as well

More generally: **inductive relations**

Given types T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n , how to **simultaneously select** elements of T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n , satisfying some property ?

General type to be considered: $T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$

To some extent, we can also use:

$$T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_n \rightarrow \mathbf{bool}$$

What does it mean, not to be selected ?

We say that u is **selected** when

- ▶ there is no proof tree in $p\ u$
- ▶ $p\ u$ is not inhabited

So, what we need here is a special type (a proposition) which is **empty**

How to make it?

Take any inductive type with **zero constructor**

Inductive **False** : Prop :=

.

This makes sense because of **strong normalization**

Strong normalization

Let T be an inductive type

Let u an inhabitant of T

Then

- ▶ u can be reduced by computation to a unique normal form u_0
- ▶ (in the empty environment),
the normal form u_0 starts with a **constructor** of T

Therefore, there is no inhabitant at all in **False**

Using a data type (bool, color,...)

Take a decision function generally written $p_b : T \rightarrow \text{bool}$
such that

forall $x : T$, $p_b\ x = \text{true}$ is equivalent to $p\ x$

No magic in bool

Take a decision function $p_c : T \rightarrow \text{color}$
such that

forall $x : T$, $p_c\ x = \text{white}$ is equivalent to $p\ x$

Inductive predicates on days

How to **select** elements of **day** ?

Even numbers

```
Inductive even : nat -> Prop :=  
  | E0 : even 0  
  | E2: forall n:nat, even n -> even (S (S n)).
```

We expect the following induction principle:

$$\frac{P\ 0 \quad \forall n, \text{even } n \rightarrow P\ n \rightarrow P\ (S\ (S\ n))}{\forall n, \text{even } n \rightarrow P\ n}$$

Lists of consecutive even numbers

```
Inductive natlist: Set :=
| E : natlist
| C : nat -> natlist -> natlist.
```

$$\frac{P E \quad \forall n \forall l, P l \rightarrow P (C n l)}{\forall l, P l}$$

```
Inductive evl : nat -> Set :=
| E0 : evl 0
| E2: forall n:nat, evl n -> evl (S (S n)).
```

$$\frac{P E0 \quad \forall n \forall l, P l \rightarrow P (E2 n l)}{\forall l, P l}$$

$$\frac{P 0 E0 \quad \forall n \forall l, P n l \rightarrow P (S (S n)) (E2 n l)}{\forall n l, P n l}$$

Functional interpretation

```
Inductive list : Set :=
| E : list
| C : nat -> list -> list.
```

$$\frac{P E \quad \forall n \forall l, P l \rightarrow P (C n l)}{\forall l, P l}$$

Lists of [consecutive even numbers](#)

typed according to the [value of the expected next head](#)

```
Inductive evl : nat -> Set :=
| E0 : evl 0
| E2: forall n:nat, evl n -> evl (S (S n)).
```

$$\frac{P E0 \quad \forall n \forall l, P l \rightarrow P (E2 n l)}{\forall l, P l}$$

$$\frac{P 0 E0 \quad \forall n \forall l, P n l \rightarrow P (S (S n)) (E2 n l)}{\forall n l, P n l}$$

Lists of consecutive even numbers (cont'd)

```
Inductive evl : nat -> Set :=
| E0 : evl 0
| E2: forall n:nat, evl n -> evl (S (S n)).
```

$$\frac{P 0 E0 \quad \forall n \forall l, P n l \rightarrow P (S (S n)) (E2 n l)}{\forall n l, P n l}$$

Take for P a predicate which does not depend on its second argument: $P n l \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q n$

$$\frac{Q 0 \quad \forall n \forall (l : \text{evl } n), Q n \rightarrow Q (S (S n))}{\forall n (l : \text{evl } n), Q n}$$

$$\frac{Q 0 \quad \forall n, \text{evl } n \rightarrow Q n \rightarrow Q (S (S n))}{\forall n, \text{evl } n \rightarrow Q n}$$

Now, evl reads just *even*

Booleans and inductively defined predicates

```
Fixpoint evenb (n:nat) : bool :=
match n with
| 0      => true
| S 0    => false
| S (S n') => evenb n'
end.
```

```
Inductive even : nat -> Prop :=
| E0 : even 0
| E2 : ∀ n, even n -> even (S (S n)).
```

Theorem even_evenb : $\forall n, \text{even } n \rightarrow \text{evenb } n = \text{true}$.

By induction on the [structure of the proof](#) of [even n](#)

Theorem evenb_even : $\forall n, \text{evenb } n = \text{true} \rightarrow \text{even } n$.

By induction on n

Booleans and inductively defined predicates

Theorem even_evenb :

$\forall n, \text{even } n \rightarrow \text{evenb } n = \text{true}.$

By induction on the **structure of the proof** of **even n**

Don't have to bother about odd numbers

Theorem evenb_even :

$\forall n, \text{evenb } n = \text{true} \rightarrow \text{even } n.$

By induction on *n*: need for strengthening and discrimination.

Inversion

Issue: getting the possible ways of constructing a hypothesis

Easier for **evenb** than for **even**

This issue cannot be avoided for non-deterministic relations

Inductive relation: less or equal on nat

From standard library

Inductive le (n : nat) : nat -> Prop :=

| le_n : n <= n

| le_S : forall m : nat, n <= m -> n <= S m

Inductive definitions / function to bool

- ▶ Inductive definitions are more flexible, easier to define
- ▶ With inductive definitions, we only care with the positive cases
- ▶ Inductive hypotheses may require heavy steps called **inversions**
- ▶ Functional definitions allow reasoning steps by computation, which is powerful and convenient
- ▶ In particular, “inversion is for free” with functional definitions
- ▶ Important: a functional definition can be used for **tests** in a program

if e then A else B is a shorthand for

```
match e with
| true => A
| false => B
end
```