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## Summary of previous lectures

- We manipulate tree-like data structures called terms
- All trees have a type, which are themselves trees
- Notation: term : type
- Basic way to have new types: Inductive definitions declaring the complete set of its constructors example: enumerated types
- Constructors may have arguments $\rightarrow$ hence trees
- Case analysis on an enumerated type (match)
- Definitions can be written directly or interactively
- In general, things are defined within an environment made of declarations variable : type
- pluging: works for all terms having the expected type
- functions of type $\forall x_{1}: t_{1}, \ldots \forall x_{n}: t_{n}, t_{\text {result }}$
where $t_{\text {result }}$ may depend on $x_{1} \ldots x_{n}$
example: funny: $\forall r: r g b$, Set_of $r$
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## Computation on trees

The whole point of computer science is computation
On trees, it means successive transformations

$$
\text { tree }_{0} \longrightarrow \text { tree }_{1} \longrightarrow \text { tree }_{2} \longrightarrow \ldots \text { tree }_{n} \longrightarrow \ldots
$$

- all tree $_{i}$ have the same type
- delimited transformations (neighboring nodes involved) called reductions
- reduction order irrelevant ****
- computation always terminates $* * * *$
- therefore, all tree $_{i}$ have the same value

We get stateless programming
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## Reduction of a case
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reduces to the "second" branch: _ co
Called $\iota$-reduction

## Reduction of a case

$3 \iota$-reductions for rgb
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## Reduction of a case

3 ィ-reductions for rgb

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\begin{array}{l}
\text { match Rf with } \\
\mid \mathrm{Rf} \Rightarrow t_{1} \\
\mid \mathrm{Gf} \Rightarrow t_{2} \\
\mid \mathrm{Bf} \Rightarrow t_{3} \\
\text { end. }
\end{array}\right\} \quad \text { Reduces to } t_{1} \\
& \text { match Gf with } \\
& \text { | Rf }=>t_{1} \\
& \mid \mathrm{Gf}=>t_{2} \\
& \text { | } \mathrm{Bf}=>t_{3} \\
& \text { end. } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { match } \mathrm{Bf} \\
\mid \mathrm{Rf} \Rightarrow t_{1}
\end{array} \\
& \text { | } \mathrm{Gf}=>t_{2} \\
& \text { | } \mathrm{Bf} \Rightarrow t_{3} \\
& \text { end. }
\end{aligned}
$$
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## Functions: example

```
Definition color_of : forall (r: rgb), color :=
    fun ( \(r\) : rgb) =>
    match \(r\) with
    | Rf => Red
    | Gf => Green
    | Bf => Blue
    end.
```

Application: by juxtaposition
color_of Bf

## Products and functions

Consider an environment containing $x: t$ (and may be other types variables) where we define a term $U_{x}: u$

More generally, $u$ may depend on $x$.
Consider an environment containing $x: t$ (and may be other types variables) where we define

- a type $u_{x}$
- a term $U_{x}: u_{x}$

Then fun $x \Rightarrow U_{x}$ is a function defined for all $x$, and returning $U_{x}$ each time it applied to some argument for $x$.

$$
\text { fun } x: t \Rightarrow U_{x}: \quad \forall x: t, u_{x}
$$

Application
If $f: \forall x: t, u_{x}$ and $A: t$
then $f$ can be applied to $A$ and the type of the result is $u_{A}$
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$$
\begin{gathered}
\vdots U \\
\frac{u_{x}}{\forall x: t, u_{x}} \text { fun }[\mathrm{x}]
\end{gathered}
$$

Warning: this $x$ makes sense only in $U$, i.e. is available only from $x: t$ to $u_{x}$

## When the type of the result does not depend on $x$
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Warning: this $x$ makes sense only in $U$, i.e. is available only from $x: t$ to $u$

## Other syntax: $t \rightarrow u$ instead of $\forall x: t, u$



$$
\begin{gathered}
{[x: t]} \\
\vdots U \\
\frac{u}{t \rightarrow u} \text { fun }[\mathrm{x}]
\end{gathered}
$$
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Warning: this $x$ makes sense only in $U$,
i.e. is available only from $x: t$ to $u$

## Example 1

```
Definition color_of : forall (r: rgb), color :=
    fun ( \(r\) : rgb) =>
    match \(r\) with
    | Rf => Red
    | Gf \(=>\) Green
    | Bf => Blue
    end.
```

Definition color_of : rgb -> color :=
fun ( $r$ : rgb) =>
match $r$ with
| Rf => Red
| Gf => Green
| Bf => Blue
end.

Question: where $r$ is available?

## Example 2

```
Definition Set_of : forall (r: rgb), Set :=
    fun (r: rgb) =>
    match \(r\) with
    | Rf => rgb
    | Gf => color
    | Bf => tuple4
    end.
```

Definition Set_of : rgb -> Set :=
fun (r: rgb) =>
match $r$ with
| Rf => rgb
| Gf => color
| Bf => tuple4
end.

Question: where $r$ is available?

## Example 3

```
Definition Set_of : rgb -> Set :=
    fun ( \(r\) : rgb) =>
    match \(r\) with
    | Rf => rgb
    | Gf => color
    | Bf => tuple4
    end.
Definition funny : forall (r: rgb), Set_of r :=
    fun (r: rgb) =>
    match \(r\) with
    | Rf \(=>\) Gf
    | Gf => Yellow
    | \(\mathrm{Bf}=>\mathrm{t} 1\)
    end.
```

Remark: Yellow : Set_of Gf because Set_of Gf reduces to color
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## Reduction of function $=$ application to an argum ${ }^{t}$
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Substitution: U [ x : $=\mathrm{A}$ ] is U where all free occurrences of x are replaced by A .

Called $\beta$-reduction

## Example

```
Set_of Gf \(\delta\)-reduces to
    (fun (r: rgb) =>
    match \(r\) with
    | Rf => rgb
    | Gf => color
    | Bf => tuple4
    end) Gf
\(\beta\)-reduces to
    match Gf with
    | Rf => rgb
    | Gf => color
    | Bf => tuple4
    end
```

match Gf with
| Rf => rgb
| Gf => color
| Bf => tuple4
end
ı-reduces to
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## Introduction, elimination, reduction

## General statement from Proof Theory

In each type we have corresponding introduction and elimination rules, as well as reductions

For inductive types

- introduction $=$ constructor
- elimination $=$ case
- reduction $=\iota$-reduction

For functions

- introduction $=$ fun
- elimination $=$ application
- reduction $=\beta$-reduction
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## Introduction, elimination, reduction

Introduction, elimination, reduction work together

- Observation: reducing a tree yields a constructor at its root
- The latter can be the key argument of a case
- Therefore, case analysis on constructors is exhaustive
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## Functions of several arguments

In $\forall x, u_{x}, \quad u_{x}$ can itself be a product type $\forall y, v_{x y}$
We get $\forall x, \forall y, v_{x y}$ which reads $\forall x,\left(\forall y, v_{x y}\right)$
Typing:

- $x: t$
- $U_{x}: u_{x}$
- $y: r_{x}$ (the type of $y$ may depend on $x!$ )

Alltogether: $\forall x: t, \forall y: r_{x}, v_{x y}$
In particular, $\forall x: t, r_{x} \rightarrow v_{x}$ reads $\forall x: t,\left(r_{x} \rightarrow v_{x}\right)$ and $t \rightarrow r \rightarrow v$ reads $t \rightarrow(r \rightarrow v)$

Consistently, $f A B$ reads $(f A) B$,

| given $f: t \rightarrow(r \rightarrow v)$, | $A: t$ | and | $B: r$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| or $\quad f: \forall x: t, \forall y: r_{x}, v_{x y}$, | $A: t$ | and | $B: r_{A}$ |
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## Example: identity function (specific)

```
Definition id_rgb : forall (r: rgb), rgb :=
    fun ( \(r\) : rgb) =>
    match \(r\) with
    | Rf \(=>R f\)
    | Gf => Gf
    | Bf \(=>B f\)
    end.
```


## Simpler

Definition id_rgb : forall (x: rgb), rgb := fun (x: rgb) => x.

## Similarly

Definition id_color : forall (x: color), color := fun (x: color) => x.

## Example: identity function (general)

Definition id_rgb : forall (x: rgb), rgb := fun (x: rgb) => x.

Definition id_rgb : rgb -> rgb := fun (x: rgb) => x.

## Generalization
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Definition id : forall (X: Set), forall (x: X), X := fun (X: Set) (x: X) $\Rightarrow x$.

Definition id : forall (X: Set), X $->$ X := fun (X: Set) (x: X) $\Rightarrow \mathrm{x}$.

Definition id_rgb : forall (x: rgb), rgb := id rgb.

## Application of a function to several arguments

Definition id : forall (X: Set), X -> X := fun (X: Set) (x: X) => x.

The term id rgb Gf reads (id rgb) Gf
And similarly for functions expecting $3,4 \ldots$ arguments
Constructors as functions

Mk4rgb : forall $x 1, x 2, x 3, x 4: r g b, ~ t u p l e 4$
Mk4rgb : rgb -> rgb -> rgb -> rgb -> tuple4
Mk4rgb Gf Rf Gf Bf
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## Partial application of a function

We have already seen: id rgb
What is meaning and the type of Mk 4 rgb Gf Rf ?
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## Functions as first class objects

We have seen that the result of a function can be a function
Similarly, a function can be passed as an argument of a function

Example: id (rgb $\rightarrow$ color) color_of

## Exercises:

- Reduce the previous expression
- Reduce: id (rgb $\rightarrow$ color) color_of Bf


## Conclusion on functions

Functions are one of the prominent feature of Coq, where they live in a very general setting.

In particular we will see that proofs are always trees and are even functions most of the time

Hence the importance of

- defining functions
- using functions (application)
- typing functions

Next important notions

- pattern matching
- application to logic
- recursive functions (fixpoints) and induction
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## Definitions in general

Definition some_name : some_type := BODY
where BODY is some code depending on previously defined names BUT NOT on yet undefined names including some_name

## Equality

$$
\text { some_name }=B O D Y
$$

Performing replacement of some_name by BODY

- lazily: $\delta$-reductions are mixed with other reductions
- statically, at the begining: the process terminates in 1 step for each occurrence of some_name this is the essence of a definition
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## Definitions of functions: as before

Definition my_function : forall (x: A), B := fun $\mathrm{x}=>B O D Y$
where $B O D Y$ is some code depending on

$$
\mathrm{x}
$$

other previously defined names
but not on my_function and other undefined names

Equalities ( $\delta$ immediately followed by new $\beta$ )

$$
\text { my_function } a=B O D Y \text { [x replaced by a] }
$$

where $a$ is any argument of type $A$
Performing replacement of my_function

- lazily: $\delta$-reductions are mixed with other reductions
- statically: essence of a definition


## Recursive "definitions"

Definition? some_name : some_type := BODY

Recursivity: when BODY does contain occurrences of some_type

Performing replacement of some_name

- statically: impossible, this is an endless process this is not a definition
- lazily: mixing $\delta$-reductions with other reductions may terminate if sensible parts of the term are deleted by interleaved reductions
- remember that $\iota$-reductions deletes subterms
- relevant for $\iota$-reductions inside functions

Computationally meaningful, definitionally meaningless

## A mathematical point of view

Definition? some_name : some_type := BODY
Let us consider some_name as a parameter of $B O D Y$, and rename it as sn .

Definition auxFP : some_type $\rightarrow$ some_type := fun sn => BODY'

Assuming the equation some_name $=B O D Y$ we get
auxFP some_name
$=B O D Y^{\prime}$ [sn replaced by some_name]
= BODY
= some_name
The "definition" actually specifies
a solution to a fixpoint equation
Makes sense as a mathematical definition if existence and unicity of a solution are ensured

## Computationally irrelevant example

Definition? mynat : nat := 2 - mynat

Definition auxFP : nat $\rightarrow$ nat := fun $x$ => 2 - $x$

Assuming the equation mynat $=2$ - mynat we get
auxFP mynat
$=$ (fun x => $2-x$ ) mynat
= 2 - mynat
$=$ mynat
mynat is specified as a solution of auxFP $\mathrm{x}=\mathrm{x}$
In this example, reductions are of no help
for finding the fixpoint: 2-(2-(2-...))
However a mathematical solution exists : 1

## Can be computationally relevant for functions

Definition? my_function :

```
    forall (x: A), B :=
    fun x => BODY
```

Replacing all occurrences of my_function by $f$ in $B O D Y$ :
Definition auxFP :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (forall (x: A), B) } \rightarrow \text { (forall (x: A), B) := } \\
& \text { fun } f=>\left(f u n ~ x ~=>B O D Y^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

We get: auxFP my_function = my_function which states that my_function is a fixpoint of auxFP

Makes computational sense if
termination of (necessary) reductions is ensured

## Fixpoints in Coq

In Coq fixpoints make sense because
Recursive calls are allowed only on structurally smaller argument

Structural recursion

- A term $t$ is structurally smaller than $t$, iff $t$ is a strict subterm of $t$ '
- obtained using pattern matching


## Important application

Induction principles are special cases of fixpoints
To be understood later, when considering proof-trees and functions over proof-trees
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## Pattern matching

- The destruct tactic and the match construct in the case where constructors have arguments
- More general pattern matching
- See related coq files
- Much better than Lisp or C style
- Important special case: empty inductive type


## Example: lists

Here we consider list of Booleans for simplicity
Inductive list : Set := | Nil : list | Cons : bool -> list -> list.

Scheme of use for pattern matching:
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```
match l with
| Nil => expression_1
| Cons h t => expression_2 of h and t
end.
```


## Why pattern matching is nice

Definition of the length of a list using pattern matching

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fixpoint length (l: list) : nat := } \\
& \text { match l with } \\
& \text { | Nil }=>0 \\
& \text { | Cons } \mathrm{h} \text { t }=>\mathrm{S} \text { (length } \mathrm{t} \text { ) } \\
& \text { end. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Compare with (in Lisp or C-like style)
...if beq_list 1 Nil then 0 else S (length (tail l))
Here, tail makes sense only if its argument is a non-empty list, but it is non trivial that the else branch of beq_list 1 Nil ensures that (the correctness of our definition of beq_list is questionnable).
In contrast, pattern-matching provides a comfortable environment for expression_2, where h and t are available with the right type for free.

## Empty inductive type

An inductive may have any number of constructors, including 0 .

Inductive empty : Set := .
Pattern matching: no case (0 branch) to consider:
Variable e: empty.
match e return nat with end.
Note the return clause in the match construct: it aims at providing the type of expressions on the different branches, when it cannot be guessed from the context.
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## Dependent inductive types

Pattern matching is still more powerful in the case of dependent inductive types

Dependent type
When a type depends on values or types provided by the current environment
Example: funny in previous lectures.
Hint: perform Print funny in the coq file.
Inductive dependent type
See more advanced lectures
Very important special case

## Equality
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## Dependent inductive types

## Example without special meaning

Inductive dontcare : bool -> Set :=
| DO : dontcare true
| D1 : forall (b:bool) (n: nat),
even $n$-> dontcare b -> dontcare (negb b).
Scheme of use for pattern matching, assuming $d$ : dontcare $b$
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```
match d with
| DO => expression_1
| D1 b' n e d' => expression_2 of b', n, e and d'
end
```
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## Special case: equality

Theory
The notation $\mathrm{x}=\mathrm{y}$ is a shorthand for eq x y , where eq is inductively defined.
The precise definition involves some subtelties, to be introduced later.

For practice it is much simpler
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We just need:

- For all type $A$, and $x, y: A$, $x=y$ is something that we can try to prove
- Canonical proofs of equality are by reflexivity
- Destructing (i.e., using) equalities: rewrite


## Equality in practice

Proving an equality
Canonical proofs of equality are by reflexivity, a shorthand for apply eq_refl

$$
\text { eq_ref1 }: \forall A, \forall x: A, x=x
$$

Using an equality
If

- the environment contains e: $X=Y$
- the current goal concludes to $P X$

Then rewrite e yields $P Y$

## Variants:

- rewrite -> e (same effect)
- rewrite <-e $\quad($ replaces $P Y$ by $P X)$

