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| :---: | :---: |
| (** * Lecture 02 *) |  |
| (** Infer some type arguments automatically. *) |  |
| Set Implicit Arguments. |  |
| (** |  |
| Note that the type constructor for functions (arrow "->") associates to the right: |  |
| $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C=A \rightarrow(B \rightarrow C)$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { >> } \\ & \text { *) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Inductive list (A: Type) : Type := \| nil : list A |  |
| \| cons : A $\rightarrow$ list A -> list A. |  |
| ```Fixpoint length (A: Type) (l: list A) : nat := match l with \| nil _ => O | cons x xs => S (length xs) end.``` |  |
| (** |  |
| So far, Coq will not infer the type argument for [nil]: << Check (cons 1 nil). |  |
| Error: The term "nil" has type "forall A : Type, list A" while it is expected to have type "list nat". |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { >> } \\ & \text { *) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Check (cons 1 (nil nat)). |  |
| (** We can tell Coq to always try though: *) |  |
| Arguments nil $\{\mathrm{A}\}$. |  |
| Check (cons 1 nil). |  |
| (** ${ }^{\text {* }}$ ) |  |
| [countdown] is a useful function for testing. [countdown $n$ ] produces the list: |  |
| $n::(n-1)::(n-2):: \ldots:: 1:: 0:: \text { nil }$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { >> } \\ & \text { *) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ```Fixpoint countdown (n: nat) := match n with \| O => cons n nil | S m => cons n (countdown m) end.``` |  |
|  |  |
| Eval cbv in (countdown 0). $1 * *$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & =\text { cons } 0 \text { nil } \\ & \text { : list nat } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { >> } \\ & \text { *) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ```Eval cbv in (countdown 3). (** = cons 3 (cons 2 (cons 1 (cons 0 nil)))``` |  |
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| :---: | :---: |
| ```We can write it slightly differently using [foldr]: *) Definition fact' (n: nat) : nat := match n with \| 0 => 1 | S m => foldr mult (map (plus 1) (countdown m)) 1 end.``` |  |
|  |  |
| ```(** As an exercise, please prove these two versions of factorial equivalent: *)``` |  |
| ```Lemma fact_fact': forall n, fact n = fact' n.``` |  |
| ```Proof. (** challenge problem *) Admitted.``` |  |
| ```(** It turns out we can write many list function just in terms of [foldr]. Here's a definition of [map] using [foldr]: *)``` |  |
| Definition map' (A B : Type) <br> (f : A -> B) (l : list A) : list B := <br> foldr (fun $x$ acc $=>$ cons ( $f$ x) acc) l nil. |  |
| ```(** We can prove our "foldr" version of map equivalent to the direct definition: *)``` |  |
| ```Lemma map_map' : forall (A B : Type) (f : A -> B) (l : list A), map f l = map' f l.``` |  |
| ```Proof. intros. induction l. + simpl. unfold map'. simpl. reflexivity. + simpl. rewrite IHl. (** again, need to unfold so simpl can grind *) unfold map'. simpl. reflexivity.``` |  |
| _Note_: this proof is very sensitive to the order of rewrite and unfold! *) |  |
| Qed. |  |
| (** |  |
| We can also define another flavor of fold, called [foldl], that starts applying [f] to the first element of the list instead of the last. <br> What's the difference? <br> When would you use [foldl] instead of [foldr]? |  |
| *) ```Fixpoint foldl (A B : Type) (f : A -> B -> B) (l : list A) (b : B) : B := match l with \| nil => b | cons x xs => foldl f xs (f x b)``` |  |
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| :---: | :---: |
| (** <br> We say that the version of [rev] above is "inefficient" because it is not _tail recursive_. A function is tail recursive when all recursive calls are the final action of the function. You can read more about tail recursion here: <br> https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tail_call <br> Tail recursion is generally faster and leads to less stack space consumption, but it is more complicated and therefore often trickier to reason about. <br> Below we define a tail recursive function to reverse a list. We first define a helper function [fast_rev_aux] which takes an additional argument [acc] ("acc" is short for "accumulator"). We "accumulate" the resulting reversed list with each recursive call. <br> Note how [fast_rev_aux] only calls itself in tail position, i.e., as its result. <br> Tail recursion is typically faster because compilers for functional programming languages often perform tail-call optimization ("TCO"), in which stack frames are re-used by recursive calls. <br> *) <br> Fixpoint fast_rev_aux (A : Type) <br> (1 : list A) (acc : list A) : list A := <br> match 1 with <br> \| nil => acc <br> \| cons x xs => fast_rev_aux xs (cons x acc) <br> end. <br> Definition fast_rev (A : Type) <br> (l : list A) : list A := <br> fast_rev_aux l nil. <br> (** <br> We can make sure our faster, tail-recursive version of reverse is right by proving it equivalent to the simpler, non-tail-recursive version. <br> However, as we see below, we will not be able to do this directly. We will first need to prove a helper lemma with a _stronger_ induction hypothesis. <br> *) <br> Theorem rev_ok: <br> forall A (l : list A), <br> fast_rev l = rev 1 . <br> Proof. <br> intros. <br> induction 1. <br> + simpl. (** reduces rev, but does nothing to rev_fast *) unfold fast_rev. (** unfold fast_rev to fast_rev_aux *) simpl. (** now we can simplify the term *) reflexivity. <br> (** TIP: if simpl doesn't work, try unfolding! *) <br> + unfold fast_rev in *. <br> (** this looks like it could be trouble... *) <br> simpl. rewrite <- IHl. <br> (** STUCK! need to know about the rev_aux accumulator (acc) *) <br> (** TIP: if your IH seems weak, try proving something more general *) <br> Abort. ```Lemma fast_rev__aux_ok: forall A (l1 l2 : list A), fast_rev_aux l1 l2 = app (rev l1) l2. Proof. intros. induction l1.``` | ```+ simpl. reflexivity. + simpl. (** STUCK AGAIN! need to know for *any* 12 *) (** TIP: if your IH seems weak, only intro up to the induction variable *)``` Abort. Lemma fast_rev_aux_ok: forall A (11 12: list A), fast_rev_aux $1112=a p p(r e v ~ l 1) ~ 12$. Proof. intros A 11. induction 11. + intros. simpl. reflexivity. $+$ (** Compare the induction hypothesis (IHll) here with the one we had before. What's different? Why is this called "generalizing" the induction hypothesis? *) intros. simpl. rename 12 into foo. (** Note that we can rewrite by IHll even though it is universally quantified (i.e., there's a [forall]). Coq will figure out what to replace [12] with in [IHll (cons a foo)]. *) rewrite IHl1. rewrite app_assoc. simpl. reflexivity. <br> Qed. <br> (** <br> With our stronger induction hypothesis from the lemma, |
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| :---: | :---: |
| ~ ' ~"' |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \gg \\ \text { *) } \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |
| (** add an element to the end of a list *)Fixpoint snoc (A : Type) |  |
|  |  |
| (l : list A) (x : A) : list A := match l with |  |
| \| nil ${ }^{\text {a }}$ cons x nil |  |
| \| cons y ys => cons y (snoc ys x) end. |  |
| Theorem snoc_app_singleton : |  |
| forall A (l : list A) (x : A), snoc $1 \mathrm{x}=\mathrm{app} \mathrm{l}$ (cons x nil). |  |
| Proof. |  |
| intros. |  |
| induction 1. |  |
| + simpl. reflexivity. |  |
| + simpl. rewrite IHl. reflexivity. Qed. |  |
| ```Theorem app_snoc_l : forall A (l1 : list A) (l2 : list A) (x : A),``` |  |
|  |  |
| Proof. |  |
| intros. |  |
| induction 11. |  |
| + simpl. reflexivity. |  |
| + simpl. rewrite IHl1. reflexivity. Qed. |  |
| Theorem app_snoc_r : |  |
| forall A (l1 : list A) (12 : list A) (x : A), app 11 (snoc 12 x ) $=\operatorname{snoc}(\operatorname{app} 11$ l2) x . |  |
| Proof. |  |
| intros. |  |
| induction ll. |  |
| + simpl. reflexivity. |  |
| + simpl. rewrite IHll. reflexivity.Qed. |  |
|  |  |
| (** Another simple but inefficient way to reverse a list *) |  |
| Fixpoint rev_snoc (A : Type) (l : list A) : list A := |  |
| ```match l with \| nil => nil``` |  |
| ```\| cons x xs => snoc (rev_snoc xs) x end.``` |  |
| Lemma fast_rev_aux_ok_snoc: |  |
| forall A (l1 12 : list A), |  |
| fast_rev_aux 11 12 = app (rev_snoc 11) 12. Proof. |  |
| intros A 11. |  |
| induction 11. |  |
| + intros. simpl. reflexivity. |  |
| + intros. simpl. |  |
| rewrite IHll. <br> rewrite app_snoc_l. |  |
|  |  |
| Qed. |  |
| Lemma fast_rev_ok_snoc: |  |
| forall A (l : list A), |  |
| fast_rev l = rev_snoc l. |  |
| Proof. |  |
| intros. <br> unfold fast rev. |  |
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reflexivity.

## ged.

(**
We'll finish off with some example lemmas about [rev] and [length].

Note how often the same proof pattern keeps emerging!
*)
Lemma length_app:
forall A (11 12 : list A),
length (app l1 12) = plus (length l1) (length 12).
Proof.
intros.
induction 11.

+ simpl. reflexivity.
+ simpl. rewrite IHll. reflexivity.
Qed.
Lemma plus_1_S:
forall n,
plus $\mathrm{n} 1=\mathrm{S} \mathrm{n}$.
Proof.
intros.
induction $n$.
+ simpl. reflexivity.
Qed
Lemma rev_length
forall A (1: list A),
length (rev l) = length 1 .
Proof.
inductio
induction 1.
+ simpl. reflexivity.
+ simpl. rewrite length_app.
rewrite IHl. reflexivity
Qed.
Lemma rev_app:
forall A (11 12: list A),
rev (app l1 l2) = app (rev l2) (rev l1).
Proof.
induction 11.
induction 11.
+ simpl. rewrite app_nil. reflexivity.
reflexivity.
Qed.
Lemma rev_involutive:
forall A (1: list A),
rev (rev 1) = 1 .
Proof.
intros.
induction 1
+ simpl. reflexivity.
+ simpl. rewrite rev_app
Qed.

