## Coq workshop

#### What is Coq?

Formal methods

- → Programming logics
  - ↓ Type theory
    - ▶ Proof assistants
      - → Coq

#### What is Coq?

- Formal language for program specification (type theory)
- Reasoning and proofs about the specification
- Mechanical assistant for proofs

"implementation" of the Calculus of Constructions by Thierry Coquand, which is based on Martin-Löf's Intuitionistic Type Theory

# Proof assistant for Mathematicians and Logicians

#### What I can do in Coq?

- Constructive logic
- Proof construction

$$\frac{\text{hypothesis}}{\text{goal}} \quad (\text{ or } \quad \frac{\text{hypothesis}_1}{\text{goal}_1} \quad \frac{\text{hypothesis}_2}{\text{goal}_2} \quad \frac{\text{hypothesis}_n}{\text{goal}_n} \quad )$$

A tactic transforms 
$$\frac{\Gamma(\text{hypothesis})}{\alpha \text{ (goal)}}$$
 into zero or more  $\frac{\Gamma_1}{\alpha_1}$   $\frac{\Gamma_2}{\alpha_2}$  ...  $\frac{\Gamma_n}{\alpha_n}$ 

That's sufficient to build a proof of the original goal

Basic tactics

assumption (the goal is in the h)

Γ <u>Η: α</u> α

Basic tactics

Introduction:

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\alpha \to \beta} \quad \text{intro H} \quad \frac{H: \alpha}{\beta}$$

**Basic tactics** 

"intro V left"	$\frac{\Gamma}{\alpha \lor \beta}$	left	<u>Γ</u>	
"intro ∨ right"	- Γ αVβ	right	<u>Γ</u>	
"intro /\"	<u>Γ</u> α/\β	split	<u>Γ</u>	<u>Γ</u> β
" 'intro' _ _"	Γ False	absurd	<u>Γ</u>	<u>Γ</u> ~α

**Basic tactics** 

Elimination

In gral

$$\frac{\Gamma}{H: \alpha_1 \to \alpha_2 \to \dots \to \beta} \qquad \text{apply H} \qquad \frac{\Gamma}{H: \alpha_1 \to \alpha_2 \to \dots \to \beta} \qquad \frac{\Gamma}{H: \alpha_1 \to \alpha_2 \to \dots \to \beta} \qquad \frac{\Pi: \alpha_1 \to \alpha_2 \to \dots \to \beta}{\alpha_2} \qquad \dots$$

**Basic tactics** 

elimination

Other tactics

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\alpha} \quad \text{cut } \beta \quad \frac{\Gamma}{\beta \rightarrow \alpha} \quad \frac{\Gamma}{\beta}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\alpha} \quad \text{exact t} \quad \text{(when t is a proof of } \alpha\text{)}$$

Other tactics

Unfold ("expand definitions")

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\sim \alpha} \quad \text{unfold not} \quad \frac{\Gamma}{\alpha \rightarrow \text{False}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\beta \leftrightarrow \alpha} \quad \text{unfold iff } \frac{\Gamma}{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) / (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)}$$

in hypothesis: unfold \*name\* in \*h\*

Other

(classical logic) a V ~a

(constructive tautologies) auto

## Proof time!

Higher order predicate calculus

#### Higher order predicate calculus

forall

Intro

 $\frac{\Gamma}{\text{forall x:A,B}}$ 

intro x

Г \_\_\_x:А \_\_\_\_\_

```
forall
      Elim
                                                 apply H - Proved!
                       H:forall x:A,Y
                                                                     (if exists a:A / B = Y[x:=a])
                                                 apply H or apply H (a1 a2 ...) - Proved!
            H:forall (x_1:A_1)(x_2:A_2)...,Y
                                                  (if exists a_1:A_1, a_2:A_2[x_1:=a_1]... / B=Y[x_1:=a_1,...,x_n:=a_n])
H:forall x_1:A_1,A_2 \rightarrow forall x_3:A_3,Y apply H
                                                             H:forall x_1:A_1,A_2 \rightarrow forall x_3:A_3,Y
            (if exists a_1:A_1 and a_3:A_2[x_1:=a_1] / B= Y[x_1:=a_1,x_2:=a_2])
```

```
exists
          Intro
                                     exists t
            exists x:U,A(x) (where t:U is a witness)
          Elim
    H:exists x:U,A(x)
                                                               H:exists x:U,A(x)
                                     elim H
                          (where y is a new variable not in B)
                                                              for all y:U, A(y) \rightarrow B
           B
```

Other tactics

reflexivity, symmetry, transitivity

rewrite -> \*term\*

replace a with b

**Show Proof** 

Show Tree

## Proof time!

Proof assistant for Programmers

#### The Curry-Howard correspondence

- direct relationship between computer programs and mathematical proofs
- generalization of a syntactic analogy between systems of formal logic and computational calculi

"The Curry–Howard correspondence is the observation that two families of seemingly unrelated formalisms—namely, the proof systems on one hand, and the models of computation on the other—are in fact the same kind of mathematical objects."

#### The Curry-Howard correspondence

LOGIC SIDE PROGRAMMING SIDE

Universal quantification Generalised product type ( $\Pi$  type)

Existential quantification Generalised sum type ( $\Sigma$  type)

Implication Function type

Conjunction Product type

Disjunction Sum type

True formula Unit type

False formula Bottom type

#### Coq programming language

Typed lambda calculus with

higher order parametric functions dependent types

inductive types

coinductive types

CC

(calculus of constructions)

CCI

(calculus of constructions with inductive types)

CCI<sup>∞</sup>

( calculus of constructions with inductive and coinductive types)

#### Programing proofs

```
H1:(x:A) B -> C
H2:B
z:A
======
C
exact ((H1 z) H2)
```

#### Syntax

```
T := Set | Type | Prop
                                                             variables
                                                             defined constants
                                                             application
 (T T)
                                                             abstraction
| [ x : T ]T
| (x : T) T
                                                             product
  T -> T
                                                             function type
  Inductive x [x:T, ...x:T] : T := c:T | ... | c:T
                                                             inductive def.
  \langle T \rangle match T with T=>T |...| T => T end
                                                             case analysis
  Fixpoint x [x:T, ...x:T] : T := T
                                                             recursive def.
```

#### Inductive types (Set)

```
Inductive nat : Set :=
     0 : nat
   | S : nat -> nat
Inductive bool : Set :=
     true : bool
   | false : bool
Inductive natlist : Set :=
     nil: natlist
   cons : nat -> natlist -> natlist
```

#### Parametric inductive types

```
Inductive list (A:Set) : Set :=
    nil : list A
    | cons : A -> list A -> list A
```

#### Inductive type families

```
Inductive array(A:Set) : nat -> Set :=
    empty : array A 0
    | add : forall n:nat, A -> array A n -> array A (S n)
```

#### Mutually inductive type families

#### Inductive predicates

Inductive predicates

```
Inductive Even : nat -> Prop :=
    e0 : Even 0
    | eSS : forall n:nat, Even n -> Even (S (S n))
```

#### Inductive definitions - Consequences

Case analysis ("pattern matching") - Functions

Recursion

Case analysis - Propositions

Induction

Destructors

#### **Functions**

```
(case analysis)

Definition pred :=
  fun n:nat => match n with
     0 => 0
     | S m => m
  end.
```

#### **Functions**

```
    Constructors application:
    apply c i
    constructor i (= intros ; apply c i )/ constructor
```

- Constructors discrimination:
   discriminate H (proves anything if H: t<sub>1</sub>= t<sub>2</sub>, with t<sub>1</sub> and t<sub>2</sub> created with different constructors)
- Constructors injectivity: injection H (removes same constructors from an equality)
- In general... simplify\_eq (applies discriminate or injection)

#### Recursive functions

#### **Fixpoint**

```
Fixpoint f(x 1 : I 1) \dots (x n : I n) : Q := e
Fixpoint add (n m:nat) {struct n}: nat :=
match n with
      \odot => m
    \mid S \mid k => S \pmod{k m}
end.
Fixpoint even (n:nat) : bool :=
    match n with 0 => true | S k => odd k
                                                 end
with odd (n:nat) : bool :=
    match n with 0 => false | S k => even k
                                                  end.
```

#### Case analysis - Propositions

To prove a property P (: Prop) by cases of an object x of a inductive type I

#### Tactics:

- case x: generates cases according the definition of I.
- destruct x: applies intros and then case

#### Induction

Induction

To prove a property P using the primitive induction principle associated to an inductive definition of a type I

Tactics:

- elim x:

generates cases according the definition of x, with their inductive hypothesis

- induction x:

applies intros and then elim

elim = apply <destructor>

#### **Destructors**

When an inductive type I is defined, Coq generates three constants corresponding to the recursion and induction principles:

- I \_ ind is the induction principle for Prop
  - Implements the structural induction principle for objects of I
- I \_ rec is the induction principle for Set
  - allows recursive definitions over objects of I
- I\_rect is the induction principle for Type
  - permite definir familias recursivas de tipos allows to define inductive type families

### Let's code!

#### Program extraction

Extract correct code to:

Scheme

Haskell

**OCaml** 

(but also F#, Rust, Scala)

#### References

https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00076024/document [CoC]

http://coq.inria.fr/

https://coq.inria.fr/tutorial-nahas

https://coq.inria.fr/tutorial/

https://x80.org/collacoq/

https://www.cis.upenn.edu/~bcpierce/sf/current/index.html

### Thank you!