

Exercise 1

Given the definition of the operator $(++)$

1. $[] ++ ys = ys$
2. $(x:xs) ++ ys = x : (xs ++ ys)$

Property 1

I will show by induction on xs that the following holds: $xs ++ [] = xs$.

- **Base Case:** $xs = []$:

$[] ++ []$
 { apply definition of $(++)$ case 1 }
 $[]$

- **Inductive step:** $xs = (w:ws)$:

$(w:ws) ++ []$
 { apply definition of $(++)$ case 2 }
 $w : (ws ++ [])$
 { apply I.H. on the subexpression $ws ++ []$ }
 $w : ws \equiv xs$

Property 2

I will show by induction on xs that $xs ++ (ys ++ zs) = (xs ++ ys) ++ zs$.

- **Base Case:** $xs = []$.

$[] ++ (ys ++ zs)$
 { apply definition of $(++)$ case 1 }
 $ys ++ zs$
 { unapply definition of $(++)$ case 1 to ys }
 $([] ++ ys) ++ zs$

- **Inductive step:** $xs = w:ws$.

$(w:ws) ++ (ys ++ zs)$
 { apply definition of $(++)$ case 2 }
 $w : (ws ++ (ys ++ zs))$
 { apply I.H. on $ws ++ (ys ++ zs)$ }
 $w : ((ws ++ ys) ++ zs)$
 { unapply case 2 of $(++)$ }
 $(w : (ws ++ ys)) ++ zs$
 { unapply case 2 of $(++)$ to $(w : (ws ++ ys))$ }
 $((w:ws) ++ ys) ++ zs$
 { substituting $(w:ws)$ with xs }
 $(xs ++ ys) ++ zs$

Exercise 2

Show that $\text{exec}(c \ ++ \ d) \ s = \text{exec } d \ (\text{exec } c \ s)$, where exec is the function that executes the code consisting of sequences of *PUSH* n and *ADD* operations. I will show by induction on c that the property holds:

- **Base Case:** $c = []$

```

exec ([] ++ d) s
  { Application of (++) }
exec d s
  { unapplying exec (case 1) }
exec d (exec [] s)

```

- **Inductive step** $c = (w:ws)$, i.e. the list contains at least one element. Because the stack is composed of Push n and Add operations, I have to distinguish two cases:

1. $c = (\text{Push } n):ws$

```

exec (((Push n):ws) ++ d) s
  { Application of (++) }
exec ((Push n) : (ws++d)) s
  { Application of exec }
exec (ws ++ d) (n : s)
  { Application of I.H. }
exec d (exec ws (n:s))
  { unapply inner exec }
exec d (exec (Push n:ws) s)

```

2. $c = \text{ADD}:ws$

```

exec ((ADD:ws) ++ d) s
  { Application of (++) }
exec (ADD : (ws++d)) s
  { Application of exec }

```

We assume that the stack is composed by at least 2 elements, i.e. $s = m:n:s'$.

The previous line is:

```

exec (ADD : (ws++d)) (m:n:s')

```

```

exec (ws ++ d) ((m+n) : s')
  { Application of I.H. }
exec d (exec ws ((m+n):s'))
  { unapply inner exec }
exec d (exec (ADD:ws) m:n:s')

```

Exercise 3

Given the type and instance declarations below, verify the functor laws for the *Tree* type, by induction of trees:

```

1 data Tree a = Leaf a | Node (Tree a) (Tree a)
2
3 instance Functor Tree where
4   --fmap :: (a -> b) -> Tree a -> Tree b
5   fmap g (Leaf x) = Leaf (g x)
6   fmap g (Node l r) = Node (fmap g l) (fmap g r)

```

First Law

I have to show that $\text{fmap id} = \text{id}$. I have to distinguish two cases: the base case $\text{Leaf } x$ and the step one $\text{Node } l \ r$

- Base case

```

fmap id (Leaf x) =
  { apply fmap }
Leaf (id x) =
  { apply id }
Leaf x =
  { unapply id } id (Leaf x)

```

- Inductive step

```

fmap id (Node l r) =
  { apply fmap }
Node (fmap id l) (fmap id r) =
  { I.H. on trees l and r }
Node (id l) (id r) =
  { apply id on l and r }
Node l r =
  { unapply id }
id (Node l r)

```

Second Law

I have to show that $\text{fmap } (g.h) = \text{fmap } g. (\text{fmap } h)$. I have to distinguish two cases: the base case $\text{Leaf } x$ and the step one $\text{Node } l \ r$

- Base case (Leaf x)

```
fmap (g.h) (Leaf x)=
  { apply fmap }
Leaf ((g.h) x)=
  { apply composition of g and h }
Leaf (g (h x))=
  { unapply fmap g }
fmap g (Leaf (h x)) =
  { unapply fmap h }
fmap g (fmap h (Leaf x)) =
  { unapply (.) }
(fmap g . fmap h) (Leaf x)
```

- Inductive step

```
fmap (g.h) (Node l r) =
  { apply fmap }
Node (fmap (g.h) l) (fmap (g.h) r) =
  { I.H. on trees l and r }
Node (fmap g . fmap h l) (fmap g . fmap h r)=
  { Application of (.) }
Node (fmap g (fmap h l)) (fmap g (fmap h r)) =
  { unapply fmap g }
fmap g (Node (fmap h l) (fmap h r))=
  { unapply fmap h }
fmap g (fmap h (Node l r))
  { unapply (.) }
(fmap g . fmap h) (Node l r)
```

Exercise 4

Verify the functor laws for the Maybe type. I recall the Maybe instantiation of the functor class:

```
1 data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
2
3 instance Functor Maybe where
4   --fmap :: (a -> b) -> Tree a -> Tree b
5   fmap g Nothing = Nothing
6   fmap g (Just x) = Just (g x)
```

First Law

I have to show that `fmap id = id`. I have to distinguish two cases: **Nothing** and **Just x** (There is no induction here!)

- Case A (**Nothing**)

```
fmap id Nothing=
{ apply fmap }
Nothing=
```

- Case B (**Just x**)

```
fmap id (Just x) =
{ apply fmap }
Just (id x) =
{ apply id }
Just x=
{ unapply id }
id (Just x)=
```

Second Law

I have to show that $\text{fmap } (g.h) = \text{fmap } g. (\text{fmap } h)$. I have to distinguish two cases: **Nothing** and **Just x**:

- Case A (**Nothing**)

```
fmap (g.h) Nothing=
{ apply fmap }
Nothing=
{ unapply fmap g }
fmap g Nothing =
{ unapply fmap h }
(fmap g.fmap h) Nothing
```

- Case B (**Just x**)

```
fmap (g.h) (Just x)=
{ apply fmap }
Just ((g.h) x)=
{ apply composition of g and h }
Just (g (h x))=
{ unapply fmap g }
fmap g (Just (h x)) =
{ unapply fmap h }
(fmap g . fmap h) (Just x)
```

Exercise 5

Given the equation $\text{comp}' e c = \text{comp } e ++ c$, show how to construct the recursive definition for comp' by induction on e . Before trying to solve the exercise I will show a very trivial LEMMA, that simplifies the following proofs:

Lemma 1. $[x]++ys = x:ys$

Proof.

```

[x]++ys
{ Desugaring }
(x:[]) ++ ys
{ Apply definition of (++) step case }
x : ([] ++ ys)
{ Apply definition of (++) }
x:ys

```

□

- **Base Case:**

```

comp' (Val n) c
{ apply given equation }
comp (Val n) ++ c
{ apply comp }
[Push n] ++ c
{ Lemma 1 }
(Push n) : c

```

- **Inductive step:**

```

comp' (Add n m) c
{ apply given equation }
comp (Add n m) ++ c
{ apply comp }
comp n ++ comp m ++ ([ADD] ++ c)
{ Lemma 1 }
comp n ++ comp m ++ (ADD : c)
{ unapply comp' }
comp n ++ (comp' m (ADD : c))
{ unapply comp' }
comp' n (comp' m (ADD : c))

```