# Reflections on Prismatic Constructions

#### Marc Coiffier

### Contents

| The pure Calculus of Construction |  |  |  |  | <br> |  |  |  |  | 1 |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Inductive Types                   |  |  |  |  | <br> |  |  |  |  | 2 |

The Calculus of Prismatic Constructions, upon which this platform is based, is an extension of the standard CoC with a mechanism for discriminating inductive constructors.

# The pure Calculus of Construction

It is already very well-described elsewhere, so I won't try to provide a full and correct history of the CoC. Suffice to say that it is a logically consistent programming language, that can prove properties withing the framework of intuitionistic logic.

At its simplest, it provides five basic constructions:

- universes, of the form  $Set_n$ , are the "types of types".  $Set_{n+1}$  is the type of  $Set_n$
- products, noted  $\forall (x:X), Yx \text{or } X \to Y \text{ when } Y \text{ doesn't depend on } x \text{are the "types of functions". } \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}, \text{ for instance is the type of functions from the natural numbers to the real numbers.}$
- functions or lambdas, noted  $\lambda(x:X), Yx$ , are the "proofs of products". A valid lambda can be interpreted as the proof of a property, quantified over its variable.
- hypotheses, or variables, are the symbols introduced by surrounding quantifiers ( $\lambda$  and  $\forall$ ). In their context, they are valid proofs of their type.
  - For example, the identity function can be written  $\lambda(A:Set_0)$ ,  $\lambda(a:A)$ , a, and it is a valid proof of  $\forall (A:Set_0)$ ,  $\forall (a:A)$ , A, since a is a valid proof of A in its context.

# **Inductive Types**

Inductive types can be described as enumerations of constructors. In Coq (and similarly in other proof assistants), an inductive type must be declared along with its constructors, using a syntax like:

```
Inductive T : forall A..., Type :=
| t0 : forall x0..., T (f0... x0...)
...
| tn : forall xn..., T (fn... xn...)
```

Here, we declare the inductive type  $T : \forall A..., Type$ , and its constructors called  $t_i$   $(i \in \{0..n\})$ .

As a more concrete example, here is how the type of Booleans can be defined inductively :

```
Inductive Boolean : Type := true : Boolean | false : Boolean.
```

The above definition is essentially a formal statement of the following description of Booleans: a Boolean can have one of two shapes, true or false, and cannot be any other thing.

This means that, if we want to prove a property Px for some unknown Boolean x, all we need is to prove Ptrue and Pfalse.

This exact information is summed up in what we call the *induction principle* for Booleans. In Coq, it will be given the name Boolean\_rect, for instance, and have the type  $\forall (P:Boolean \rightarrow Type), Ptrue \rightarrow Pfalse \rightarrow \forall (b:Boolean), Pb.$