

Proofs by Resolution and Existential Variables

František Farka^{1,2}

¹University of Dundee, Dundee, Scotland

²University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Scotland

ff32@st-andrews.ac.uk

CoALP-Ty'16, Edinburgh
November 28, 2016

Motivation

- ▶ Horn-Clause Logic in program verification
 - ▶ HC as a general framework (Bjørner *et al.*; 2015)
 - ▶ type-theoretic interpretation (Fu *et al.*; 2016)
 - ▶ soundness of HC resolution for Type-Class resolution (Farka *et al.*; 2016)
- ▶ Limitation of the above - universal fragment
 - ▶ clauses without *existential variables*
 - ▶ resolution by *matching* / universally quantified goals
- ▶ Resolution with existential variables and unification / existentially qualified goals

Problem by an example

Example (Vytiniotis *et al.*; 2011)

```
data T a where
  T1 : Int → T Bool
  T2 : T a

test (T1 n) _ = false
test T2      r = r
```

In System F, there are two different most-general types of test:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{test} & : \forall \alpha. T \alpha \rightarrow \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} \\ \text{test} & : \forall \alpha. T \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \end{aligned}$$

Constrained-type solution:

$$\text{test} : \forall \alpha. \forall \beta. (\alpha \sim \text{Bool} \supset \beta \sim \text{Bool}) \Rightarrow T \alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta$$

With existential quantification:

$$\text{test} : \forall \alpha. \exists \beta. T \alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta$$

Calculus (matching)

Definition (Syntax)

Horn clause $HC ::= \mathcal{K} : At \leftarrow At, \dots, At$

Proof terms $PT ::= \mathcal{K}(PT, \dots, PT)$

Goals $G ::= \forall Var, \dots, Var \exists Var, \dots, Var. At$

Definition (LP-M)

$$\kappa : A \leftarrow B_1, \dots, B_n \in P \frac{P \vdash e_1 : \forall \overline{w_1} \exists \overline{z_1}. \sigma B_1 \quad \dots \quad P \vdash e_n : \forall \overline{w_n} \exists \overline{z_n}. \sigma B_n}{P \vdash \kappa(e_1, \dots, e_n) : \forall \overline{x} \exists \overline{y}. \sigma A}$$

where $\overline{w_i} = \overline{x} \cap \text{var}(\sigma B_i)$ and $\overline{z_i} = \text{var}(\sigma B_i) \setminus w_i$.

Problem by an example revised

Example

constraint-based form (Simonet and Pottier; 2007)

```
data T a where
  T1 : ∀ a [a ~ Bool] . Int → T a
  T2 : ∀ a . T a

test (T1 n) _ = false
test T2      r = r
```

Logic program:

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{refl} : \text{eq}(x, x) & \Leftarrow \\ \kappa_{test} : \text{test}(T(x), y, z) & \Leftarrow (\text{eq}(x, \text{bool}) \Rightarrow \text{eq}(z, \text{bool})), \\ & \text{eq}(y, z) \end{aligned}$$

Outside Horn-clauses (Hereditary Harrop formulae)

Type checking by matching

The type $\text{test} : \forall a. T a \rightarrow a \rightarrow a$ corresponds to a goal
 $\forall a. \text{test}(T(a), a, a)$

$$\frac{\frac{P, (\alpha : \text{eq}(a, \text{bool}) \Leftarrow) \vdash \alpha : \forall a. \text{eq}(a, \text{bool})}{P \vdash \lambda \alpha. \alpha : \forall a. \text{eq}(a, \text{bool})} \quad \frac{}{P \vdash \kappa_{\text{refl}} : \forall a. \text{eq}(a, a)}}{P \vdash \kappa_{\text{test}}(\kappa_{\text{refl}}, \lambda \alpha. \alpha, \kappa_{\text{refl}}) : \forall a. \text{test}(T(a), a, a)}$$

Calculus (unification)

Definition (Extended syntax)

Proof term $HC ::= \dots \mid ind(Var.Term, PT)$

Definition (LP-U)

$$\kappa : A \leftarrow B_1, \dots, B_n \in P \frac{P \vdash e_1 : \forall \bar{w}_1 \exists \bar{z}_1. \sigma B_1 \quad \dots \quad P \vdash e_n : \forall \bar{w}_n \exists \bar{z}_n. \sigma B_n}{P \vdash ind(\bar{y}. \sigma \bar{y}, \kappa(e_1, \dots, e_n)) : \forall \bar{x} \exists \bar{y}. A'}$$

if $(\sigma \upharpoonright \bar{y})A' = (\sigma \upharpoonright \bar{y})A$. Moreover, $w_i = \bar{x} \cap \text{var}(\sigma B_i)$ and $\bar{z}_i = \text{var}(\sigma B_i) \setminus w_i$.

Type checking by unification

The type $\text{test} : \forall a. \exists b. T a \rightarrow b \rightarrow b$ corresponds to a goal
 $\forall a. \exists b. \text{test}(T(a), b, b)$

$$\frac{\frac{P, (\alpha : \text{eq}(a, \text{bool}) \Leftarrow) \vdash \kappa_{\text{refl}} : \text{eq}(\text{bool}, \text{bool})}{P \vdash \lambda \alpha. \kappa_{\text{refl}} : \text{eq}(a, \text{bool}) \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{bool}, \text{bool})} \quad \frac{}{P \vdash \kappa_{\text{refl}} : \text{eq}(\text{bool}, \text{bool})}}{P \vdash \text{ind}(b.\text{bool}, \kappa_{\text{test}}(\kappa_{\text{refl}}, \lambda \alpha. \kappa_{\text{refl}}, \kappa_{\text{refl}})) : \forall a \exists b. \text{test}(T(a), b, b)}$$

Soundness and completeness

Soundness and completeness w.r.t. *first-order dependent type theory* (DTT) (Jacobs; 1999)

Theorem (Soundness)

If $P \vdash_{LP} e : \forall \bar{x} \exists \bar{y}. A$ then $P \vdash_{DTT} e : \Pi \bar{x} \Sigma \bar{y}. A$

Theorem (Completeness)

If $P \vdash_{DTT} e : G$ where e is in ground normal form then $P \vdash_{LP} G$.

Type inference

Utilising *Structural resolution* for type inference (Komendantskaya and Johann; 2015)

- ▶ exhaustive matching / LP-M steps
- ▶ one unification step / LP-U step

Definition (Structural resolution)

Given a logic program P , *structural resolution* is given by an abstract reduction system $(P, \rightarrow_{LP-M}^* \cdot \rightarrow_{LP-U}^1)$

Quantifier assignment:

- ▶ LP-U binds substituted variables to \exists quantifier
- ▶ LP-M binds eliminated variables to \forall quantifier
- ▶ Normalise prefix to $\forall \bar{x} \exists \bar{y}$ by the appropriate substitutions

Type inference (cont'd)

Example

test(x, y, z)

\rightarrow_{LP-U}

eq(w, bool) \Rightarrow eq(z, bool), eq(y, z)

\rightarrow_{LAM}

eq(z, bool), eq(y, z)

\rightarrow_{LP-U}

eq(y, bool)

\rightarrow_{LP-U}

\emptyset

$\{x/T(w)\}; \exists x \forall w$

$\{z/\text{bool}\}; \exists z$

$\{y/\text{bool}\}; \exists y$

Have: $\forall w. \exists z. \exists y. \text{test}(T(w), y, z)$

$\text{ind}(z.\text{bool}, \text{ind}(y.\text{bool}, \kappa_{\text{test}}(\kappa_{\text{refl}}, \lambda\alpha.\kappa_{\text{refl}}, \kappa_{\text{refl}}))) :$

Related Work, Work in Progress & Future Work

Related Work

- ▶ Constraint-based type inference—HM(X), OutsideIn(X), ...
- ▶ Guarded ADT's (Simonet and Pottier; 2007)

Work in Progress

- ▶ Other language constructs than ADTs (Type Families, ...)
- ▶ Non-existential clauses

Future Work

- ▶ Semantics of the calculus
- ▶ Higher order formulae

Thank you