

Coinductive Soundness of Corecursive Type Class Resolution

František Farka^{1,2}, Ekaterina Komendantskaya², Kevin Hammond², and Peng Fu³

¹University of Dundee, Dundee, Scotland

²University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Scotland
{ff32,kh8}@st-andrews.ac.uk

³Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, Scotland
{ek19,pf7}@hw.ac.uk

August 25, 2016

Research questions

- ▶ Soundness of resolution on a fragment of Horn-clause logic
 - ▶ inductive soundness w.r.t. the (standard) least Herbrand models
 - ▶ coinductive soundness w.r.t. the greatest Herbrand models
- ▶ Motivated by type-classes resolution
- ▶ Feasibility of context update techniques for corecursive type class resolution
- ▶ The fragment
 - ▶ no existential variables
 - ▶ no overlapping clauses
 - ▶ resolution by matching

Problem by an example

Example (Equality on Pairs)

```
class Eq x where  
  eq :: Eq x  $\Rightarrow$  x  $\rightarrow$  x  $\rightarrow$  Bool  
  
instance (Eq x, Eq y)  $\Rightarrow$  Eq (Pair x y) where  
  eq (Pair x1 y1) (Pair x2 y2) = eq x1 x2 && eq y1 y2  
  
instance Eq Int where  
  eq x y = primitiveIntEq x y
```

Example (Φ_{Pair})

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_1 : \text{eq}(x), \text{eq}(y) &\Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{pair}(x, y)) \\ \kappa_2 : &\Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{int}) \end{aligned}$$
$$\text{eq}(\text{pair}(\text{int}, \text{int})) \rightarrow_{\kappa_1} \text{eq}(\text{int}), \text{eq}(\text{int}) \rightarrow_{\kappa_2} \text{eq}(\text{int}) \rightarrow_{\kappa_2} \emptyset$$

Models

- ▶ *Herbrand base* \mathbf{B}_Σ - set of all (finite) ground atoms
- ▶ *Semantic operator* $\mathcal{T}_P : 2^{\mathbf{B}_\Sigma} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbf{B}_\Sigma}$ -

$$\mathcal{T}_P(I) = \{A \in \mathbf{B}_\Sigma \mid B_1, \dots, B_n \Rightarrow A \text{ is a ground instance of a program clause, and } \{B_1, \dots, B_n\} \subseteq I\}$$

- ▶ The *least Herbrand model* is the least set such that it is a fixed point of \mathcal{T}_P .
- ▶ The *greatest Herbrand model* is the greatest set such that it is a fixed point of \mathcal{T}_P .

We use $P \models_{ind} A$ and $P \models_{coind} A$ to denote that A is the least and the greatest model respectively

Type Class Resolution

Definition

$$\text{if } (e : B_1, \dots, B_n \Rightarrow A) \in \Phi \frac{\Phi \vdash e_1 : \sigma B_1 \quad \dots \quad \Phi \vdash e_n : \sigma B_n}{\Phi \vdash e \ e_1 \ \dots \ e_n : \sigma A} \quad (\text{LP-M})$$

Example

$$\frac{\frac{\Phi_{Pair} \vdash \kappa_2 : \text{eq}(\text{int})}{\Phi_{Pair} \vdash \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \kappa_2 : \text{eq}(\text{pair}(\text{int}, \text{int}))} \quad \frac{\Phi_{Pair} \vdash \kappa_2 : \text{eq}(\text{int})}{\Phi_{Pair} \vdash \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \kappa_2 : \text{eq}(\text{pair}(\text{int}, \text{int}))}}{\Phi_{Pair} \vdash \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \kappa_2 : \text{eq}(\text{pair}(\text{int}, \text{int}))}$$

Theorem

Let Φ be an axiom environment for a logic program P , and let $\Phi \vdash e : A$ hold. Then $P \models_{ind} A$.

Data types *Even* and *Odd*

Example ($\Phi_{EvenOdd}$)

$$\kappa_1 : \text{eq}(x), \text{eq}(\text{evenList}(x)) \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{oddList}(x))$$

$$\kappa_2 : \text{eq}(x), \text{eq}(\text{oddList}(x)) \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{evenList}(x))$$

$$\kappa_3 : \qquad \qquad \qquad \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{int})$$

$$\underline{\text{eq}(\text{evenList}(\text{int}))} \rightarrow_{\kappa_2} \text{eq}(\text{int}), \text{eq}(\text{oddList}(\text{int})) \rightarrow_{\kappa_3}$$

$$\text{eq}(\text{oddList}(\text{int})) \rightarrow_{\kappa_1} \text{eq}(\text{int}), \text{eq}(\text{evenList}(\text{int})) \rightarrow_{\kappa_3}$$

$$\underline{\text{eq}(\text{evenList}(\text{int}))} \rightarrow_{\kappa_2} \dots$$

Corecursive Type Class Resolution

Definition

$$\text{if HNF}(e) \frac{\Phi, (\alpha : \Rightarrow A) \vdash e : A}{\Phi \vdash \nu \alpha. e : A} \quad (\text{NU}')$$

Example

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\kappa_3 : \text{eq}(\text{int})}}{\vdash \kappa_3 : \text{eq}(\text{int})} \quad \frac{\frac{\kappa_3 : \text{eq}(\text{int})}{\vdash \kappa_3 : \text{eq}(\text{int})} \quad \frac{\alpha : \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{evenList}(\text{int}))}{\vdash \alpha : \text{eq}(\text{evenList}(\text{int}))}}{\Phi_{\text{EvenOdd}}, \alpha : - \vdash \kappa_1 \kappa_3 \alpha : \text{eq}(\text{oddList}(\text{int}))}}{\Phi_{\text{EvenOdd}}, \alpha : - \vdash \kappa_2 \kappa_3 (\kappa_1 \kappa_3 \alpha) : \text{eq}(\text{evenList}(\text{int}))}} \text{NU}'}{\Phi_{\text{EvenOdd}} \vdash \nu \alpha. \kappa_2 \kappa_3 (\kappa_1 \kappa_3 \alpha) : \text{eq}(\text{evenList}(\text{int}))}$$

Theorem

Let Φ be an axiom environment for a logic program P , and let F be an atomic formula. If $\Phi \vdash e : F$ by the LP-M and NU' rules, then $P \vDash_{\text{coind}} F$.

Data type *Bush*

Example (Φ_{Bush})

$$\kappa_1 : \quad \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{int})$$

$$\kappa_2 : \text{eq}(x), \text{eq}(\text{bush}(\text{bush}(x))) \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{bush}(x))$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{eq}(\text{bush}(\text{int})) \rightarrow_{\kappa_2} \text{eq}(\text{int}), \text{eq}(\text{bush}(\text{bush}(\text{int})) \rightarrow_{\kappa_1} \dots \rightarrow_{\kappa_2} \\ \text{eq}(\text{bush}(\text{int})), \text{eq}(\text{bush}(\text{bush}(\text{bush}(\text{int})))) \rightarrow_{\kappa_1} \dots \end{aligned}$$

Extended Corecursive Type Class Resolution

Definition

$$\frac{\Phi, (\beta_1 : \Rightarrow B_1), \dots, (\beta_n : \Rightarrow B_n) \vdash e : A}{\Phi \vdash \lambda\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n. e : B_1, \dots, B_n \Rightarrow A} \quad (\text{LAM})$$

$$\text{if HNF}(e) \frac{\Phi, (\alpha : B_1, \dots, B_n \Rightarrow A) \vdash e : B_1, \dots, B_n \Rightarrow A}{\Phi \vdash \nu\alpha. e : B_1, \dots, B_n \Rightarrow A} \quad (\text{NU})$$

Example

$$\frac{\frac{\Phi_{Bush} \vdash}{\kappa_1 : \text{eq}(\text{int})} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\Phi_{Bush}, (\alpha : \text{eq}(x) \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{bush}(x))), (\beta : \Rightarrow \text{eq}(x)) \vdash \kappa_2\beta(\alpha(\alpha\beta)) : \text{eq}(\text{bush}(x))}{\Phi_{Bush}, (\alpha : _)} \vdash \lambda\beta. \kappa_2\beta(\alpha(\alpha\beta)) : \text{eq}(x) \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{bush}(x))}{\Phi_{Bush} \vdash \nu\alpha. \lambda\beta. \kappa_2\beta(\alpha(\alpha\beta)) : \text{eq}(x) \Rightarrow \text{eq}(\text{bush}(x))}}{\Phi_{Bush} \vdash (\nu\alpha. \lambda\beta. \kappa_2\beta(\alpha(\alpha\beta))) \kappa_1 : \text{eq}(\text{bush}(\text{int}))} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{LAM} \\ \text{NU} \end{array}$$

Soundness of Extended Corecursive Type Class Resolution

Theorem

Let Φ be an axiom environment for a logic program P , and let $\Phi \vdash e : F$ for a formula F by the LP-M, LAM, and NU rules. Then $P \vDash_{\text{coind}} F$.

Proposition

There exists a logic program P , an axiom environment Φ for P and a formula F such that $\Phi \vdash e : F$ by the LP-M, LAM, and NU rules and $P \not\vDash_{\text{ind}} F$.

Consider $\Phi_A = \{\kappa : A \Rightarrow A\}$.

Then $\Phi_A \vdash \nu\alpha.\kappa\alpha : A$ and $P_A \not\vDash_{\text{ind}} A$.

Conclusion & Future Work

Conclusion

- ▶ We provide a uniform analysis of soundness of type class resolution
- ▶ We establish coinductive soundness of extended corecursive type class resolution
- ▶ We demonstrate that corecursive type class resolution is not sound inductively

Future Work

- ▶ Program transformation for extended type class resolution
- ▶ Completeness properties for extended type class resolution