

Towards Refinement by Resolution Dependent Type Theory

František Farka

joint work with Kevin Hammond and Ekaterina Komendantskaya

November 9, 2017

Motivation

```
data maybeA (a : A)    : Bool → type where
  nothing          : maybeA ff
  just             : A → maybeA tt

fromJust : maybeA tt → A
fromJust (just x) = x
```

Motivation

```
data maybeA (a : A) : Bool → type where
  nothing : maybeA ff
  just : A → maybeA tt
```

fromJust : maybe_A tt → A

fromJust (just x) = x


$$\begin{aligned} t_{\text{fromJust}} = & \lambda(m : \text{maybe}_A \text{ tt}). \text{elim}_{\text{maybe}_A \text{ tt}} m \\ & (\lambda(w : \text{tt} \equiv \text{ff}). \text{elim}_{\equiv} w) \\ & (\lambda(w : \text{tt} \equiv \text{tt}). \lambda(x : A). x) \end{aligned}$$

Motivation

```
data maybeA (a : A)    : Bool → type where
  nothing          : maybeA ff
  just             : A → maybeA tt
```

```
fromJust : maybeA tt → A
```

```
fromJust (just x) = x
```



$$\begin{aligned} t_{\text{fromJust}} = & \lambda(m : \text{maybe}_A \text{ tt}). \text{elim}_{\text{maybe}_A} ?_a m \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_A). ?_b) \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_B). \lambda(x : A). x) \end{aligned}$$

Problem

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\text{fromJust}} = & \lambda(m : \text{maybe}_A \text{ tt}). \text{elim}_{\text{maybe}_A} ?_a m \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_A). ?_b) \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_B). \lambda(x : A). x) \end{aligned}$$

Problem

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\text{fromJust}} = & \lambda(m : \text{maybe}_A \text{ tt}). \text{elim}_{\text{maybe}_A} ?_a m \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_A). ?_b) \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_B). \lambda(x : A). x) \end{aligned}$$

Solution:

$$?_A \rightarrow \text{tt} \equiv \text{ff}$$

$$?_B \rightarrow \text{tt} \equiv \text{tt}$$

$$?_a \rightarrow \text{tt}$$

$$?_b \rightarrow \text{elim}_\equiv w$$

Problem

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\text{fromJust}} = & \lambda(m : \text{maybe}_A \text{ tt}). \text{elim}_{\text{maybe}_A} ?_a m \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_A). ?_b) \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_B). \lambda(x : A). x) \end{aligned}$$

Solution:

$$\begin{aligned} ?_A \rightarrow \text{tt} &\equiv \text{ff} \\ ?_B \rightarrow \text{tt} &\equiv \text{tt} \\ ?_a \rightarrow \text{tt} & \\ ?_b \rightarrow \text{elim}_\equiv w & \end{aligned}$$

Method:

- ▶ Refinement calculus to first-order Horn-clause logic
- ▶ Proof-relevant resolution
- ▶ Interpretation of answer substitutions as solutions

Problem

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\text{fromJust}} = & \lambda(m : \text{maybe}_A \text{ tt}). \text{elim}_{\text{maybe}_A} ?_a m \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_A). ?_b) \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_B). \lambda(x : A). x) \end{aligned}$$

First-order Horn clause logic (fohc) with resolution:

judgements	→	atoms / goals
type-level metavariables	→	logic variables
inference rules	→	program clauses
term-level metavariables	→	

Problem

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\text{fromJust}} = & \lambda(m : \text{maybe}_A \text{ tt}). \text{elim}_{\text{maybe}_A} ?_a m \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_A). ?_b) \\ & (\lambda(w : ?_B). \lambda(x : A). x) \end{aligned}$$

First-order Horn clause logic (fohc) with resolution:

judgements	→	atoms / goals
type-level metavariables	→	logic variables
inference rules	→	program clauses
term-level metavariables	→	proof-terms

Proof-Relevant Resolution

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Terms} & Ter ::= \quad Var \mid \mathcal{F}(Ter, \dots, Ter) \\ \text{Atoms} & At ::= \quad \mathcal{P}(Ter, \dots, Ter) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{HC's} & HC ::= \quad At \leftarrow At, \dots, At \\ \text{Progs} & P ::= \quad \cdot \mid P, HC \end{array}$$

$$A \leftarrow B_1, \dots, B_n \in P \frac{P \vdash \quad \sigma B_1 \quad \dots \quad P \vdash \quad \sigma B_n}{P \vdash \sigma A}$$

Proof-Relevant Resolution

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Terms} & Ter ::= \quad Var \mid \mathcal{F}(Ter, \dots, Ter) \\ \text{Atoms} & At ::= \quad \mathcal{P}(Ter, \dots, Ter) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{HC's} & HC ::= \quad \mathcal{K} : At \leftarrow At, \dots, At \\ \text{Progs} & P ::= \quad \cdot \mid P, HC \end{array}$$

$$c : A \leftarrow B_1, \dots, B_n \in P \quad \frac{P \vdash e_1 : \sigma B_1 \quad \dots \quad P \vdash e_n : \sigma B_n}{P \vdash c \ e_1 \ \dots \ e_n : \sigma A}$$

Example

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \text{type} : \text{kind}}{\text{TYPEAX}}$$

Example

$$P = \dots,$$
$$c_{typeAx} : kind(type, X) \quad \leftarrow \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash type : \text{kind}} \text{TYPEAx}$$

Example

$$P = \dots,$$
$$c_{typeAx} : kind(type, X) \quad \leftarrow \frac{\Gamma \vdash type : kind}{\Gamma \vdash type : kind} \text{ TYPEAx}$$

Goal: $\text{kind}(Y, \text{nil})$

$$\frac{}{P \vdash c_{typeAx} : kind(type, nil)}$$

Refinement

$\mathcal{S} \vdash P$

$\mathcal{S}; \Gamma; A \vdash (G \mid K)$
 $\mathcal{S}; \Gamma; M \vdash (G \mid A)$

Refinement

$$\mathcal{S} \vdash P$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{S}; \Gamma; A \vdash (G \mid K) \\ \mathcal{S}; \Gamma; M \vdash (G \mid A) \end{array}$$

LF:

$$\frac{\mathcal{S}; \Gamma \vdash: \Pi x : A.B \quad \mathcal{S}; \Gamma \vdash N : A}{\mathcal{S}; \Gamma \vdash MN : B[M/x]} \text{Π-ELIM}$$

Refinement calculus:

$$\frac{\mathcal{S}; \Gamma; M \vdash (G_M \mid C) \quad \mathcal{S}; \Gamma; N \vdash (G_N \mid A)}{\mathcal{S}; \Gamma; MN \vdash (G_M \wedge G_N \wedge C \equiv \Pi A. ?_B | ?_B [M/x])} \text{REF-Π-ELIM}$$

Refinement

$$\mathcal{S} \vdash P$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{S}; \Gamma; A \vdash (G \mid K) \\ \mathcal{S}; \Gamma; M \vdash (G \mid A) \end{array}$$

LF:

$$\frac{\mathcal{S}; \Gamma \vdash: \Pi x : A. B \quad \mathcal{S}; \Gamma \vdash N : A}{\mathcal{S}; \Gamma \vdash MN : B[M/x]} \text{Π-ELIM}$$

Refinement calculus:

$$\frac{\mathcal{S}; \Gamma; M \vdash (G_M \mid C) \quad \mathcal{S}; \Gamma; N \vdash (G_N \mid A)}{\mathcal{S}; \Gamma; MN \vdash (G_M \wedge G_N \wedge C \equiv \Pi A. ?_B | ?_B[M/x])} \text{REF-Π-ELIM}$$

Lemma

Let t be a refinement problem in a well-formed signature \mathcal{S} such that a solution (ρ, R) exists. Then there is a goal G and an extended type A such that $\mathcal{S}; \cdot \vdash (G \mid A)$.

Nameless Representation

builds on *Locally nameless representation* (Urban *et al.*; 2011)

$$\lambda B.x0z \xrightleftharpoons[\text{close}]{\text{open}} \lambda A.\lambda B.1\ 0\ z$$

Nameless Representation

builds on *Locally nameless representation* (Urban *et al.*; 2011)

$$\lambda B.x0z \stackrel{\substack{open \\ \Leftarrow \\ close}}{\Leftarrow} \lambda A.\lambda B.1\ 0\ z$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A.\lambda y : B.xy\ 0 \stackrel{\substack{unshift \\ \Leftarrow \\ shift}}{\Leftarrow} \Gamma, C \vdash \lambda x : A.\lambda y : B.xy1$$

Nameless Representation

builds on *Locally nameless representation* (Urban *et al.*; 2011)

$$\lambda B.x0z \xrightarrow[\text{close}]{\text{open}} \lambda A.\lambda B.10z$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A.\lambda y : B.xy0 \xrightarrow[\text{shift}]{\text{unshift}} \Gamma, C \vdash \lambda x : A.\lambda y : B.xy1$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda A.\lambda B.1_T0_T0_\Gamma$$

Nameless Representation

builds on *Locally nameless representation* (Urban *et al.*; 2011)

$$\lambda B.x0z \stackrel{\substack{open \\ \Leftarrow \\ close}}{\Leftarrow} \lambda A.\lambda B.1\ 0\ z$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A.\lambda y : B.xy\ 0 \stackrel{\substack{unshift \\ shift}}{\Leftarrow} \Gamma, C \vdash \lambda x : A.\lambda y : B.xy1$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda A.\lambda B.1_T 0_T 0_\Gamma$$

Combined operations:

- ▶ simultaneous open/shift: $\overleftarrow{M}[0_\Gamma/0_T]$
- ▶ simultaneous close/unshift: $\overrightarrow{M}[0_T/0_\Gamma]$
- ▶ simultaneous open/substitution: $M[0_T/N]$

Nameless Representation

builds on *Locally nameless representation* (Urban *et al.*; 2011)

$$\lambda B.x0z \stackrel{\substack{open \\ \Leftarrow \\ close}}{\quad} \lambda A.\lambda B.1\ 0\ z$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A.\lambda y : B.xy\ 0 \stackrel{\substack{unshift \\ \Leftarrow \\ shift}}{\quad} \Gamma, C \vdash \lambda x : A.\lambda y : B.xy1$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda A.\lambda B.1_T 0_T 0_\Gamma$$

Combined operations:

- ▶ simultaneous open/shift: $\overleftarrow{M}[0_\Gamma/0_T]$
- ▶ simultaneous close/unshift: $\overrightarrow{M}[0_T/0_\Gamma]$
- ▶ simultaneous open/substitution: $M[0_T/N]$

Lemma (Equality of LF and nameless LF)

$\mathcal{S}; \Gamma \vdash M : A$ if and only if $\Gamma \mathcal{S} \vdash \Gamma M \vdash \Gamma A$

Example

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, C \vdash 0_\Gamma : C} \text{CTXZERO}$$

$$\frac{\vec{\Gamma} \vdash i_\Gamma : C}{\Gamma, D \vdash \sigma i_\Gamma : \overleftarrow{C}} \text{CTXSUCC}$$

Example

$P = \dots,$

$c_{ctxZero} : type(C, [C \mid \Gamma]) \leftarrow$

$c_{ctxSucc} : type(C', [D \mid \Gamma]) \leftarrow$

$\Gamma \equiv \overleftarrow{\Gamma'}, type(\overrightarrow{C}, \Gamma'), C' \equiv \overleftarrow{C}$

$\frac{}{\Gamma, C \vdash 0_\Gamma : C} \text{CTXZERO}$

$\frac{\overrightarrow{\Gamma} \vdash i_\Gamma : C}{\Gamma, D \vdash \sigma i_\Gamma : \overleftarrow{C}} \text{CTXSUCC}$

Example

$P = \dots,$

$c_{ctxZero} : type(C, [C \mid \Gamma]) \leftarrow$

$c_{ctxSucc} : type(C', [D \mid \Gamma]) \leftarrow$

$\Gamma \equiv \overleftarrow{\Gamma}', type(\overrightarrow{C}, \Gamma'), C' \equiv \overleftarrow{C}$

$\frac{}{\Gamma, C \vdash 0_\Gamma : C} \text{CTXZERO}$

$\frac{\overrightarrow{\Gamma} \vdash i_\Gamma : C}{\Gamma, D \vdash \sigma i_\Gamma : \overleftarrow{C}} \text{CTXSUCC}$

Example: $\Gamma = n : A, m : \text{maybe}_A(\text{tt})$ and a goal for $\text{type}(?_b, A, \Gamma)$:

$\frac{}{P \vdash c_{ctxZero} : type(A, [A, \text{maybe}_A(\text{tt})])}$

Soundness

Theorem

Let M be a term in \mathcal{S} . Let P_M and G_M be a program and a goal s.t. $\mathcal{S} \vdash P$ and $\mathcal{S}; \cdot; M \vdash (G_M \mid A)$. Let ρ, R be a substitution and a proof-term assignment such that $P \vdash_R^\rho G_M$. Then for any solution (ρ', R') s.t. $(\rho', R')M$ is a well-formed there is (ρ'', R'') such that

$$(\rho'', R'')((\rho, R)M) = (\rho', R')M$$

Conclusion and Future work

Conclusion

- ▶ type and term refinement in first-order type theory as first-order resolution
- ▶ nameless representation removes α -equivalence and name freshness issues
- ▶ proof-relevant resolution captures term-level metavariables

Future work

- ▶ higher-order DTT
- ▶ coinductive interpretation of the program
 - ▶ extend our work on coinductive soundness of Haskell typeclasses (Farka *et al.*; 2017)
- ▶ <https://github.com/frantisekfarka/resviaref>

Thank you

First-order Dependent Type Theory

Language we are working in

Language of FoDTT:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{Kinds} & K ::= & \text{type} \mid \Pi \mathcal{V} : T.K \\ \text{Types} & T ::= & \mathcal{B} \mid \Pi \mathcal{V} : T.T \mid Tt \\ \text{Terms} & t ::= & \mathcal{C} \mid \mathcal{V} \mid \lambda \mathcal{V} : T.t \mid tt \end{array}$$

Well-formedness rules:

$$\Sigma; \Gamma \vdash K : \text{kind}$$

$$\Sigma; \Gamma \vdash A : K$$

$$\Sigma; \Gamma \vdash M : A$$

Refinement

We extend the language of FoDTT to FoDTT*:

Types* $T ::= \dots | ?\mathcal{B}$

Terms* $t ::= \dots | ?\mathcal{V}$

and we look for assignments $?B \rightarrow \text{Types}$ and $?V \rightarrow \text{Terms}$.

Refinement

We extend the language of FoDTT to FoDTT*:

Types* $T ::= \dots | ?\mathcal{B}$

Terms* $t ::= \dots | ?\mathcal{V}$

and we look for assignments $?B \rightarrow \text{Types}$ and $?V \rightarrow \text{Terms}$.

Example:

$\lambda n : ?A. \lambda v : \text{Vec}A (c_{succ} n). c_{el \mid \text{Vec}} ?_{irr} (\lambda m : ?B. \lambda a : ?C. \lambda as : ?D. a) ?_n ?_v$

Refinement (cont'd)

By generation of goals that constrain type-level meta-variables and by binding their proof-terms to term-level meta-variables:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma; \Gamma; t \vdash_{TeGoal} (G \mid t' : A) \\ \Sigma; \Gamma; A \vdash_{TyGoal} (G \mid A' : K) \\ \Sigma; \Gamma; K \vdash_{KiGoal} (G \mid K' : \text{kind})\end{aligned}$$

Refinement (cont'd)

By generation of goals that constrain type-level meta-variables and by binding their proof-terms to term-level meta-variables:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma; \Gamma; t \vdash_{TeGoal} (G \mid t' : A) \\ \Sigma; \Gamma; A \vdash_{TyGoal} (G \mid A' : K) \\ \Sigma; \Gamma; K \vdash_{KiGoal} (G \mid K' : \text{kind})\end{aligned}$$

Signature gives a program that solves the generated goals:

$$\Sigma \vdash_{Prog} P$$