Introduction
0000000000

Type checker for MF
000000

Interpretation
00000

Conclusions
000

# Towards an implementation in LambdaProlog of the two level Minimalist Foundation

A. Fiori     C. Sacerdoti Coen

University of Padova     University of Bologna

Padova, 28/11/2017

# Outline

Introduction
○●○○○○○○○○○

Type checker for MF
○○○○○○

Interpretation
○○○○○

Conclusions
○○○

# Mathematical Proofs

**SYLOW I.** *If $p$ is a prime and $p^k$, $k \geq 0$, divides $|G|$ (assumed finite), then $G$ contains a subgroup of order $p^k$.*

*Proof.* We shall prove the result by induction on $|G|$. It is clear if $|G| = 1$, and we may assume it holds for every group of order $< |G|$. We first prove a special case of the theorem (which goes back to Cauchy): if $G$ is finite abelian and $p$ is a prime divisor of $|G|$ then $G$ contains an element of order $p$. To prove this we take an element $a \neq 1$ in $G$. If the order $r$ of $a$ is divisible by $p$, say $r = pr'$, then $b = a^{r'}$ has order $p$. On the other hand, if the order $r$ of $a$ is prime to $p$, then the order $|G|/r$ of $G/\langle a \rangle$ is divisible by $p$ and is less than $|G|$. Hence this factor group contains an element $b\langle a \rangle$ of order $p$. We claim that the order $s$ of $b$ is divisible by $p$, for we have $(b\langle a \rangle)^s = b^s \langle a \rangle = 1(=\langle a \rangle)$. Hence the order $p$ of $b\langle a \rangle$ is a divisor of $s$. Now, since $b$ has order divisible by $p$, we obtain an element of order $p$ as before. After this preliminary result we can quickly give the proof. We consider the class equation (41'): $|G| = |C| + \sum [G:C(y_j)]$. If $p \nmid |C|$ then $p \nmid [G:C(y_j)]$ for some $j$. Then $p^k | |C(y_j)|$ and the subgroup $C(y_j)$ has order $< |G|$ since $y_j$ is not in the center. Then, by the induction hypothesis, $C(y_j)$ contains a subgroup of order $p^k$. Next suppose $p | |C|$. Then, by Cauchy's result, $C$ contains an element $c$ of order $p$. Now $\langle c \rangle$ is a normal subgroup of $G$ of order $p$, and the order $|G|/p$ of $G/\langle c \rangle$ is divisible by $p^{k-1}$. Hence, by induction, $G/\langle c \rangle$ contains a subgroup of order $p^{k-1}$. This subgroup has the form $H/\langle c \rangle$ where $H$ is a subgroup of $G$ containing $\langle c \rangle$. Then

$$|H| = [H:\langle c \rangle]|\langle c \rangle| = p^{k-1}p = p^k. \quad \square$$

Introduction
○○●○○○○○○○○

Type checker for MF
○○○○○○

Interpretation
○○○○○

Conclusions
○○○

## Mathematical Proofs

```
Lemma galois_fixedField K E :
  reflect (fixedField 'Gal(E / K) = K) (galois K E).

Lemma mem_galTrace K E a : galois K E → a \in E → galTrace K E a \in K.

Lemma mem_galNorm K E a : galois K E → a \in E → galNorm K E a \in K.

Lemma gal_independent_contra E (P : pred (gal_of E)) (c_ : gal_of E → L) x
    P x → c_ x != 0 →
  exists2 a, a \in E & \sum_(y | P y) c_ y × y a != 0.

Lemma gal_independent E (P : pred (gal_of E)) (c_ : gal_of E → L) :
    (∀ a, a \in E → \sum_(x | P x) c_ x × x a = 0) →
  (∀ x, P x → c_ x = 0).

Lemma Hilbert's_theorem_90 K E x a :
    generator 'Gal(E / K) x → a \in E →
  reflect (exists2 b, b \in E ∧ b != 0 & a = b / x b) (galNorm K E a == 1).
```

### On paper

- Set Theory (ZFC) or Category Theory
- Quotients, functions as graphs, extensionality of $\in$...
- Classical logic

### On proof-assistants

- Type Theories
- Intensionality, computational semantic, code extraction...
- Constructive logic

### Notation: Inference rules

$$\frac{P_1 \qquad P_2 \qquad \ldots \qquad P_n}{C}$$

The judgement $C$ holds if all the judgements $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_n$ hold.

## The Minimalist Foundation

- Ideated by Maietti and Sambin in 2005
- Completed by Maietti in 2009
- Is compatible with the most influential constructive foundations
- Has an extensional level (with quotients and subsets) and an intensional level (decidable type-checking)
- Forget-restore principle

In 2009 Maietti succesfully interpreted the extensional level (emTT) in the intensional level (mTT)

## Outline of Our Work

### Completed Work

- Type checkers for (a large subset of) the two levels of the Minimalist Foundation (implemented in $\lambda$Prolog).
- Implementation (in $\lambda$Prolog) of the interpretation from (a large subset of) the extensional level to the intensional level.

### Future Works

- Formal validation of the interpretation (in Abella).
- Proof assistant over the extensional level (in *ELPI* = $\lambda$Prolog + Constraint Programming)
- Code extraction at the intensional level.

## What Programming Language to Formalize a Theory?

### Characteristics of $\lambda$-Prolog

1. very high level language, usable by a logician/mathematician
2. easy definition of structures with binders
3. $\alpha$-equality and capture-avoiding substitution for free
4. simple encoding of inference rules
5. automatic management of non-determinism/backtracking
6. simple reasoning on the programs (simple semantics)

*$\lambda$Prolog is the smallest extension to Prolog able to treat syntaxes with binders*

Introduction
○○○○○○○○○●○

Type checker for MF
○○○○○○

Interpretation
○○○○○

Conclusions
○○○

# Higher Order Logic Programming (HOLP)

## $\lambda$Prolog = Prolog $\cup \{\Rightarrow, \forall\}$ in queries

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c}[c]\\ \vdots \\ q\end{array}}{c => q}$$

Locally scoped,
hypothetical reasoning

$$\frac{c\{y/x\} \quad y \text{ fresh}}{\text{pi } x\backslash c}$$

Generation of
fresh names

HOAS + $\{\Rightarrow, \forall\}$ for entering binders in recursive definition

Introduction
○○○○○○○○○●

Type checker for MF
○○○○○○

Interpretation
○○○○○

Conclusions
○○○

# The Hello-World of $\lambda$Prolog

### Type-Checking for Simply Typed $\lambda$-calculus

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : A \to B \quad \Gamma \vdash N : A}{\Gamma \vdash MN : B} \qquad \frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash F\, x : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.F\, x : A \to B} \qquad \frac{(x : A) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : A}$$

### Representation of Simply Typed $\lambda$-calculus

```
type app    term -> term -> term.
type lam    (term -> term) -> term.
```

### Type-Checking/Inference in $\lambda$Prolog

```
of (app M N) B :- of M (arr A B), of N A.
of (lam F) (arr A B) :- pi x\ of x A => of (F x) B.
```

# Outline

1. Introduction

2. **Type checkers for the two levels of the Minimalist Foundation**

3. Interpreting the extensional level in the intensional level

4. Conclusions and Future Works

## Preliminary Work: Minor Changes to the Calculus

### Syntax directed version of the rules

From

$$\frac{x \in A \quad A = B}{x \in B} \qquad \frac{f \in \Pi_{x \in B}C(x) \quad t \in B}{f \ t \in C(t)}$$

to

$$\frac{f \in \Pi_{x \in B}C(x) \quad t \in = B}{f \ t \in C(t)}$$

### Deterministic equality check

From $\quad (\lambda_{x \in B}C(x)) \ t = C(t)$

to $\quad\;\;\, (\lambda_{x \in B}C(x)) \ t \rhd C(t)$ and $\quad (s = t) := s \rhd^{**} \lhd t$

Introduction
0000000000

Type checker for MF
00●0000

Interpretation
00000

Conclusions
000

## Preliminary Work: Major Changes to the Calculus

### Problem: proofs are not recorded at the extensional level

$$\frac{true \in Eq(C, c, d)}{c = d \in C} \qquad \frac{true \in B \quad true \in C \quad B \; props \quad C \; props}{true \in B \wedge C}$$

### Discarded solution

The typechecker takes the whole derivation in input.
The datatype for the derivation is yet another typed $\lambda$-calculus.

### Partial solution

Keep proof terms as in the intensional level.
To a user we can still show *true* because of proof irrelevance.
It does not solve the problem of the *conv* rule.

## Preliminary Work: Major Changes to the Calculus

### Full solution: deterministic equality check in the ext. level

From arbitrary conversion proofs

$$\frac{true \in Eq(C, c, d)}{c = d \in C}$$

to contextual closure + context lookup rule

$$\frac{(x \in Eq(C, c, d)) \in \Gamma}{c = d \in C}$$

and new LetIn term constructor

$$\frac{p \in P \qquad t \in T\,[x \in P]}{let\ x := p \in P\ in\ t \in T}$$

Introduction
○○○○○○○○○○

Type checker for MF
○○○○○●○

Interpretation
○○○○○

Conclusions
○○○

# Preliminary Work: Changes for Code Reuse

## Π Introduction rule

$$\frac{B \; set \qquad c(x) \in C(x) \; [x \in B] \qquad C(x) \; set \; [x \in B]}{\lambda x^B.c(x) \in \Pi_{x \in B}C(x)}$$

```
of (lambda B F) (setPi B C) IE :-
  isType B _ IE,
  (pi x\ locDecl x B => isType (C x) _ IE)
  pi x\ locDecl x B => of (F x) (C x) IE.
```

## Π Formation rule

$$\frac{B \; set \qquad C(x) \; set \; [x \in B]}{\Pi_{x \in B}C(x) \; set} \qquad \frac{B \; col \qquad C(x) \; col \; [x \in B]}{\Pi_{x \in B}C(x) \; col}$$

```
isType (setPi B C) KIND3 IE :-
  isType B KIND1 IE,
  pi x locDecl x B => isType (C x) KIND2 IE,
  pts_pi KIND1 KIND2 KIND3.
```

## Typechecking and future works

### Typechecking

- Code reuse between levels.
- Code reduction via PTS-style.
- Extremely modular code.

### Future works

- Complete and debug all the rules.
- The changes to the calculi have to be validated
- The $\xi$-rule at the intentional level must be removed.
  Requires a syntax directed version of explicit substitutions.

# Outline

## Design of the Interpretation

### The Interpretation in a Nutshell

- In the Minimalist Foundation types are interpreted in dependent setoids.
- The interpretation on types is defined by structural recursion.
- For simple types (the singleton, the empty set, naturals) the setoid equality is the intensional propositional equality
- The equality of functions imposes the $\xi$ rule
- Proof irrelevance is imposed by the interpretation
- Lack of impredicative quantifications avoids user-defined type equalities: this is NOT homotopy type theory

## Design of the Interpretation

### The Interpretation is Rich and Complex

- Requires lots of (proof) terms to be defined by meta-level recursion on types, terms and derivations of equalities
  - proofs of reflexivity, symmetry, transitivity
  - proofs that equivalences behave as congruences for every user defined function
  - canonical isomorphisms between interpretation of extensionally equal types
  - proofs that they are indeed isomorphisms
  - . . .
- We are unable to directly use the proof of the paper as they are often given in categorical terms.

## The Main Issue

### Subsumption becomes coercions

- Equality used to fix mismatching (extensionally convertible) types must become term translation.

$$\frac{x \in A \qquad A = B}{x \in B} \text{ becomes } \frac{x \in A \qquad A \mathcal{R} B}{\sigma x \in B}$$

- $\sigma$ is defined by recursion also over the proof of $A = B$ (compring the missing derivations of $Eq(T, c, d)$)
  Luckily we made proof search deterministic via let-ins and restricting to congruence rules and context lookup

- An example of an extensionally well typed term with mismatching types

$$\forall_{x \in \mathbb{1}} \forall_{f \in (x =_\mathbb{1} \bigstar) \to \mathbb{1}} (\bigstar =_\mathbb{1} x) \Rightarrow f(rfl(\bigstar)) =_\mathbb{1} f(rfl(\bigstar))$$

Introduction
○○○○○○○○○○

Type checker for MF
○○○○○○

Interpretation
○○○○●

Conclusions
○○○

## Interpretation of Types

```
forall singleton x0 \
  forall (colSigma (fun (propId singleton x0 star) singl
  forall (propId singleton x0 star) x2 \
  forall (propId singleton x0 star) x3 \
  forall (propId singleton star star) x4 \
  propId singleton (fun_app x1 x2) (fun_app x1 x3)) x1 \
forall (propId singleton star x0) x2 \ propId singleton
(fun_app (elim_colSigma x1 (x3 \
    fun (propId singleton x0 star) singleton) x3 \ x4 \
    (impl_app (impl_app (forall_app (forall_app (impl_ap
    (forall_app (forall_app (k_propId singleton) star) x
    x2) star) star) (id singleton star)) (id singleton s
(fun_app (elim_colSigma x1 (x3 \
    fun (propId singleton x0 star) singleton) x3 \ x4 \
    (impl_app (impl_app (forall_app (forall_app (impl_ap
    (forall_app (forall_app (k_propId singleton) star) x
    x2) star) star) (id singleton star)) (id singleton s
```

# Outline

## Conclusions

Implementing the Minimalist Foundation is non trivial

- Many different type constructors and rules.
- Many terms need to be provided during the interpretation.
- Extensional type theories pose issues to the implementors.
- Implementation choices impact the calculus.
- The good properties must be preserved.

But the constrained nature of the theory helps

- Structural recursion on types is facilitated by their very rigid structure.
- The propositional equality (int./ext.) is the only type constructor that directly takes terms as arguments.

# Conclusions and Future Works

$\lambda$Prolog was a great choice

- Takes away the pain due to binders, $\alpha$-conversion, capture avoiding substitution, etc.
- The code is in 1-1 relation with the new syntax oriented version of the formal inference rules.
- Joint Bologna/INRIA effort to combine $\lambda$Prolog with Constraint Programming to smoothly transition to proof assistant implementation.

In the future we wish to extend our work

- Complete and validate (in Abella) the type checkers and interpretation.
- Implement code extraction for the intensional level.
- Implement a proof assistant for the extensional level.
- Validate the proof assistant formalizing Sambin's Basic Picture book (porting proofs from Matita).