

1 Intro

A walkthrough of [1] and [2], mainly focusing on the presentation in [2]. We first briefly review measures and kernels because they show up in the semantics.

2 Measures

A **σ -algebra** Σ_X on a set X is a collection of subsets of X that contains \emptyset and is closed under complements and countable unions. A **measurable space** is a pair (X, Σ_X) of a set and a σ -algebra on it. The elements of Σ_X , which are themselves sets of elements in X , are called **measurable sets**. For example, the Borel sets are the smallest σ -algebra on \mathbb{R} that contains the intervals. This is the usual σ -algebra for \mathbb{R} . For any countable set, you can always start off with the individual elements of the set: satisfying complements and unions this gives you the powerset σ -algebra.

A **measure** on a measurable space (X, Σ_X) is a function $\mu : \Sigma_X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ into the set $[0, \infty]$ of extended non-negative reals that takes countable disjoint unions to sums, i.e. $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\mu(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(U_n)$ for any \mathbb{N} -indexed sequence of disjoint measurable sets U_n . A **probability measure** is a measure μ such that $\mu(X) = 1$. For example, the Lebesgue measure λ on \mathbb{R} is generated by $\lambda((a, b)) = b - a$. For any $x \in X$, the Dirac measure $\delta_x(U) = 1$ if $x \in U$ and 0 otherwise.

3 Kernels

A **kernel** k from X to Y , notated $k : X \rightsquigarrow Y$, is a function $k : X \times \Sigma_Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that

- for fixed x , $k(x, -) : \Sigma_Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a measure
- for fixed dy , $k(-, dy) : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a measurable function.

An intuitive example of kernels at work is conditional probability. Take $k(x, -)$ to be a probability measure $\mu_Y : \Sigma_Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$ on Y given a particular value $X = x$: $\sum_{dy \in \Sigma_Y} k(x, dy) = 1$. Note that $\sum_{x \in X} k(x, dy) \neq 1$ in general.

Let X, Y, Z be measurable spaces and let $k^1 : X \times Y \rightsquigarrow Z$ and $k^2 : X \rightsquigarrow Y$ be s-finite kernels (**TODO**: explain s-finiteness). Then we can define the composition $(k^1 \star k^2) : X \rightsquigarrow Z$ as

$$(k^1 \star k^2)(x, U) = \int_Y k^2(x, dy) k^1(x, y, U)$$

For intuition, consider $k(x, -) : \Sigma_Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$ to be the probability measure that tells you how likely it is to start off at location x and end up in the interval dy . Then the composition $(k^1 \star k^2)(x, dz) = \int_Y k^2(x, dy) k^1(x, y, dz)$ can be taken to represent the probability of starting off at x and ending up in the interval dz , where we take a step in-between to land on y , but average out across all intervals dy that we can land in when jumping from x .

4 Types and Semantics

The two papers [1,2] don't actually define the set of terms, but they are implied to be the typical ones in a language like Haskell. The 2018 POPL paper on semantics for higher-order languages [3] does formally introduce a kind and type system and a set of terms. We define our types as:

$$\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} ::= \mathbb{R} | P(\mathbb{A}) | 1 | \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B} | \sum_i \mathbb{A}_{i \in I}$$

where I is countable and non-empty. As we will see, types are to be interpreted as measurable spaces $[[\mathbb{A}]]$. We have sum and product types. We have a type \mathbb{R} that denotes the Reals $[[\mathbb{R}]]$. We have a type $P(\mathbb{A})$ that denotes the set of probability measures $[[P(\mathbb{A})]]$ over a space denoted by \mathbb{A} . We have the type 1 that denotes a singleton set. For booleans, we can just take $(1 + 1)$ and $P(1 + 1)$ is the type for distributions over booleans. For the natural numbers, we can use $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} 1$.

Typing judgements: $\Gamma \vdash_d$ for deterministic judgements and $\Gamma \vdash_p$ for probabilistic judgements. Having the two typing judgements is mainly for notational clarity: it helps us to define interpretation differently for deterministic and probabilistic terms.

4.1 Typing Judgements and Interpretations for Deterministic Terms

Deterministic terms $\Gamma \vdash_d t : \mathbb{A}$ are interpreted as measurable functions $[[t]] : [[\Gamma]] \rightarrow [[\mathbb{A}]]$, where $[[t]](\gamma) = x$ is an element of the underlying set $[[\mathbb{A}]]$ and not a measurable set in $\Sigma_{[[\mathbb{A}]]}$. **Note:** the following informally uses the notation $\Gamma :: (x : \mathbb{A}) :: \Gamma'$ to show a particular variable x of type \mathbb{A} in the environment.

- **basic term** $x : \mathbb{A}$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma :: (x : \mathbb{A}) :: \Gamma' \vdash_d x : \mathbb{A}} \quad [[x]](\gamma :: d :: \gamma') = d$$

- **Disjoint Sum Type**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_d t : \mathbb{A}_i}{\Gamma \vdash_d (i, t) : \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{A}_i} \quad [[(i, t)]](\gamma) = (i, [[t]](\gamma))$$

- **Deterministic case**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_d t : \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{A}_i \quad (\Gamma :: (x : \mathbb{A}_i) \vdash_d u_i : \mathbb{B})_{i \in I}}{\Gamma \vdash_d (\text{case } t \text{ of } \{(i, x) \rightarrow u_i\}_{i \in I}) : \mathbb{B}}$$

$$[[\text{case } t \text{ of } \{(i, x) \rightarrow u_i\}_{i \in I}]](\gamma) = [[u_i]](\gamma, d) \text{ if } [[t]](\gamma) = (i, d)$$

- **Unit** $()$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash_d () : 1} \quad [[()]](\gamma) = ()$$

- **Product Type**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_d t_0 : \mathbb{A}_0 \quad \Gamma \vdash_d t_1 : \mathbb{A}_1}{\Gamma \vdash_d (t_0, t_1) : \mathbb{A}_0 \times \mathbb{A}_1} \quad [[(t_0, t_1)]](\gamma) = ([t_0](\gamma), [t_1](\gamma))$$

- **Projection**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_d t : \mathbb{A}_0 \times \mathbb{A}_1}{\Gamma \vdash_d \pi_j(t) : \mathbb{A}_j} \quad [[\pi_j(t)]](\gamma) = d_j \text{ if } [[t]](\gamma) = (d_0, d_1)$$

where the **case** expression above has a deterministic continuation u_i . We will come back to the probabilistic continuation case. Now the semantics for sequencing.

4.2 Typing Judgements and Interpretations for Probabilistic Terms

Probabilistic terms $\Gamma \vdash_p t : \mathbb{A}$ are interpreted as s-finite kernels $[[t]] : [[\Gamma]] \rightsquigarrow [[\mathbb{A}]]$.

- **return(t)**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_d t : \mathbb{A}}{\Gamma \vdash_p \mathbf{return}(t) : \mathbb{A}} \quad [[\mathbf{return}(t)]](\gamma, da) = \delta_{[[t]](\gamma)}(da)$$

this corresponds to a Dirac Delta measure sitting at a point $[[t]]_\gamma$.

- **let x = t in u**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_p t : \mathbb{A} \quad \Gamma, x : \mathbb{A} \vdash_p u : \mathbb{B}}{\Gamma \vdash_p \mathbf{let } x = t \mathbf{ in } u : \mathbb{B}} \quad [[\mathbf{let } x = t \mathbf{ in } u]](\gamma, db) = \int_{x, dx \in [[\mathbb{A}]]} [[u]](\gamma, x, db) [[t]](\gamma, dx)$$

This one takes careful reading. Consider the kernel composition definition above. Take k_1 to be $[[u]]$ and take k_2 to be $[[t]]$. Then $(k_1 \star k_2)(\gamma, db) = ([u] \star [t])(\gamma, db)$

- **probabilistic case**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_d t : \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{A}_i \quad (\Gamma, x : \mathbb{A}_i \vdash_p u_i : \mathbb{B})_{i \in I}}{\Gamma \vdash_p (\mathbf{case } t \mathbf{ of } \{(i, x) \rightarrow u_i\}_{i \in I}) : \mathbb{B}}$$

$$[[\mathbf{case } t \mathbf{ of } \{(i, x) \rightarrow u_i\}_{i \in I}]](\gamma, db) = [[u_i]](\gamma :: d, db) \text{ if } [[t]](\gamma) = (i, d)$$

- **sample(t)**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_d t : P(\mathbb{A})}{\Gamma \vdash_p \mathbf{sample}(t) : \mathbb{A}} \quad [[\mathbf{sample}(t)]](\gamma, da) = \left([[t]](\gamma) \right)(da)$$

- **score(t)**

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_d t : \mathbb{R}}{\Gamma \vdash_p \mathbf{score}(t) : 1}$$

$$[[\mathbf{score}(t)]](\gamma, du) = \begin{cases} \mathit{abs}([t](\gamma)), & \text{if } du = \{()\} \\ 0, & \text{if } du = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

4.3 Typing Judgements and Interpretation for Normalize

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_p t : \mathbb{A}}{\Gamma \vdash_d \text{normalize}(t) : \mathbb{R} \times P(\mathbb{A}) + 1 + 1}$$

To give it a semantics, we must find the normalizing constant to divide by. Consider $\Gamma \vdash_p t : \mathbb{A}$ and let $\text{evidence}_t = \llbracket t \rrbracket_{\gamma, \llbracket \mathbb{A} \rrbracket}$. Then:

$$\llbracket \llbracket \text{normalize}(t) \rrbracket(\gamma) = \begin{cases} (0, (\text{evidence}_t, \frac{\llbracket t \rrbracket(\gamma, (-))}{\text{evidence}_t})), & \text{if } \text{evidence}_t \in (0, \infty) \\ (1, ()), & \text{if } \text{evidence}_t = 0 \\ (2, ()), & \text{if } \text{evidence}_t = \infty \end{cases}$$

5 Example Programs

Definition of Density: if $f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \llbracket \vdash_p \text{let } x = \text{sample}(\text{gauss}(0, 1)) \text{ in score}(1/f(x)); \text{return}(x) : \mathbb{R} \rrbracket(U) \\ &= \\ & \text{lebesgue}(U) \end{aligned}$$

For probability measure p with density g , recover the importance sampling algorithm for sampling from p by sampling from a Gaussian by showing:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \llbracket \text{sample}(p) \rrbracket \rrbracket &= \llbracket \llbracket \text{let } x = \text{lebesgue} \text{ in score}(p(x)); \text{return}(x) \rrbracket \rrbracket \\ &= \llbracket \llbracket \text{let } x = \text{gauss}(0, 1) \text{ in score}(1/f(x)); \text{score}(g(x)); \text{return}(x) \rrbracket \rrbracket \\ &= \llbracket \llbracket \text{let } x = \text{gauss}(0, 1) \text{ in score}(g(x)/f(x)); \text{return}(x) \rrbracket \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

Conjugate Prior: If you place a prior of $\text{beta}(2, 2)$ on the parameter x of a Bernoulli likelihood distribution for binary data, and you see the data point 1, then the posterior distribution of x is $\text{beta}(3, 2)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \llbracket \text{let } x = \text{sample}(\text{beta}(2, 2)) \text{ in score}(\text{bern}(1; x)); x \text{ in observe } 1 \text{ from } \text{bern}(x); x \rrbracket \rrbracket \\ &= \\ & \llbracket \llbracket \text{observe } 1 \text{ from } \text{bern}(2/(2+2)); \text{sample}(\text{beta}(2+1, 2)) \rrbracket \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

6 Higher Order

...

7 Citation

1. Staton et al. Semantics for probabilistic programming: higher-order functions, continuous distributions, and soft constraints. LICS 2016. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1601.04943.pdf>
2. Staton. Commutative semantics for probabilistic programming. ESOP 2017. ‘<http://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/people/samuel.staton/papers/esop2017.pdf>
3. Scibior et al. Denotational validation of Bayesian inference. POPL 2018. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1711.03219.pdf>