# Semantics of Probabilistic Programs Mark Goldstein

#### 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 Measure Theory

A  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\Sigma_X$  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  $(X, \Sigma_X)$  of a set and a  $\sigma$ -algebra on it. The elements of  $\Sigma_X$ , which are themselves sets of elements in X, are called **measurable sets**. For example, the Borel sets are the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\mathbb{R}$  that contains the intervals. This is the usual  $\sigma$ -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  $\sigma$ -algebra.

A measure on a measurable space  $(X, \Sigma_X)$  is a function  $\mu : \Sigma_X \to [0, \infty]$  into the set  $[0, \infty]$  of extended non-negative reals that takes countable disjoint unions to sums, i.e.  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\mu(\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n) = \Sigma_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(U_n)$  for any  $\mathbb{N}$ -indexed sequence of disjoint measurable sets  $U_n$ . A **probability measure** is a measure  $\mu$  such that  $\mu(X) = 1$ . For example, the Lebesgue measure  $\lambda$  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.

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

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

An intuitive example of kernels at work is conditional probability. Take k(x, -) to be a probability measure  $\mu_Y : \Sigma_Y \to [0, 1]$  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.

# 3 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 [[A]]. We have sum and product types. We have a type  $\mathbb R$  that denotes the Reals [[R]]. We have a type P(A) that denotes the set of probability measures [[P(A)]] over a space denoted by A. We have the type 1 the denotes a singleton set. For bools, we can just take (1+1) and P(1+1) is

the type for distributions over bools. 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.

#### 3.1 Typing Judgements and Interpretations for Deterministic Terms

Deterministic terms  $\Gamma \vdash_d t : \mathbb{A}$  are interpreted as measurable functions  $[[t]] : [[\Gamma]] \to [[\mathbb{A}]]$ , 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  $x : \mathbb{A}$ 

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

• Disjoint Sum Type

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

• Deterministic case

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

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

• Unit ()

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

• Product Type

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

• Projection

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

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.

#### 3.2 Typing Judgements and Interpretations for Probabilistic Terms

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

• return(t)

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

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

ullet let x=t in u

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

• probabilistic case

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

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

• sample(t)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_d t : P(\mathbb{A})}{\Gamma \vdash_n \mathtt{sample}(t) : \mathbb{A}} \qquad \qquad [[\mathtt{sample}(t)]](\gamma, da) = \Big([[t]](\gamma)\Big)(da)$$

• score(t)

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

$$[[\mathtt{score}(t)]](\gamma, du) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} abs\Big([[t]](\gamma)\Big), & \text{if } du = \{()\} \\ 0, & \text{if } du = \emptyset \end{array} \right\}$$

# 3.3 Typing Judgements and Interpretation for Normalize TODO

# 4 Example Programs

Beta-Bernoulli model: in the following, we derive that "the un-normalized posterior is a measure defined by integrating the likelihood with respect to the prior".

[[let 
$$x = \mathtt{sample}(\mathtt{Beta}(2,2))$$
 in  $\mathtt{score}(\mathtt{Bernoulli}(1;x));\mathtt{return}(x)]](db)$ 

$$=\int_x \quad [[\text{let } a = \text{score}(\text{Bernoulli}(1;x)) \text{ in } \text{return}(x)]](\gamma :: x, db) \quad [[\text{sample}(\text{Beta}(2,2))]](\gamma, dx) \\ = \int_x \quad [[\text{let } a = \text{score}(\text{Bernoulli}(1;x)) \text{ in } \text{return}(x)]](\gamma :: x, db) \quad \text{Beta}(dx;2,2) \\ = \int_x \Big( \sum_{s \in \{\emptyset, \{()\}\}} [[\text{return}(x)]](\gamma :: x :: a, db) \quad [[\text{score}(\text{Bernoulli}(1;x))]](\gamma :: x, s) \Big) \quad \text{Beta}(dx;2,2) \\ = \int_x \Big( [[\text{return}(x)]](\gamma :: x :: a, db) \quad [[\text{score}(\text{Bernoulli}(1;x))]](\gamma :: x, \{()\}) \Big) \quad \text{Beta}(dx;2,2) \\ = \int_x \Big( \mathbbm{1}[x \in db] \quad \text{Bernoulli}(1;x) \Big) \quad \text{Beta}(dx;2,2) \\ = UnnormalizedPosterior}(db) = \int_{x \in db} \text{Bernoulli}(1;x) \quad \text{Beta}(dx;2,2) \\ = \int_{x \in db} \Big( x^{\alpha+1-1}(1-x)^{\beta-1} \Big) \\$$

This gives the expected result. We were able to interpret the program as an un-normalized posterior for a Beta-Bernoulli model.

Note on conjugacy: In this example, we consider a Beta-Bernoulli model. The Beta distribution is a continuous distribution over [0,1] whose shape is determined by two parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  so that the density is  $\text{Beta}(x;\alpha,\beta) = \frac{1}{C(\alpha,\beta)}x^{\alpha-1}(1-x)^{\beta=1}$  where  $C(\alpha,\beta)$  is just a normalizing constant. The Bernoulli distribution is a discrete distribution over  $\{0,1\}$  with parameter  $x \in [0,1]$  defined by mass function Bernoulli(d;x) = x if d=1 and 1-x if d=0. The two distributions have the following property: if x is distributed  $\text{Beta}(\alpha,\beta)$  and you observe data-points  $d_i \in \{0,1\}$  with likelihood distribution  $\prod_i \text{Bernoulli}(d_i;x)$  (Bernoulli with parameter x), then the posterior distribution over x is  $\text{Beta}(\alpha + \#1, \beta + \#0)$ , where there are #1 1's and #0 0's in the data. This is a result coming from the Beta and Bernoulli being a **conjugate pair**. If we were to wrap the entire program in a call to normalize(), we should get a measure with density Beta(2+1,2)

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

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

$$\begin{split} [[\mathtt{sample}(p)]] &= [[\mathtt{let}\ x = lebesgue\ \mathtt{in}\ \mathtt{score}(p(x)); \mathtt{return}(x)]] \\ &= [[\mathtt{let}\ x = gauss(0,1)\ \mathtt{in}\ \mathtt{score}(1/f(x)); \mathtt{score}(g(x)); \mathtt{return}(x)]] \\ &= [[\mathtt{let}\ x = gauss(0,1)\ \mathtt{in}\ \mathtt{score}(g(x)/f(x)); \mathtt{return}(x)]] \end{split}$$

# 5 Higher Order

...

# 6 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.  $\frac{\text{https://arxiv.org/pdf/1711.03219.pdf}}{\text{pdf/1711.03219.pdf}}$