

Modeling Functions

by Sven Nilsen, 2020

In this paper I show how to model functions in Path Semantical Logic, using logical NOT as example.

A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ can be modeled as following in Path Semantical Logic^[1]:

$$f \Rightarrow (a \Rightarrow b, a(A) \Rightarrow b(B))$$

Here, words starting with small letters are level 1 and words starting with big letters are level 0.
The notation $a(A)$ means $a \Rightarrow A$ where A is at a lower level.
Comma is the same as \wedge (logical AND).

One can prove the following:

$$(f, a) \Rightarrow b$$

When calling f with an argument a , it produces a value b .

One can also prove the following:

$$(f, a) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow B)$$

However, one can **not** prove the following:

$$\begin{array}{ll} (f, a) \Rightarrow A & \text{These expressions are not provable, which might be thought of as} \\ (f, a) \Rightarrow B & \text{'f' taking ownership of 'a', plus 'b' not owned after returning.} \end{array}$$

When only the Constrained Implication Theorem^[2] is used, one can think of variables as linear types.
One can use the Normal Implication Theorem^[3] to share $a(A)$, e.g. modeling types that can be cloned.

The function f is a singleton, because both A and B contains only one element.

Type with singleton elements are useful in proofs of parametricity^[4].

Path Semantical Logic is best at modeling proofs where all types are generic^[5].

However, one can push the limits of this logic, to reason a little bit about concrete cases.

For example, to model logical NOT, I extend the definition to include cases for both tr and fa :

$$\begin{array}{ll} \therefore & \text{notf} \Rightarrow (fa \Rightarrow tr, tr \Rightarrow fa, fa(\text{Bool}) \Rightarrow tr(\text{Bool}), tr(\text{Bool}) \Rightarrow fa(\text{Bool})) \\ \therefore & (\text{notf}, tr) \Rightarrow fa, (\text{notf}, fa) \Rightarrow tr, (\text{notf}, fa) \Rightarrow (\text{Bool} \Rightarrow \text{Bool}), (\text{notf}, tr) \Rightarrow (\text{Bool} \Rightarrow \text{Bool}) \end{array}$$

Here, $\text{Bool} \Rightarrow \text{Bool}$ is a tautology, but one can swap the output type to BoolOut .

Similarly, one can swap the output tr with tr_out and fa with fa_out :

$$\begin{array}{ll} \therefore & \text{notf} \Rightarrow (fa \Rightarrow tr_out, tr \Rightarrow fa_out, fa(\text{Bool}) \Rightarrow tr_out(\text{BoolOut}), tr(\text{Bool}) \Rightarrow fa_out(\text{BoolOut})) \\ \therefore & (\text{notf}, tr) \Rightarrow fa_out, (\text{notf}, fa) \Rightarrow tr_out \\ \therefore & (\text{notf}, fa) \Rightarrow (\text{Bool} \Rightarrow \text{BoolOut}), (\text{notf}, tr_out) \Rightarrow (\text{Bool} \Rightarrow \text{BoolOut}) \end{array}$$

References:

- [1] “Path Semantical Logic”
AdvancedResearch, reading sequence on Path Semantics
https://github.com/advancedresearch/path_semantics/blob/master/sequences.md#path-semantical-logic
- [2] “Constrained Implication Theorem”
Sven Nilsen, 2020
https://github.com/advancedresearch/path_semantics/blob/master/papers-wip/constrained-implication-theorem.pdf
- [3] “Normal Implication Theorem”
Sven Nilsen, 2020
https://github.com/advancedresearch/path_semantics/blob/master/papers-wip/implication-theorem.pdf
- [4] “Parametricity”
Wikipedia
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parametricity>
- [5] “Generic Programming”
Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generic_programming