

Programming Language Foundations in Agda


Philip Wadler
(with Wen Kokke)

University of Edinburgh / IOHK / Rio de Janeiro
University of Melbourne, 16 May 2019



Proof Assistants

Robin Milner



LCF / ML

Gerard Huet & Thierry Coquand



Coq

Conor McBride and James McKenna



Epigram

Ulf Norell and Andreas Abel



Agda

Programming Language Foundations in Agda

(Programming Language)
Foundations in Agda

Programming (Language Foundations) in Agda

Coq vs Agda

Lambda, The Ultimate TA

Using a Proof Assistant to Teach
Programming Language Foundations

ICFP 2009

Benjamin C. Pierce
University of Pennsylvania





automated proof assistant
=
one TA per student

Oops, forgot one thing...

There is one small catch...

- Making up lectures and homeworks takes between one and two orders of magnitude more work for the instructor than a paper-and-pencil presentation of the same material!

The screenshot shows a web browser window with the title "Software Foundations". The URL in the address bar is <https://softwarefoundations.cis.upenn.edu>. The page content is as follows:

SOFTWARE FOUNDATIONS

The Software Foundations series is a broad introduction to the mathematical underpinnings of reliable software.

The principal novelty of the series is that every detail is one hundred percent formalized and machine-checked: the entire text of each volume, including the exercises, is literally a "proof script" for the Coq proof assistant.

The exposition is intended for a broad range of readers, from advanced undergraduates to PhD students and researchers. No specific background in logic or programming languages is assumed, though a degree of mathematical maturity is helpful. A one-semester course can expect to cover *Logical Foundations* plus most of *Programming Language Foundations* or *Verified Functional Algorithms*, or selections from both.

Volume 1

Logical Foundations is the entry-point to the series. It covers functional programming, basic concepts of logic, computer-assisted theorem proving, and Coq.

Volume 2

Programming Language Foundations surveys the theory of programming languages, including operational semantics, Hoare logic, and static type systems.

At the bottom left, there is a link to "LambdaTA.pdf". At the bottom right, there are buttons for "Show All" and "X".

The troubles with Coq ...

- Everything needs to be done twice! Students need to learn both the pair type (terms and patterns) and the tactics for manipulating conjunctions (split and destruct).
- Induction can be mysterious.
- Names vs notations: `subst N x M` vs `N[x:=M]`.
- Naming conventions vary widely.
- Propositions as Types present but hidden.

... are absent in Agda

- No tactics to learn. Pairing and conjunction identical.
- Induction is the same as recursion.
- `_[_:=_]` is name for `N [x := M]`.
- Standard Library makes a stab at consistency.
- Propositions as Types on proud display.

Agda vs Coq: Simply-Typed Lambda Calculus

Progress

We would like to show that every term is either a value or takes a reduction step. However, this is not true in general. The term

```
`zero . `suc `zero
```

is neither a value nor can take a reduction step. And if $s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ then the term

```
s . `zero
```

cannot reduce because we do not know which function is bound to the free variable s . The first of those terms is ill-typed, and the second has a free variable. Every term that is well-typed and closed has the desired property.

Progress: If $\emptyset \vdash M : A$ then either M is a value or there is an N such that $M \rightarrow N$.

To formulate this property, we first introduce a relation that captures what it means for a term M to make progress.

```
data Progress (M : Term) : Set where

  step : ∀ {N}
    → M → N
    -----
    → Progress M

  done :
    Value M
    -----
    → Progress M
```

A term M makes progress if either it can take a step, meaning there exists a term N such that $M \rightarrow N$, or if it is done, meaning that M is a value.

If a term is well-typed in the empty context then it satisfies progress.

<code>progress : ∀ {M A}</code>	
$\rightarrow \emptyset \vdash M : A$	
<hr/>	
$\rightarrow \text{Progress } M$	
<code>progress (H` ())</code>	
<code>progress (Hλ HN)</code>	= <code>done V-λ</code>
<code>progress (Hl · HM) with progress HL</code>	
... <code>step L→L'</code>	= <code>step (ξ-·1 L→L')</code>
... <code>done VL with progress HM</code>	
... <code>step M→M'</code>	= <code>step (ξ-·2 VL M→M')</code>
... <code>done VM with canonical HL VL</code>	
... <code>C-λ _</code>	= <code>step (β-λ VM)</code>
<code>progress Hzero</code>	= <code>done V-zero</code>
<code>progress (Hsuc HM) with progress HM</code>	
... <code>step M→M'</code>	= <code>step (ξ-suc M→M')</code>
... <code>done VM</code>	= <code>done (V-suc VM)</code>
<code>progress (Hcase HL HM HN) with progress HL</code>	
... <code>step L→L'</code>	= <code>step (ξ-case L→L')</code>
... <code>done VL with canonical HL VL</code>	
... <code>C-zero</code>	= <code>step β-zero</code>
... <code>C-suc CL</code>	= <code>step (β-suc (value CL))</code>
<code>progress (Hμ HM)</code>	= <code>step β-μ</code>

We induct on the evidence that M is well-typed. Let's unpack the first three cases.

- The term cannot be a variable, since no variable is well typed in the empty context.
- If the term is a lambda abstraction then it is a value.
- If the term is an application $L \cdot M$, recursively apply progress to the derivation that L is well-typed.
 - If the term steps, we have evidence that $L \rightarrow L'$, which by $\xi \rightarrow 1$ means that our original term steps to $L' \cdot M$
 - If the term is done, we have evidence that L is a value. Recursively apply progress to the derivation that M is well-typed.
 - If the term steps, we have evidence that $M \rightarrow M'$, which by $\xi \rightarrow 2$ means that our original term steps to $L \cdot M'$. Step $\xi \rightarrow 2$ applies only if we have evidence that L is a value, but progress on that subterm has already supplied the required evidence.
 - If the term is done, we have evidence that M is a value. We apply the canonical forms lemma to the evidence that L is well typed and a value, which since we are in an application leads to the conclusion that L must be a lambda abstraction. We also have evidence that M is a value, so our original term steps by $\beta\lambda$.

The remaining cases are similar. If by induction we have a `step` case we apply a ξ rule, and if we have a `done` case then either we have a value or apply a β rule. For fixpoint, no induction is required as the β rule applies immediately.

Our code reads neatly in part because we consider the `step` option before the `done` option. We could, of course, do it the other way around, but then the `...` abbreviation no longer works, and we will need to write out all the arguments in full. In general, the rule of thumb is to consider the easy case (here `step`) before the hard case (here `done`). If you have two hard cases, you will have to expand out `...` or introduce subsidiary functions.

Progress

The *progress* theorem tells us that closed, well-typed terms are not stuck: either a well-typed term is a value, or it can take a reduction step. The proof is a relatively straightforward extension of the progress proof we saw in the [Types](#) chapter. We'll give the proof in English first, then the formal version.

```
Theorem progress : ∀ t T,  
empty |- t ∈ T →  
value t ∨ ∃ t', t ==> t'.
```

Proof: By induction on the derivation of $\vdash t \in T$.

- The last rule of the derivation cannot be T_Var , since a variable is never well typed in an empty context.
- The T_True , T_False , and T_Abs cases are trivial, since in each of these cases we can see by inspecting the rule that t is a value.
- If the last rule of the derivation is T_App , then t has the form $t_1 t_2$ for some t_1 and t_2 , where $\vdash t_1 \in T_2 \rightarrow T$ and $\vdash t_2 \in T_2$ for some type T_2 . By the induction hypothesis, either t_1 is a value or it can take a reduction step.
 - If t_1 is a value, then consider t_2 , which by the other induction hypothesis must also either be a value or take a step.
 - Suppose t_2 is a value. Since t_1 is a value with an arrow type, it must be a lambda abstraction; hence $t_1 t_2$ can take a step by ST_AppAbs .
 - Otherwise, t_2 can take a step, and hence so can $t_1 t_2$ by ST_App2 .
 - If t_1 can take a step, then so can $t_1 t_2$ by ST_App1 .
- If the last rule of the derivation is T_If , then $t = \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3$, where t_1 has type Bool . By the IH, t_1 either is a value or takes a step.
 - If t_1 is a value, then since it has type Bool it must be either `true` or `false`. If it is `true`, then t steps to t_2 ; otherwise it steps to t_3 .
 - Otherwise, t_1 takes a step, and therefore so does t (by ST_If).

```

Proof with eauto.
intros t T Ht.
remember (@empty ty) as Gamma.
induction Ht; subst Gamma...
- (* T_Var *)
  (* contradictory: variables cannot be typed in an
   empty context *)
  inversion H.

- (* T_App *)
  (* t = t1 t2. Proceed by cases on whether t1 is a
   value or steps... *)
  right. destruct IHt1...
+ (* t1 is a value *)
  destruct IHt2...
  * (* t2 is also a value *)
    assert ( $\exists x_0 t_0, t_1 = \text{tabs } x_0 T_{11} t_0$ ).
    eapply canonical_forms_fun; eauto.
    destruct H1 as [x0 [t0 Heq]]. subst.
     $\exists ([x_0 := t_2] t_0)$ ...

  * (* t2 steps *)
    inversion H0 as [t2' Hstp].  $\exists (\text{tapp } t_1 t_2')$ ...

+ (* t1 steps *)
  inversion H as [t1' Hstp].  $\exists (\text{tapp } t_1' t_2)$ ...

- (* T_If *)
  right. destruct IHt1...
+ (* t1 is a value *)
  destruct (canonical_forms_bool t1); subst; eauto.

+ (* t1 also steps *)
  inversion H as [t1' Hstp].  $\exists (\text{tif } t_1' t_2 t_3)$ ...

```

Qed.

Inherently Typed
is Golden

Lines of code,
omitting examples

Named variables, separate types 451

de Bruijn indexes, inherently typed 275

$$451 / 275 = 1.6$$

$$275 / 451 = 0.6$$

```

Id : Set
Id = String

data Term : Set where
  `_` : Id → Term
  λ_⇒_ : Id → Term → Term
  _·_ : Term → Term → Term

data Type : Set where
  _⇒_ : Type → Type → Type
  `N : Type

data Context : Set where
  ∅ : Context
  _;_ : Context → Id → Type → Context

data _Ξ_ : Context → Id → Type → Set where
  Z : ∀ {Γ x A}
  -----
  → Γ , x ≈ A Ξ x ≈ A

  S : ∀ {Γ x y A B}
  → x ≠ y
  → Γ Ξ x ≈ A
  -----
  → Γ , y ≈ B Ξ x ≈ A

data _H_ : Context → Term → Type → Set where
  H` : ∀ {Γ x A}
  → Γ Ξ x ≈ A
  -----
  → Γ H` x ≈ A

  Hλ : ∀ {Γ x N A B}
  → Γ , x ≈ A H N ≈ B
  -----
  → Γ H λ x ↦ N ≈ A ↦ B

  H· : ∀ {Γ L M A B}
  → Γ H L ≈ A ↦ B
  → Γ H M ≈ A
  -----
  → Γ H L · M ≈ B

```

```

data Type : Set where
  _ $\rightarrow$ _ : Type  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Type
  `N` : Type

data Context : Set where
   $\emptyset$  : Context
  _ $,$ _ : Context  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Context

data _ $\exists$ _ : Context  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  Z :  $\forall \{\Gamma\} A$ 
  -----
   $\rightarrow \Gamma , A \not\exists A$ 

  S_ :  $\forall \{\Gamma\} A B$ 
   $\rightarrow \Gamma \not\exists A$ 
  -----
   $\rightarrow \Gamma , B \not\exists A$ 

data _ $\vdash$ _ : Context  $\rightarrow$  Type  $\rightarrow$  Set where
  `_ :  $\forall \{\Gamma\} \{A\}$ 
   $\rightarrow \Gamma \not\exists A$ 
  -----
   $\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash A$ 

  K_ :  $\forall \{\Gamma\} \{A B\}$ 
   $\rightarrow \Gamma , A \vdash B$ 
  -----
   $\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash A \not\vdash B$ 

  L_ :  $\forall \{\Gamma\} \{A B\}$ 
   $\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash A \not\vdash B$ 
   $\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash A$ 
  -----
   $\rightarrow \Gamma \vdash B$ 

```

Progress + Preservation
= Animation

Functional Big-step Semantics

Scott Owens¹, Magnus O. Myreen², Ramana Kumar³, and Yong Kiam Tan⁴

¹ School of Computing, University of Kent, UK

² CSE Department, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

³ NICTA, Australia

⁴ IHPC, A*STAR, Singapore

Testing semantics To test a semantics, one must actually use it to evaluate programs. Functional big-step semantics can do this out-of-the-box, as can many small-step approaches [13,14]. Where semantics are defined in a relational big-

13. C. Ellison and G. Rosu. An executable formal semantics of C with applications. In *Proceedings of the 39th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2012*, pages 533–544, 2012. doi: [10.1145/2103656.2103719](https://doi.org/10.1145/2103656.2103719).
14. C. Klein, J. Clements, C. Dimoulas, C. Eastlund, M. Felleisen, M. Flatt, J. A. McCarthy, J. Rafkind, S. Tobin-Hochstadt, and R. B. Findler. Run your research: on the effectiveness of lightweight mechanization. In *Proceedings of the 39th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2012*, pages 285–296, 2012. doi: [10.1145/2103656.2103691](https://doi.org/10.1145/2103656.2103691).

Aside: the normalize Tactic

When experimenting with definitions of programming languages in Coq, we often want to see what a particular concrete term steps to — i.e., we want to find proofs for goals of the form $t \Rightarrow^* t'$, where t is a completely concrete term and t' is unknown. These proofs are quite tedious to do by hand. Consider, for example, reducing an arithmetic expression using the small-step relation `astep`.

The following custom `Tactic Notation` definition captures this pattern. In addition, before each step, we print out the current goal, so that we can follow how the term is being reduced.

```
Tactic Notation "print_goal" :=
  match goal with |- ?x => idtac x end.

Tactic Notation "normalize" :=
  repeat (print_goal; eapply multi_step ;
    [ (eauto 10; fail) | (instantiate; simpl)]);
  apply multi_refl.
```

The `normalize` tactic also provides a simple way to calculate the normal form of a term, by starting with a goal with an existentially bound variable.

```
Example step_example1''' : ∃ e',  
  (P (C 3) (P (C 3) (C 4)))  
==>* e'.
```

Proof.

```
eapply ex_intro. normalize.  
(* This time, the trace is:  
  (P (C 3) (P (C 3) (C 4)) ==>* ?e')  
  (P (C 3) (C 7) ==>* ?e')  
  (C 10 ==>* ?e')  
  where ?e' is the variable ``guessed'' by eapply. *)
```

Qed.

Is Coq The Ultimate TA?

Pros:

- Can really build everything we need from scratch
- Curry-Howard
 - Proving = programming
- Good automation

Cons:

- Curry-Howard
 - Proving = programming → deep waters
 - Constructive logic can be confusing to students
- Annoyances
 - Lack of animation facilities
 - Poor interface
 - Notation facilities
 - Choice of variable names

My Coq proof scripts do not have the conciseness and elegance of Jérôme Vouillon's. Sorry, I've been using Coq for only 6 years...

- Leroy (2005)

Mechanized Metatheory for the Masses: The POPLMARK Challenge

Brian E. Aydemir¹, Aaron Bohannon¹, Matthew Fairbairn², J. Nathan Foster¹,
Benjamin C. Pierce¹, Peter Sewell², Dimitrios Vytiniotis¹, Geoffrey
Washburn¹, Stephanie Weirich¹, and Steve Zdancewic¹

¹ Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania

² Computer Laboratory, University of Cambridge

Challenge 2A: Type Safety for Pure F_<

Type soundness is usually proven in the style popularized by Wright and Felleisen [51], in terms of *preservation* and *progress* theorems. Challenge 2A is to prove these properties for pure F_<.

3.3 THEOREM [PRESERVATION]: If $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ and $t \rightarrow t'$, then $\Gamma \vdash t' : T$. \square

3.4 THEOREM [PROGRESS]: If t is a closed, well-typed F_< term (i.e., if $\vdash t : T$ for some T), then either t is a value or else there is some t' with $t \rightarrow t'$. \square

Challenge 3: Testing and Animating with Respect to the Semantics

Our final challenge is to provide an implementation of this functionality, specifically for the following three tasks (using the language of Challenge 2B):

1. Given $F_{<}$ terms t and t' , decide whether $t \rightarrow t'$.
2. Given $F_{<}$ terms t and t' , decide whether $t \rightarrow^* t' \not\rightarrow$, where \rightarrow^* is the reflexive-transitive closure of \rightarrow .
3. Given an $F_{<}$ term t , find a term t' such that $t \rightarrow t'$.

Evaluation

By repeated application of progress and preservation, we can evaluate any well-typed term. In this section, we will present an Agda function that computes the reduction sequence from any given closed, well-typed term to its value, if it has one.

The evaluator takes gas and evidence that a term is well-typed, and returns the corresponding steps.

```
eval : ∀ {L A}
  → Gas
  → ⊕ ⊢ L : A
  -----
  → Steps L

eval {L} (gas zero)    ⊢L          =  steps (L ▀) out-of-gas
eval {L} (gas (suc m)) ⊢L with progress ⊢L
... | done VL          =  steps (L ▀) (done VL)
... | step L→M with eval (gas m) (preserve ⊢L L→M)
...   | steps M→N fin    =  steps (L →⟨ L→M ⟩ M→N) fin
```

```

_ : eval (gas 100) (htwoc . hSucc . hZero) ≡
steps
  ((λ "s" ⇒ (λ "z" ⇒ ` "s" . (` "s" . ` "z")))) . (λ "n" ⇒ ` suc ` "n")
  . ` zero
→ < ξ-· 1 (β-λ V-λ) >
  (λ "z" ⇒ (λ "n" ⇒ ` suc ` "n") . ((λ "n" ⇒ ` suc ` "n") . ` "z")) .
  ` zero
→ < β-λ V-zero >
  (λ "n" ⇒ ` suc ` "n") . ((λ "n" ⇒ ` suc ` "n") . ` zero)
→ < ξ-· 2 V-λ (β-λ V-zero) >
  (λ "n" ⇒ ` suc ` "n") . ` suc ` zero
→ < β-λ (V-suc V-zero) >
  ` suc (` suc ` zero)
■)
(done (V-suc (V-suc V-zero))) )
_ = refl

```

Agda for Fun and Profit: System F



Vanessa McHale



Philip Wadler
Manuel
Chakravarty



Michael Peyton Jones



Kris Jenkins



Simon Thompson



Roman
Kireev



Kenneth
MacKenzie



Rebecca Valentine
(Former Member)



James Chapman



Jann Müller

David Smith



Pablo
Lamela Seijas



Alexander
Nemish

Lambda Calculus



Alonzo Church, 1932-40

Natural Deduction




Gerhard Gentzen, 1935

System F



Jean-Yves Girard, 1972

Polymorphic Lambda Calcululus



John Reynolds, 1974

Plutus Core

Kinds

$J, K ::=$

$*$

$J \rightarrow K$

Types

$A, B ::=$

X

$A \rightarrow B$

$\forall X. B$

$\mu X. B$

ρ

Terms

$L, M, N ::=$

x

$\lambda x:A. N$

$L\ M$

$\Lambda X:K. N$

$L\ A$

wrap M

unwrap M

ρ

Plutus Core in Agda

```
data Kind : Set where
  *   : Kind
  _⇒_ : Kind → Kind → Kind
```

```
data _⊤*_ : Ctx* → Kind → Set where
  `  : ⊢ ⊤* J
  -----
  → ⊢ ⊤* J
```

```
ƛ  : ⊢ , * K ⊤* J
  -----
  → ⊢ ⊤* K ⇒ J
```

```
_·_ : ⊢ ⊤* K ⇒ J
  → ⊢ ⊤* K
  -----
  → ⊢ ⊤* J
```

```
Π  : ⊢ , * K ⊤* *
  -----
  → ⊢ ⊤* *
```

```
_⇒_ : ⊢ ⊤* *
  → ⊢ ⊤* *
  -----
  → ⊢ ⊤* *
```

```
data _H_ : ∀ Γ → ||Γ|| ⊤* J → Set where
  `  : Γ ⊢ A
  -----
  → Γ ⊢ A
```

```
ƛ  : Γ , A ⊢ B
  -----
  → Γ ⊢ A ⇒ B
```

```
_·_ : Γ ⊢ A ⇒ B
  → Γ ⊢ A
  -----
  → Γ ⊢ B
```

```
Λ  : Γ , * K ⊢ B
  -----
  → Γ ⊢ Π B
```

```
_·*_ : Γ ⊢ Π B
  → (A : ||Γ|| ⊤* K)
  -----
  → Γ ⊢ B [ A ]
```


```
conv : A ≡β B
  → Γ ⊢ A
  -----
  → Γ ⊢ B
```



Roman Kireev 3 months ago

I haven't talked with James except for a couple of messages, but I read what he wrote in Agda and I'm very surprised that you can formalize System F in a non-disgusting way. Or at least I do not see those huge clunky theorems which I see everywhere including my own attempts

Conclusions



XXI SBMF

BRAZILIAN SYMPOSIUM ON
FORMAL METHODS
26 - 30 Nov, 2018
SALVADOR, BA, BRAZIL

SBMF 2018 Best Paper Award

1st Place

presented to

Philip Wadler

for his paper

Programming Language Foundations in Agda

Mohammad Mousavi
PC Co-chair

Adolfo Almeida Duran
General Chair

Tiago Massoni
PC Co-chair

Realisation



Propositions as Types

By Philip Wadler

Communications of the ACM, December 2015, Vol. 58 No. 12, Pages 75-84


10.1145/2699407

[Comments \(1\)](#)

VIEW AS:



SHARE:



Powerful insights arise from linking two fields of study previously thought separate. Examples include Descartes's coordinates, which links geometry to algebra, Planck's Quantum Theory, which links particles to waves, and Shannon's Information Theory, which links thermodynamics to communication. Such a synthesis is offered by the principle of Propositions as Types, which links logic to computation. At first sight it appears to be a simple coincidence—almost a pun—but it turns out to be remarkably robust, inspiring the design of automated proof assistants and programming languages, and continuing to influence the forefronts of computing.

[Back to Top](#)



YouTube AU

Search



Sept 25-26, 2015

thestrangeloop.com



"Propositions as Types" by Philip Wadler

61,321 views

LIKE

DISLIKE

SHARE

SAVE

...



vilem

@buggymcbugfix

Follow



I just proved commutativity of multiplication in Agda and got way too much serotonin out of it. 😊

Programming Language Foundations in Agda is AMAZING. Check it out at plfa.github.io.

Thank you, Phil Wadler and [@wenkokke](#).

(PS: If you have a better proof, let me know!)

```
*-comm : (m n : ℕ) → m * n ≡ n * m
*-comm zero n
  rewrite *-absorption n = refl
*-comm m zero
  rewrite *-absorption m = refl
*-comm (suc m') (suc n')
  rewrite *-comm m' (suc n')           -- suc m' * suc n' ≡ suc n' * suc m'
  | sym (+-assoc n' m' (n' * m'))    -- n' + (m' + n' * m') ≡ m' + n' * suc m'
  | *-comm n' m'                     -- n' + m' + m' * n' ≡ m' + n' * suc m'
  | +-comm n' m'                   -- m' + n' + m' * n' ≡ m' + n' * suc m'
  | *-comm n' (suc m')            -- m' + n' + m' * n' ≡ m' + (n' + m' * n')
  | +-assoc m' n' (m' * n')
= refl
```

10:35 AM - 16 Oct 2018

14 Likes



<http://plfa.inf.ed.ac.uk>
<https://github.com/plfa>

Or search for “Kokke Wadler”

Please send your comments and pull requests!