

I wanted to try out making a proof assistant corresponding to the double category **Rel**.

You have a calculus of “values” corresponding to one edge of **Rel** and a sort of relational calculus of “predicates” corresponding to the other edge. Squares ought to correspond to judgements stating a value satisfies a predicate.

The language of “predicates” is based off the Simply Typed Lambda Calculus (in category theory terms is closed/has exponential objects) and the language of “values” has product types (in category theory terms is Cartesian.)

This is the core framework. I’ve been thinking about further extensions but I want to see how far I can get characterizing **Rel** with as few language features as possible. Later on I give a few possible extensions.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \top & \xrightarrow{\sigma_v} & \prod_{x: t! \in \Gamma_v} t \\
 \sigma_p \downarrow & & \downarrow v \models p[\sigma_v, \sigma_p] \\
 \sum_{x: t? \in \Gamma_p} t & \xrightarrow{p} & t
 \end{array}$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{tt} : \top!} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash v : t_0 \times t_1!} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{fst}(v) : t_0!} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash v : t_0 \times t_1!} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{snd}(v) : t_1!} \\
 \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash v_0 : t_0! \quad \Gamma \vdash v_1 : t_1!} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash (v_0, v_1) : t_0 \times t_1!} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash p : \top?} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{fail}_t(p) : t?} \\
 \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash p_0 : t_0 \times t_1? \quad \Gamma \vdash p_1 : t_0?} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash p_0 p_1 : t_1?} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma, x : t_0? \vdash p : t_1?} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mu(x : t_0?).p : t_0 \times t_1?}$$

When a value satisfies a predicate (I need a better symbol here.)

$$\frac{v_0 \models p \quad [\sigma]}{\mathbf{fst}(v_0, v_1) \models p \quad [\sigma]} \quad \frac{v_1 \models p \quad [\sigma]}{\mathbf{snd}(v_0, v_1) \models p \quad [\sigma]} \quad \frac{v \models \mathbf{fail}_t(p) \quad [\sigma]}{\mathbf{tt} \models p \quad [\sigma]} \\
 \frac{v \models [x \leftarrow p_1] p_0 \quad [\sigma]}{v \models (\mu(x : t?).p_0) p_1 \quad [\sigma]} \quad \frac{v_1 \models p \quad [\sigma, v_0 \models x]}{(v_0, v_1) \models \mu(x : t?).p \quad [\sigma]}$$

Core Calculus

Types	$t ::= \top \mid t \times t$
Sorts	$s ::= t? \mid t!$
Values	$v ::= x \mid \mathbf{tt} \mid \mathbf{fst}(v) \mid \mathbf{snd}(v) \mid (v, v)$
Predicates	$p ::= x \mid \mathbf{fail}_t(p) \mid p p \mid \mu(x : t?).p$
Environment	$\Gamma ::= \cdot \mid \Gamma, x : s$
Substitutions	$\sigma ::= \cdot \mid \sigma, v \models x$

I need a better name for the abstraction for predicates. It’s a little like the μ abstraction from the $\bar{\lambda}\mu\tilde{\mu}$ calculus but different.

Typing judgments.

Examples

Pattern matching on equality

$$(v, v) \models \mu(x : t?).x$$

Transposition

$$\mu(p : t \times t \times \top)(x : t)(y : t).p y x$$

Disjoint Unions

I am fairly confident in a simple extension to disjoint unions of sets which are sum types in the value calculus and product types in the predicate calculus.

Types	$t ::= \dots \mid \perp \mid t + t$
Values	$v ::= \dots \mid \mathbf{absurd}_t(v) \mid \mathbf{inl}_t(v) \mid \mathbf{inr}_t(v) \mid$ $\mathbf{match} \ v \ \begin{cases} v \leftarrow \mathbf{inl}(x) \\ v \leftarrow \mathbf{inr}(x) \end{cases}$
Predicates	$p ::= \dots \mid \mathbf{false} \mid \mathbf{left}(p) \mid \mathbf{right}(p) \mid$ $[p; p]$

Typing judgments.

$\Gamma \vdash v : \perp!$
$\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{absurd}_t(v) : t!$
$\Gamma \vdash v : t_0!$
$\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{inl}_{t_1}(v) : t_0 + t_1!$
$\Gamma \vdash v : t_1!$
$\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{inr}_{t_0}(v) : t_0 + t_1!$
$\Gamma \vdash v_0 : t_0 + t_1! \ \Gamma, x_0 : t_0! \vdash v_1 : t_2! \ \Gamma, x_1 : t_1! \vdash v_2 : t_2!$
$\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{match} \ v_0 \ \begin{cases} v_1 \leftarrow \mathbf{inl}(x_0) \\ v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{inr}(x_1) \end{cases} : t_2!$
$\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{false} : \perp?$
$\Gamma \vdash p : t_0 + t_1?$
$\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{left}(p) : t_0?$
$\Gamma \vdash p : t_0 + t_1?$
$\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{right}(p) : t_1?$
$\Gamma \vdash p_0 : t_0? \ \Gamma \vdash p_1 : t_1?$
$\Gamma \vdash [p_0; p_1] : t_0 + t_1?$

Satisfies

$[x_0 \leftarrow v_0]v_1 \models p \ [\sigma]$
$\mathbf{match} \ \mathbf{inl}_t(v_0) \ \begin{cases} v_1 \leftarrow \mathbf{inl}(x_0) \\ v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{inr}(x_1) \end{cases} \models p \ [\sigma]$
$[x_1 \leftarrow v_0]v_2 \models p \ [\sigma]$
$\mathbf{match} \ \mathbf{inr}_t(v_0) \ \begin{cases} v_1 \leftarrow \mathbf{inl}(x_0) \\ v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{inr}(x_1) \end{cases} \models p \ [\sigma]$
$v \models p_0 \ [\sigma]$
$v \models \mathbf{left}([p_0; p_1]) \ [\sigma]$
$v \models p_1 \ [\sigma]$
$v \models \mathbf{right}([p_0; p_1]) \ [\sigma]$
$\mathbf{absurd}_t(v) \models p \ [\sigma]$
$v \models \mathbf{false} \ [\sigma]$
$v \models p_0 \ [\sigma]$
$\mathbf{inl}_t(v) \models [p_0; p_1] \ [\sigma]$
$v \models p_1 \ [\sigma]$
$\mathbf{inr}_t(v) \models [p_0; p_1] \ [\sigma]$

Dependent Sums

If product of sets becomes an exponential in the predicate calculus then dependent sums ought to become like Π types. So the predicate calculus effectively becomes like System-F.

Some things become awkward to interpret here though.

I also really can't figure out unpacking. It's messy if you don't want full dependent types.

Types	$t ::= \dots \mid x \mid \mathbf{head}(v) \mid \Sigma(x : *) . t$
Sorts	$s ::= \dots \mid *$
Values	$v ::= \dots \mid \mathbf{tail}(v) \mid \langle x \leftarrow t, v \rangle$
Predicates	$p ::= \dots \mid p \ t \mid \mathbf{M}(x : *) . p$
Substitutions	$\sigma ::= \dots \mid \sigma, t \models x$

Not really good at the typing judgements for dependent sum types.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma \vdash v : \Sigma(x : *) . t!}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{head}(v) : *} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash v : \Sigma(x : *) . t!}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{tail}(v) : [x \leftarrow \mathbf{head}(v)] t!} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_0 : * \quad \Gamma, x : * \vdash v : t_1!}{\Gamma \vdash \langle x \leftarrow t_0, v \rangle : \Sigma(x : *) . t_0!} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : \Sigma(x : *) . t_1? \quad \Gamma \vdash t_0 : *}{\Gamma \vdash p_0 t_0 : [x \leftarrow t_0] t_1?} \\
\frac{\Gamma, x : * \vdash p : t?}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{M}(x : *) . p : \Sigma(x : *) . t?}
\end{array}$$

I can't figure out satisfaction at all.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{t \models p \quad [\sigma]}{\mathbf{head}(\langle x \leftarrow t, v \rangle) \models p \quad [\sigma]} \\
\frac{[x \leftarrow t] v \models p \quad [\sigma]}{\mathbf{tail}(\langle x \leftarrow t, v \rangle) \models p \quad [\sigma]} \\
\frac{v \models [x \leftarrow t] p \quad [\sigma]}{v \models (\mathbf{M}(x : *) . p) t \quad [\sigma]} \\
\frac{v \models p \quad [\sigma, t \models x]}{\langle x \leftarrow t, v \rangle \models \mathbf{M}(x : *) . p \quad [\sigma]}
\end{array}$$

The Future?

Satisfies judgments correspond to thin squares. Moving to more generally categories such as **Span** or **Prof** or **Vect** for matrix math requires an interpretation of squares carrying constructive content.