

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.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \top & \xrightarrow{\sigma_v} & \Gamma_v \\
 \sigma_p \downarrow & & \downarrow v \models p \\
 \Gamma_p & \xrightarrow{p} & t
 \end{array}$$

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.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{tt}: \top!}{\Gamma \vdash v: t_0 \times t_1!}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{fst}(v): t_0!}}{\Gamma \vdash v: t_0 \times t_1!}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{snd}(v): t_1!}}{\Gamma \vdash v_0: t_0! \quad \Gamma \vdash v_1: t_1!}}{\Gamma \vdash (v_0, v_1): t_0 \times t_1!}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash p: \top?}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{fail}_t(p): t?}}{\Gamma \vdash p_0: t_0 \times t_1? \quad \Gamma \vdash p_1: t_0?}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p_0 p_1: t_1?}{\Gamma, x: t_0? \vdash p: t_1?}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p_0 p_1: t_1?}{\Gamma \vdash \mu(x: t_0?).p: t_0 \times t_1?}$$

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

$$\frac{v_0 \models p \quad [\sigma]}{\mathbf{fst}(v_0, v_1) \models p \quad [\sigma]}$$

$$\frac{v_1 \models p \quad [\sigma]}{\mathbf{snd}(v_0, v_1) \models p \quad [\sigma]}$$

$$\frac{v \models \mathbf{fail}_t(p) \quad [\sigma]}{\mathbf{tt} \models p \quad [\sigma]}$$

$$\frac{v \models [x \leftarrow p_1]p_0 \quad [\sigma]}{v \models (\mu(x: t?).p_0) p_1 \quad [\sigma]}$$

$$\frac{v_1 \models p \quad [\sigma, v_0 \models x]}{(v_0, v_1) \models \mu(x: t?).p \quad [\sigma]}$$

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.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma \vdash v: \perp!}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{absurd}_t(v): t!} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash v: t_0!}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{inl}_{t_1}(v): t_0 + t_1!} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash v: t_1!}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{inr}_{t_0}(v): t_0 + t_1!} \\
\hline
\Gamma \vdash v_0: t_0 + t_1! \Gamma, x_0: t_0! \vdash v_1: t_2! \Gamma, x_1: t_1! \vdash v_2: t_2! \\
\hline
\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{match} v_0 \begin{cases} v_1 \leftarrow \mathbf{inl}(x_0) \\ v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{inr}(x_1) \end{cases} : t_2!
\end{array}$$

Satisfies

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

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.

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

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.