

CREATING A UNIVERSAL INFORMATION LANGUAGE

OSCAR BENDER-STONE

ABSTRACT. Welkin is a formalized programming language to store information. We introduce its use cases and rigorously define its syntax and semantics. From there, we introduce the bootstrap, making Welkin completely self-contained under the meta-theory of Goedel's System T (equi-consistent to Peano Arithmetic).

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Bridging Formal Representations	2
1.2. Background on Information Theory	3
1.3. Goals	4
1.4. Organization	4
2. Foundations	5
2.1. Logic of Proofs	5
2.2. Computability	5
2.3. Verifiers	5
3. Information Systems	6
3.1. Motivating Examples and Definition	7
3.2. Constructions and Reflection	7
3.3. Universality	8
4. Syntax	9
5. Semantics	9
5.1. Terms	9
6. Bootstrap	9
7. Conclusion	9
References	9

1. INTRODUCTION

Undergraduates are taught many things in lecture, books, and papers, but there is one unspoken truth: researchers have extremely *diverse* communities. Each community has their own approaches, their own conferences, and their own formatting. They even have a distinct preference to chalk, dry erase marker, or neither. I didn't notice their prominence in my early mathematical journey, in which I explored papers from set theory, logic, and more. At the time, I was in secondary education and had few physical resources. I was fortunate to have vast archives available on the internet, but my ability to *collaborate* in research was limited. This quickly changed in college. I participated in several research groups and found how rich and fulfilling each was. Sometimes, I heard about research groups during lecture, and this too opened my perception of research as a whole. I recognize now that diversity *drives* research, including in the sciences, liberal arts, and many more subjects I have hardly explored.

Because of how diverse research is, these communities are extremely independent and have separate results. For example, I wrote a poster for a cryptography class, concerning an MIT researcher who created programs of common cryptographic schemes and mathematically proved their correctness. I met this researcher at a conference and

discovered that *neither* knew about the other! They provided their own contributions, but I initially assumed that *everyone* contributing to cryptography work on common projects. As another example, at my time in the Budapest Semesters in Mathematics, I explored a key tool in program verification to find proofs for a combinatorial problem. According to my advisor, that approach had *never* been considered before. The boundaries between these communities isn't so clear, and it seems to take years to begin to *remotely* find them.

The separation of these communities raises a key question: *can* knowledge across disciplines be bridged together? Publications have become more widely available thanks to the internet, even behind a paywall or subscriptions. However, there are more challenges to storing the knowledge therein, as recognized by several papers, including [1]. Firstly, journals are usually highly specialized, require an immense understanding of the broader concepts involved and nomenclature used. This is clear in the sciences, as explored in [2], [3]. Additionally, representing knowledge can be difficult. In mathematics, for example, several attempts have been made to catalog major theories and results. [DESCRIBE ATTEMPTS & LIMITATIONS]. In other subjects, like the social sciences, there are *no* standard terms, and the majority of cited references are books, which are not indexed by many databases [4]. These are [challenging synonym] for existing tools [2]. As another challenge, many formats are fragile to incorrect syntax [EXPLAIN AND ELABORATE]. Each of these challenges, a small fraction of existing barriers, demonstrate the difficulty in creating a knowledge base with both broad applicability and faithful representations to the original research.

There is one existing approach to these problems: ontologies. [Explain use of AI AND how it doesn't work well with, e.g., logical formulas or such, IF this is true. Or maybe this IS still limited?]

1.1. Bridging Formal Representations.

Specifically, we can consider *formalized representations*, so sets of strings that are computable, i.e., accepted by a computer. By taking computable to mean the standard notion, Turing computable, our inquiry is now exactly about the proliferation of programming languages. These, too, are extremely distinct and built for different purposes. Translations between these, also known as *transpilation*, is incredibly difficult, as this is generally equivalent to the Halting Problem. A major project towards this goal is LLVM [5], a compiler library for other programming languages. Languages can implement in an intermediate form, LLVM IR, that the LLVM framework can then compile into a range of machine architectures. While being an industry and research standard, LLVM has faced numerous challenges, with a brief list including breaking changes and a massive packaging challenge across different Operating Systems. One approach that addresses a subset of these problems is MILR [6], another IR to abstract away from the original. Implementing these systems for *general* programs is beyond the scope of this thesis. We will instead focus on computable programs, which we can interpret as verifiers to proof assistants. Even here, translations are difficult.

To illustrate the challenge in translations between two proof assistants, consider quotient types in Lean4 vs Rocq. [TODO: complete + cite relevant literature!]

Creating bridges between formal representations does require a historical change in perspective: *embracing reflection rather than focusing on a single theory*. This train of thought comes from Universal Logic, initiated by Béziau [7]. Previously, during the

rapid expansion of foundations in the 20th century, logicians sought the “one true logic”, a system to be the basis for all mathematics. Such a system was quickly shown to be impossible by Gödel’s incompleteness theorems, with certain results requiring an infinite chain of increasingly more powerful theories. But this was a symptom of a larger problem: translating into the *exact* language of a base logic can be unnatural, just as it is unnatural to represent quotient types in Rocq without an additional theory ontop. To work back in the original logic, a key requirement is *faithfulness*, that isomorphisms in a theory must be reflected, a notion called “ ε -representation distance” by Meseguer [8]. However, the researchers surrounding Universal Logic are, too, their own community, and have their own broad definition of a logic, which is distinct from those in Categorical Logic, Type Theory, and others.

Beyond Universal Logic, a further leap is needed, from the idea a *universal theory* to *universal building blocks*. To support the wide diversity of languages, a spectrum of these building blocks, which we consider to be *information*. This thesis creates a universal information language for this purpose, to express information about *any formal representation*. This includes improving the representation itself!

1.2. Background on Information Theory.

Given the desire to *use* information, how do we define it? Information Theory has established several different major trains of thoughts:

- Shannon + entropy:
 - Main founder of information theory
 - Information = “reduced uncertainty”
 - Primarily probabilistic and based on *communication of bits*. Not enough for *semantics*!
 - Takeaway: information is *used* in communication
- Kolmogorov + complexity:
 - Minimum Description Length (MDL): we should describe objects with the smallest description possible.
 - Kolmogorov complexity = length of *smallest* program accepting a string
 - Practical problem: not computable!
 - Bigger problem: *measures* information, but does not *define it*
 - Takeaway: provides a *computational* lens for information
- Scott domains:
 - Introduced information systems, but in the context of programming language semantics.
 - Problem: provides the axioms and key models, but not clearly tied to the other theories. Also divergence from information in other senses, like ontology (OWL, etc.)
- Ontologies:
 - Frameworks: OWL, Conceptual Graphs, etc.
 - Problem: pretty restricted! Most theories are only first-order, so difficult for certain type theories, e.g., dependently typed.
- Synthesis of information theory + past paragraph
 - We want to explore *information* as a universal framework.
 - * Major goal: address information *on* information.
 - . Motivation: transfer between different things!

- Logics: proofs!
 - Models: properties!
 - Solvers: techniques and checkpoints! Reduces computation!
 - And more!
- But what *is* information?
- * So many examples: hard to know where we should go!
 - . Algorithmic ideas.
 - . Specific formulations in logics.
 - . High level properties.
 - . Probabilistic information.
 - * *Can* start at an indirect approach to ensure we don't miss anything: indirectly define things by how they are *checked*. This checker/verifier MUST be a Turing machine (using a standard notion!).
 - * Emphasize: finding a certificate is *not* guaranteed, e.g., finding a proof of a theorem in first order logic.
 - * To simplify this: we have *verifiers/checkers* that take in binary strings called *certificates*. Correct certificates are accepted by the checker, and rejected otherwise.
 - * *Use this definition to justify universality!*

Our overarching architecture is based on a key idea: separate *cheap queries* from *expensive search*. We develop the entire theory of queries and enable arbitrary extensions to the search procedures. This is inspired by and generalizes DPLL(T) [9] for SMT-LIB solvers. In DPLL(T), the goal is to find a proof of a first-order statement into two parts: solve propositional statements in a SAT solver, and solve theory-specific problems with theory solvers. Additionally, this enables future exploration for implementing general programs.

In addition to this architecture, we establish a small Trusted Computing Base (TCB). In our base logic, uses a novel technique: Artemov's Logic of Proofs [10]. This establishes our metatheory, which is equi-consistent to [TODO: find this!] (Section 2). [TODO: talk about prototype! Key!]

1.3. Goals.

The aim of this thesis is to create a universal information language to standardize *all* formal representations. I call this language **Welkin**, an old German word meaning cloud [11]. This aim will be made more precise in the later sections, where we will formally define a verifier for a programming language.

- **Goal 1:** universality. This language applies to ANY checker.
- **Goal 2:** standardized. Needs to be rigorously and formally specified.
- **Goal 3:** optimal reuse. With respect to some criterion, enable *as much* reuse on information as possible.
- **Goal 4:** efficiency. Checking if we have enough information *given* a database much be efficient!

1.4. Organization.

- Section 2. Foundations: define the meta-theory used + verifiers. Also outline the Trusted Computing Base.

- Section 3. Information Systems: explore information in the context of verifiers. Then synthesize a definition to satisfy Goal 1.
- Section 4. Information Reuse. Develops the optimal informal system (w.r.t to a metric defined in this system) to satisfy Goal 3.
- Section 5. Syntax: Go over the simple LL(1) grammar, which is similar to JSON and uses python syntax for modules.
- Section 6. Semantics: Defines information graphs and their correspondence with the optimal informal system in Section 3.
- Section 7. Bootstrap. Fulfill Goal 2 with both the Standard AND the complete bootstrap.
- Section ?. Prototype. Time permitting, develop a prototype to showcase the language, implemented in python with a GUI frontend (Qt) and possibly a hand-made LL(1) parser.
- Section 8. Conclusion. Reviews the work done in the previous sections. Then outlines several possible applications.

2. FOUNDATIONS

Our first step is to define the set of verifiers, a subset of the computable functions. Based on our architecture to separate *query* from *search*, we focus this subset to primitive recursive functions.

To explore verifiers, we need a reliable metatheory, establishing our logical TCB. How can we establish what *reliable* means? [TODO: cite that ZFC, or ZFC + inaccessibles, is common in literature.] However, each of these are *specific theories*, and while ZFC + inaccessibilities likely suffices for, e.g., formal verification, what about other subjects? We want to make this *as extensible* as possible, akin to an infinite hierarchy of theories via reflection. So we will need a different approach.

The key problem to reliability is, while we can easily verify if a given input is accepted by a verifier, how do we tell when there is *no* such input? We use a novel criterion developed by Artemov's Logic of Proofs [10]. [TODO: bridge this with selector proofs. Also, make sure to explain WHY the arithmetic hierarchy is enough. We JUST want to explore properties of naturals. We can't do beyond. But we should prove this!]

This is where our metatheory come in. [TODO: explore arithmetic hierarchy briefly? How do we know *which* results on computability are trustworthy? This is ESSENTIAL for the TCB!]

2.1. Logic of Proofs.

2.2. Computability.

2.3. Verifiers.

Given a partial computable function φ , let $L(\varphi)$ be the language recognized by φ .

Definition 2.3.0. An **effective verifier** is a Turing machine that runs in linear time and it accepts an input *must* have read the entire input.

In a refined form of Kleene representability, we show that every RE set corresponds to an effective verifier in an important way.

Lemma 2.3.1. *For every RE set S with recognizer φ , there is an effective verifier V_φ such that $x \in S$ iff there is some trace t that starts with x and $t \in L(V_\varphi)$.*

For the rest of this thesis, all verifiers mentioned will be effective. Note that we will return to practical verifiers, those with realistic constants.

3. INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Now with our meta-theory in Section 2, we can proceed to discuss information systems.

- Now can study the set of *verifiers*. A universal verifier is a verifier of a UTM. So we only need *one* such verifier. We encode the TM AND the input in question, and then simulate the whole TM.
 - Same problems as before: *how* do we organize this?
 - Instead of asking what information is broadly (we'll come back to that in the overarching semantics), we want to ask, what is information *for verifiers*?
 - * Recall translation from before: we *define* things by how they *are checked*. To information on mathematical objects corresponds to *information on how they are checked*.
 - . By how, this includes:
 - *what* things are/are not checked.
 - If it speeds it up/is a slow route.
 - . We capture this how by defining information *as* a relation between an input and a language *per* a trace.
 - . Current idea in a formal setting: *information are traces*.
 - Broadly treat information *as* a relation. Manifested as traces to include source, target, *and* steps inbetween.
 - Problem: this isn't efficient! Come up with non-trivial examples that, while we discern here, doesn't resolve the problem!
 - Also note: may not be *nice* w.r.t. certain systems. E.g., for sequent calculus, composition may not be guaranteed! So we can say a composite exist if *some* steps inbetween do, but this isn't always nice! Not *isomorphic* to sequent calculus proofs (depending on the system)! TODO: cite Strassburger deep inference paper to cite this issue and his approach.
 - Currently: we treat *proofs* as being traces. Need to resolve in the meta-theory!
 - Assuming we have a representation for traces (maybe via lambda terms? Review!),

we can look at the space of *all* these traces.

- HOW do we organize them? They are *base* information, but pretty dense.
 - Inefficient with equivalence modulo labeling
 - So we explore information systems based on these bounds:
 - (1) explicit = trace(s) \leq faster trace 1 \leq faster trace 2 $\leq \dots \leq$ implicit = statement of problem (x in S)

- * TODO: create diagram that highlights this! Make the outer circle the problem, Halting instance, and then the center is the set of explicit traces. When we union these, then the an explicit trace in one machine is the implicit one for another - maybe show this in a simple lemma?
- * ... ensured by Blum's speedup theorem - we will make this result self-contained + define Blum complexity measures!
- * Consider *statement* of problem to be "most implicit" by fiat: even if we use a proof search approach (so this may NOT halt) or use more uncomputable means, that still adds "extra" to the search itself.
 - * Note that \leq here is NOT necessarily implication; we are more thinking about a rough *measure* of being an *exact* trace of a TM
 - * Blum [12] says you can always do better (*in general*).
. Cite example: palindromes! Easy to discuss on efficiency
 - * TODO: show that this corresponds to *shorter traces*, fixing the main measure as the size of the trace. Again, to separate *query* from *search*, we do NOT want to involve any aspect of time, so the main other attribute is the space itself.
- Our goal: how to organize when we have a **space** of things like (1) that are *interconnected*?
 - Old approach (diagram!): show that people had *different* ways to tackle the stuff in-between. That's where most theories like (e.g., dependently typed theories, HOL, etc.)
 - New approach: separate *query* from *search*! Unify the previous approaches by focusing on optimizing the *left side* that we *can* control effectively

3.1. Motivating Examples and Definition.

We start with simple informal examples to explore the concept of information:

- Statements about the world.
- Taxonomies.
- Mathematical relations.
- More sophisticated: formal theories.

Each of the previous examples suggests a common definition: *information is a relation*. However, we want to express any formalizable kind of information. A binary relation *can* encode any other computable one, but not without clear reasons or connections. We add this missing component by using triadic relations instead, building off of semiotics and related schools of thought.

Definition 3.1.0. An **information system** is a pair (D, I) , where:

- D is the **domain**, a finite, computable set of **data** in \mathbb{N}
- I is **(partial) information**, a partially computable subset of $D \times D \times D$. This information is **complete** if I is totally computable.

3.2. Constructions and Reflection.

Let **Info** be the set of all information systems.

A natural construction to include is a system with *indexed information*, akin to indexed families of sets. But we want to have information between information as well.

We can think of a disjoint union of systems as the weakest transformation between systems.

Definition 3.2.1. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{(D_i, I_i)\}_{\{i \in \mathbb{N}\}}$ be a family of information systems, indexed by a partial computable function. Then the **sum** of \mathcal{S} is $(\bigcup D_i, \bigcup I_i)$. A **transformation** on \mathcal{S} is an information system $(\bigcup D_i, I')$ such that for each $i \in I$, $I' \cap (D_i \times D_i \times D_i) = I_i$.

As another construction, we can naturally model formal systems by asserting that I is reflexive and transitive in a general sense, formalized by below.

Definition 3.2.2. A **formal system** is an information system such that the information relation is reflexive and “transitive in a general sense” (WIP).

This construction is **information compressing**: we can computably encode information into a different representation and computably decode it back.

Special systems:

- (\emptyset, \emptyset) is the **null information system**
- $(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N})$ is the **discrete information system**

Lemma 3.2.3. Let $\mathcal{H} \equiv (\text{Info}, \leq)$, where $(D_1, I_1) \leq (D_2, I_2)$ iff $D_1 \subseteq D_2$ and $I_1 \subseteq I_2$. Then \mathcal{H} forms a Heyting Algebra, with bottom element being the null information system and the top element being the discrete one.

Theorem 3.2.4.

- The discrete information system cannot represent \mathcal{H} .
- \mathcal{H} can represent any extension of this structure and therefore induces an idempotent operator.

TODO: Show that a formal system provides a proof system that is a way to *optimize* the search space of information systems.

3.3. Universality.

Theorem 3.3.5. Every universal formal system induces a framework \mathbb{F}' , as the image of the functor $\mathcal{G} : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}'$, given by $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{S}) = (\text{Image}(G_{\mathcal{S}}), \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}} \cap \text{Image}(G_{\mathcal{S}})^2)$. Conversely, every framework induces a universal formal system.

Proof. We must show that \mathbb{F}' is a framework for \mathbb{F} . Clearly this is a computable sub-category. To prove \mathcal{G} is an equivalence, notice that \mathcal{G} is full and faithful as a full sub-category of \mathbb{F} . Additionally, \mathcal{G} is essentially surjective precisely by construction. This completes the forwards direction.

Conversely, a univeral framework can be formed from a system by creating a computable encoding of the formulas and rules of a system. The family G can then be defined from an equivalence from \mathbb{F} to \mathbb{F}' , which can be easily verified to preserve and reflection derivations. \square

4. SYNTAX

5. SEMANTICS

5.1. Terms.

We expand upon to anaylze the ASTs generated from Section 4.

6. BOOTSTRAP

7. CONCLUSION

REFERENCES

1. Wilkinson, M.D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I.J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., Silva Santos, L.O.B. da, Bourne, P.E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A.J., Clark, T., Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S.C., Evelo, C.T.A., Finkers, R., González-Beltrán, A.N., Gray, A.J.G., Groth, P., Goble, C.A., Grethe, J.S., Heringa, J., Hoen, P.A.C. 't, Hooft, R.W.W., Kuhn, T., Kok, R.G., Kok, J.N., Lusher, S.J., Martone, M.E., Mons, A., Packer, A.L., Persson, B., Rocca-Serra, P., Roos, M., Schaik, R.C. van, Sansone, S.-A., Schultes, E.A., Sengstag, T., Slater, T., Straw, G.O., Swertz, M.A., Thompson, M., Lei, J. van der, Mulligen, E.M. van, Velterop, J., Waagmeester, A., Wittenburg, P., Wolstencroft, K., Zhao, J., Mons, B.: The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*. 3, (2016)
2. Fanelli, W., Daniele AND Glänzel: Bibliometric Evidence for a Hierarchy of the Sciences. *Plos One*. 8, 1–11 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066938>
3. Casadevall, A., Fang, F.C.: Specialized Science. *Infection and Immunity*. 82, 1355–1360 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1128/iai.01530-13>
4. Archambault, É., Vignola-Gagné, É., Côté, G., Larivière, V., Gingras, Y.: Benchmarking scientific output in the social sciences and humanities: The limits of existing databases. *Scientometrics*. 68, 329–342 (2006)
5. Lattner, C., Adve, V.: LLVM: A Compilation Framework for Lifelong Program Analysis & Transformation. In: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization: Feedback-Directed and Runtime Optimization. p. 75. IEEE Computer Society, Palo Alto, California (2004)
6. Lattner, C., Amini, M., Bondhugula, U., Cohen, A., Davis, A., Pienaar, J., Riddle, R., Shpeisman, T., Vasileache, N., Zinenko, O.: MLIR: Scaling Compiler Infrastructure for Domain Specific Computation. In: 2021 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO). pp. 2–14 (2021)
7. Béziau, J.-Y.: Universal Logic: Evolution of a Project. *Logica Universalis*. 12, 1–8 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11787-018-0194-7>
8. Meseguer, J.: Twenty years of rewriting logic. *The Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*. 81, 721–781 (2012). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlap.2012.06.003>
9. Ganzinger, H., Hagen, G., Nieuwenhuis, R., Oliveras, A., Tinelli, C.: DPLL(T): Fast Decision Procedures. In: Alur, R. and Peled, D.A. (eds.) *Computer Aided Verification*. pp. 175–188. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2004)
10. Artemov, S.N.: Explicit Provability and Constructive Semantics. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*. 7, 1–36 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2687821>
11. Dictionary, O.E.: welkin, n., https://www.oed.com/dictionary/welkin_n
12. Blum, M.: A Machine-Independent Theory of the Complexity of Recursive Functions. *J. Acm*. 14, 322–336 (1967). <https://doi.org/10.1145/321386.321395>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER, BOULDER, CO

Email address: oscar-bender-stone@protonmail.com