Implementing Parametricity

Jean-Philippe Bernardy



CHALMERS | GÖTEBORG UNIVERSITY

Parametricity Workshop May 2nd, 2012

Reynolds' Parametricity

In the Polymorphic Lambda Calculus/System F:

- 1. Every type A can be interpreted as a relation $[\![A]\!]$.
- 2. Abstraction: evaluating a term in related environments yields related values.
- Corollary: The interpretation of a term satisfies the interpretation of its type.
- 4. (Identity extension: The interpretation of types preserves identities)

Wadler: Free theorems

Idea: if you tell me

...then I know...

$$(x,x) \in \llbracket A \rrbracket$$

... and [A] is useful if x is polymorphic.

Example: filter

See Filter.agda

Goal

Goal: implementing parametricity in a proof assistant.

Goal

Goal: implementing parametricity in a proof assistant. Why?

- Can already represent programs and propositions
- Seems a natural setting
 - parametricity has many applications: I want it supported in my proof assistant!
 - meta-programming (from less-typed to more-typed)
- ► Encode your type-system in Agda; get "specific" parametricity for free.

Goal

Goal: implementing parametricity in a proof assistant.

Why?

- Can already represent programs and propositions
- Seems a natural setting
 - parametricity has many applications: I want it supported in my proof assistant!
 - meta-programming (from less-typed to more-typed)
- Encode your type-system in Agda; get "specific" parametricity for free.

To do:

- Extend parametricity to full dependent types (CC)
- Clarify the logical status of parametricity (does [A] compute?)
- Pragmatics: make a convenient tool



Extensions

- System F (Reynolds, 1983)
- ► Hints of type constructors, classes (Wadler, FPCA 1989)
- Functors (Folklore; Fegaras and Sheard credit Paterson, POPL 1996)
- Seq, bottoms (Johann and Voigtländer, POPL 2004)
- Constructor classes (Voigtländer, ICFP 2009)
- Fω (Vytiniotis and Weirich, JFP 2010)
- PTSs+Inductive constructions (Bernardy, Jansson and Paterson, ICFP 2010) (Extended version in JFP: http://publications.lib.chalmers.se/cpl/record/ index.xsql?pubid=135303)

Tool: Free Theorem Generator

Tool of choice: Voigtländer-Böhme's free theorem generator http://www-ps.iai.uni-bonn.de/cgi-bin/free-theorems-webui.cgi

- specialization of relations to functions
- sublanguages of Haskell
- **.**..

Logical status: Types to Propositions; Programs to Proofs

X	$\llbracket x rbracket$
Programming Language	Logic
Types	Propositions
Programs	Proofs
STLC	LCF
Poly. LC	2nd order logic
F ω	Higher-order logic
PTS	PTS
$CC\omega$	$CC\omega$
CiC	CiC
MLTT	MLTT

Note that the logic contains the same constructions as the programming language + quantification over "programs".

Extension: Parametricity for PTSs

Theorem (abstraction)

If
$$\Gamma \vdash A : B : s$$
, then $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket A \rrbracket : \overline{A} \in \llbracket B \rrbracket : s$

Tool: Lightweight Free Theorems (in Agda)

```
http://wiki.portal.chalmers.se/agda/agda.php?n=Libraries.LightweightFreeTheorems
Demo
```

Tool: Tactics

"Parametricity in an Impredicative Sort" M. Lasson and C. Keller http:

//perso.ens-lyon.fr/marc.lasson/coqparam-draft.pdf
Remark:

- Difficult to work with "raw" free theorems.
- ► Can we instantiate automatically some relations appropriately dependent on the goal?

Logical Status: open terms

What I really want: in Agda, use [A] on any term A.

Required:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : B}{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket A \rrbracket : A \in \llbracket B \rrbracket}$$

le. don't assume that every free variable in the context is parametric.

Logical Status: open terms

What I really want: in Agda, use [A] on any term A. Required:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A : B}{\Gamma \vdash \llbracket A \rrbracket : A \in \llbracket B \rrbracket}$$

le. don't assume that every free variable in the context is parametric. Actually; that's ok. Just block on free variables; wait for a concrete term to appear.

Amendment to $\lceil \cdot \rceil$:

- Carry a local context of associations between variables and their relational interpretations.
- $\blacktriangleright \quad \llbracket A \rrbracket_{x \mapsto \dot{x}, y \mapsto \dot{y}, \dots}$
- $\qquad \qquad [\![\lambda x : A. \quad B]\!]_{\rho} = \lambda \overline{x : A}. \quad \lambda \dot{x} : \overline{x} \in [\![A]\!]. \quad [\![B]\!]_{\rho, x \mapsto \dot{x}}$



Logical status: nesting

Why?

- binary relations obtained from unary ones.
- if [[·]] is used in programs, you want this.

Challenge:

- evaluate $[[x]]_{x \mapsto \dot{x}}$
- ▶ naive approach $(\llbracket \llbracket x \rrbracket_{x \mapsto \dot{x}} \rrbracket)$ does not preserve subject reduction: confuses $\llbracket x \rrbracket$ and \dot{x} .

Possible approaches:

- Preventing nesting: use the system of sorts presented by Lasson and Keller.
- points to higher-dimensional type-theory. (Bernardy and Moulin, LICS 2012, http://publications.lib.chalmers. se/cpl/record/index.xsql?pubid=153094)

Conclusions

- Extensions: Agda is ripe with exotic extensions (Co-induction (easy); Abel's irrelevance, other features?)
- Logical status: Done!
- ▶ Toolification: Room for improvement

The long term: study relationship with extensionality, induction, \dots

Logical Status: Remark

Parametricity is Anti-classical