

Church Encoding with Dependent Type and Self Type

Peng Fu, Aaron Stump

Dept. of Computer Science
University of Iowa

September 23, 2013

Motivation

- ▶ Church encoding in system **F**.

Motivation

- ▶ Church encoding in system **F**.
- ▶ Dependent type theory.

Motivation

- ▶ Church encoding in system **F**.
- ▶ Dependent type theory.
- ▶ Primitive inductive data type.

Church Encoding

- ▶ Why not use Church encoded data?

Church Encoding

- ▶ Why not use Church encoded data?
- ▶ Inefficiency to retrieve subdata.

Church Encoding

- ▶ Why not use Church encoded data?
- ▶ Inefficiency to retrieve subdata.
- ▶ Can not prove $0 \neq 1$ (e.g. Calculus of Construction **CC**).

Church Encoding

- ▶ Why not use Church encoded data?
- ▶ Inefficiency to retrieve subdata.
- ▶ Can not prove $0 \neq 1$ (e.g. Calculus of Construction **CC**).
- ▶ Induction principle is not derivable (e.g. **CC**).

Church Encoding: Inefficiency

- ▶ Linear time to compute predecessor:

$$\text{pred (Succ } \bar{n}) \underbrace{\rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow \bar{n}}_{\geq n+1}$$

- ▶ “Unintuitive” predecessor function.

$$\text{pred} := \lambda n. \lambda f. \lambda x. n (\lambda g. \lambda h. h (g f)) (\lambda u. x) (\lambda u. u)$$

- ▶ It is inherent to Church encodings.

Underivability of $0 \neq 1$

- ▶ Depends on the notion of contradiction.
- ▶ Calculus of Construction:

$$x =_A y \quad := \quad \prod C : A \rightarrow *. C x \rightarrow C y$$

$$\perp \quad := \quad \prod X : *. X$$

$$0 =_{\text{Nat}} 1 \rightarrow \perp \quad := \quad (\prod C : \text{Nat} \rightarrow *. C 0 \rightarrow C 1) \rightarrow \prod X : *. X$$

- ▶ $0 =_{\text{Nat}} 1 \rightarrow \perp$ is underivable in **CC**.
- ▶ $\vdash_{cc} t : 0 \neq_{\text{Nat}} 1$ implies $\vdash_F |t| : |0 \neq_{\text{Nat}} 1|$
- ▶ $|0 =_{\text{Nat}} 1 \rightarrow \perp| := \prod C.(C \rightarrow C) \rightarrow \prod X.X$ in **F**.

Underivability of $0 \neq 1$

- ▶ A change of notion of contradiction.
- ▶ Calculus of Construction:

$$\begin{aligned}x =_A y &:= \prod C : A \rightarrow *. C x \rightarrow C y \\ \perp &:= \prod A : *. \prod x : A. \prod y : A. x =_A y \\ 0 =_{\text{Nat}} 1 \rightarrow \perp &:= (\prod C : \text{Nat} \rightarrow *. C 0 \rightarrow C 1) \\ &\rightarrow (\prod A : *. \prod x : A. \prod y : A. x =_A y)\end{aligned}$$

- ▶ \perp is uninhabited in **CC**.
- ▶ $0 =_{\text{Nat}} 1 \rightarrow \perp$ is derivable in **CC**.
- ▶ $0 \neq 1$ in **CC** is mapped to $\prod C. (C \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (\prod A. \prod C. C \rightarrow C)$ in **F**.

Underivability of Induction Principle

- ▶ Depends on the formulation of the logical system.

- ▶ Calculus of Construction:

$$Ind := \prod P : \text{Nat} \rightarrow *. (\prod y : \text{Nat}. (P y \rightarrow P(\mathbf{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow \prod x : \text{Nat}. P x.$$

- ▶ Let

$$\Gamma = P : \text{Nat} \rightarrow *, s : \prod y : \text{Nat}. (P y \rightarrow P(\mathbf{S}y)), z : P \bar{0}, x : \text{Nat}$$
$$\Gamma \vdash ? : P x$$

Underivability of Induction Principle

$\Gamma = P : \text{Nat} \rightarrow *, s : \Pi y : \text{Nat}. (Py \rightarrow P(Sy)), z : P \bar{0}, x : \text{Nat}$

► Observe that:

$\Gamma \vdash z : P \bar{0}$

$\Gamma \vdash s \bar{0} z : P \bar{1}$

$\Gamma \vdash s \bar{1} (s \bar{0} z) : P \bar{2}$

Underivability of Induction Principle

$\Gamma = P : \text{Nat} \rightarrow *, s : \Pi y : \text{Nat} . (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y)), z : P \bar{0}, x : \text{Nat}$

- ▶ Observe that:

$\Gamma \vdash z : P \bar{0}$

$\Gamma \vdash s \bar{0} z : P \bar{1}$

$\Gamma \vdash s \bar{1} (s \bar{0} z) : P \bar{2}$

- ▶ A new notion of Lambda numerals:

$\bar{0} := \lambda s . \lambda z . z :$

$(\Pi y : \text{Nat} . (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow P \bar{0}$

$\bar{1} := \lambda s . \lambda z . s \ 0 \ z :$

$(\Pi y : \text{Nat} . (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow P \bar{1}$

$\bar{2} := \lambda s . \lambda z . s \ 1 \ (s \ \bar{0} \ z) :$

$(\Pi y : \text{Nat} . (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow P \bar{2}$

$\text{S} := \lambda n . \lambda s . \lambda z . s \ n \ (n \ s \ z)$

Underivability of Induction Principle

$\Gamma = P : \text{Nat} \rightarrow *, s : \Pi y : \text{Nat} . (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y)), z : P \bar{0}, x : \text{Nat}$

- ▶ Observe that:

$\Gamma \vdash z : P \bar{0}$

$\Gamma \vdash s \bar{0} z : P \bar{1}$

$\Gamma \vdash s \bar{1} (s \bar{0} z) : P \bar{2}$

- ▶ A new notion of Lambda numerals:

$\bar{0} := \lambda s . \lambda z . z :$

$(\Pi y : \text{Nat} . (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow P \bar{0}$

$\bar{1} := \lambda s . \lambda z . s \ 0 \ z :$

$(\Pi y : \text{Nat} . (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow P \bar{1}$

$\bar{2} := \lambda s . \lambda z . s \ 1 \ (s \ \bar{0} \ z) :$

$(\Pi y : \text{Nat} . (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow P \bar{2}$

$\text{S} := \lambda n . \lambda s . \lambda z . s \ n \ (n \ s \ z)$

- ▶ $\text{Nat} := \Pi P : \text{Nat} \rightarrow * . (\Pi y : \text{Nat} . (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow P \bar{n}$ for every \bar{n} ?

Self Type: Introduction

$\text{Nat} := \Pi P : \text{Nat} \rightarrow *. (\Pi y : \text{Nat}. (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow P \bar{n}$ for every \bar{n} ?

▶ We introduce *self* type.

▶ $\text{Nat} :=$

$\lambda x. \Pi P : \text{Nat} \rightarrow *. (\Pi y : \text{Nat}. (P y \rightarrow P(\text{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow P x$

▶ Typing rules:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \lambda x. T}{\Gamma \vdash t : [t/x]T} \text{SelfInst} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : [t/x]T}{\Gamma \vdash t : \lambda x. T} \text{SelfGen}$$

▶ Self type formation rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : \lambda x. T \vdash T : *}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x. T : *}$$

Self Type: Handling Recursive Definition

Nat :=

$\iota x. \Pi P : \mathbf{Nat} \rightarrow *. (\Pi y : \mathbf{Nat}. (Py \rightarrow P(\mathbf{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow Px$

- ▶ The encoding is not quite Church-like yet.

$0 := \lambda s. \lambda z. z$

$\mathbf{S} := \lambda n. \lambda s. \lambda z. s \ n \ (n \ s \ z)$

- ▶ We need Miquel's implicit product.

Nat :=

$\iota x. \Pi P : \mathbf{Nat} \rightarrow *. (\forall y : \mathbf{Nat}. (Py \rightarrow P(\mathbf{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow Px$

- ▶ Now we have Church numerals:

$0 := \lambda s. \lambda z. z$

$\mathbf{S} := \lambda n. \lambda s. \lambda z. s \ (n \ s \ z)$

- ▶ Induction now is derivable:

$Ind : \Pi P : \mathbf{Nat} \rightarrow *. (\forall y : \mathbf{Nat}. (Py \rightarrow P(\mathbf{S}y))) \rightarrow P \bar{0} \rightarrow \Pi x : \mathbf{Nat}. P \ x$

$Ind := \lambda s. \lambda z. \lambda n. n \ s \ z.$

Summary and Results

- ▶ $0 \neq 1$ is provable with a change of notion of contradiction.
- ▶ Introduce Self type to derive induction principle.

Some Results

- ▶ Self type is incorporated in a type system called S .
- ▶ We prove S can be erased to F_ω , thus establishing consistency.
- ▶ We prove preservation theorem for S .

Thank you for listening!

- ▶ Questions?