

Why is equality interesting?

Ambrus Kaposi

Dept. of Programming Languages and Compilers,
Eötvös Loránd University,
Budapest

5th World Logic Day
Rényi Institute, Budapest
13 January 2023

Plan

- ▶ First order logic as a second order generalised algebraic theory (SOGAT)
- ▶ Type theory as a SOGAT
- ▶ Type theory and set theory
- ▶ Equality type in type theory

FOL as SOGAT

$\text{Tm} : \text{Set}^+$

$\text{For} : \text{Set}$

$- \supset - : \text{For} \rightarrow \text{For} \rightarrow \text{For}$

$\forall : (\text{Tm} \rightarrow \text{For}) \rightarrow \text{For}$

$\text{Eq} : \text{Tm} \rightarrow \text{Tm} \rightarrow \text{For}$

FOL as SOGAT

$\text{Tm} \quad : \text{Set}^+$

$\text{For} \quad : \text{Set}$

$- \supset - : \text{For} \rightarrow \text{For} \rightarrow \text{For}$

$\forall \quad : (\text{Tm} \rightarrow \text{For}) \rightarrow \text{For}$

$\text{Eq} \quad : \text{Tm} \rightarrow \text{Tm} \rightarrow \text{For}$

$\text{Pf} \quad : \text{For} \rightarrow \text{Set}^+$

$: (p, q : \text{Pf } A) \rightarrow p = q$

$: (\text{Pf } A \rightarrow \text{Pf } B) \leftrightarrow \text{Pf } (A \supset B)$

$: ((t : \text{Tm}) \rightarrow \text{Pf } (A t)) \leftrightarrow \text{Pf } (\forall A)$

$: (t = t') \leftrightarrow \text{Pf } (\text{Eq } t t')$

Graphs

As a two-sorted algebraic theory:

$V : \text{Set}$

$E : \text{Set}$

$\text{start} : E \rightarrow V$

$\text{end} : E \rightarrow V$

As a generalised algebraic theory:

$V : \text{Set}$

$E : V \rightarrow V \rightarrow \text{Set}$

Transitive graphs

As an essentially algebraic theory:

V : Set

E : Set

start : $E \rightarrow V$

end : $E \rightarrow V$

tran : $(f, g : E) \rightarrow \text{end } f = \text{start } g \rightarrow E$

: $\text{start } (\text{tran } f g e) = \text{start } f$

: $\text{end } (\text{tran } f g e) = \text{end } g$

As a generalised algebraic theory:

V : Set

E : $V \rightarrow V \rightarrow \text{Set}$

tran : $E x y \rightarrow E y z \rightarrow E x z$

FOL as SOGAT

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Tm} \quad : \text{Set}^+ \\ \text{For} \quad : \text{Set} \\ - \supset - : \text{For} \rightarrow \text{For} \rightarrow \text{For} \\ \forall \quad : (\text{Tm} \rightarrow \text{For}) \rightarrow \text{For} \\ \text{Eq} \quad : \text{Tm} \rightarrow \text{Tm} \rightarrow \text{For} \\ \hline \text{Pf} \quad : \text{For} \rightarrow \text{Set}^+ \\ \quad : (p, q : \text{Pf } A) \rightarrow p = q \\ \quad : (\text{Pf } A \rightarrow \text{Pf } B) \leftrightarrow \text{Pf } (A \supset B) \\ \quad : ((t : \text{Tm}) \rightarrow \text{Pf } (A t)) \leftrightarrow \text{Pf } (\forall A) \\ \quad : (t = t') \leftrightarrow \text{Pf } (\text{Eq } t t') \end{array}$$

- ▶ algebraic theory, signature with equations
- ▶ generalised (Cartmell)
- ▶ second order
- ▶ every SOGAT has a first order GAT presentation: a category \mathcal{C} together with the signature interpreted in presheaves over \mathcal{C}
- ▶ category of algebras
- ▶ syntax = initial algebra

Untyped lambda calculus as SOGAT

$\mathsf{Tm} : \mathsf{Set}^+$

$\mathsf{lam} : (\mathsf{Tm} \rightarrow \mathsf{Tm}) \rightarrow \mathsf{Tm}$

$\mathsf{- \$ -} : \mathsf{Tm} \rightarrow \mathsf{Tm} \rightarrow \mathsf{Tm}$

$\beta : (\mathsf{lam } t) \$ t' = t t'$

Simply typed lambda calculus as SOGAT

Ty : Set

Tm : $Ty \rightarrow Set^+$

$- \Rightarrow -$: $Ty \rightarrow Ty \rightarrow Ty$

lam : $(Tm A \rightarrow Tm B) \cong Tm (A \Rightarrow B)$: - \$ -

Type theory as SOGAT (i)

$\text{Ty} \quad : \text{Set}$

$\text{Tm} \quad : \text{Ty} \rightarrow \text{Set}^+$

$\Pi \quad : (A : \text{Ty}) \rightarrow (\text{Tm } A \rightarrow \text{Ty}) \rightarrow \text{Ty}$

$\text{lam} \quad : ((t : \text{Tm } A) \rightarrow \text{Tm } (B \ t)) \cong \text{Tm } (\Pi \ A \ B) : - \$ -$

Type theory as SOGAT (ii)

$$\text{Ty} : \text{Set}$$
$$\text{Tm} : \text{Ty} \rightarrow \text{Set}^+$$

$$\Pi : (A : \text{Ty}) \rightarrow (\text{Tm } A \rightarrow \text{Ty}) \rightarrow \text{Ty}$$
$$\text{lam} : ((t : \text{Tm } A) \rightarrow \text{Tm } (B t)) \cong \text{Tm } (\Pi A B) : - \$ -$$

$$\text{U} : \text{Ty}$$
$$\text{El} : \text{Tm } \text{U} \cong \text{Ty}$$

$$\mathbb{N} : \text{Ty}$$
$$\text{zero} : \text{Tm } \mathbb{N}$$
$$\text{suc} : \text{Tm } \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Tm } \mathbb{N}$$
$$\text{ind}_{\mathbb{N}} : (A : \text{Tm } \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Ty}) \rightarrow \text{Tm } (A \text{ zero}) \rightarrow$$
$$((t : \text{Tm } \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \text{Tm } (C t) \rightarrow \text{Tm } (C (\text{suc } t))) \rightarrow$$
$$(t : \text{Tm } \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \text{Tm } (A t)$$
$$\mathbb{N}\beta_1 : \text{ind}_{\mathbb{N}} A z s \text{ zero} = z$$
$$\mathbb{N}\beta_2 : \text{ind}_{\mathbb{N}} A z s (\text{suc } t) = s t (\text{ind}_{\mathbb{N}} A z s t)$$

$$\text{Eq} : (A : \text{Ty}) \rightarrow \text{Tm } A \rightarrow \text{Tm } A \rightarrow \text{Ty}$$

Type theory

vs.

Set theory

$\text{suc zero} : \text{Nm } \mathbb{N}$

$(\text{suc zero} \in \mathbb{N}) : \text{For}$

$\dots : \text{Pf}(\text{suc zero} \in \mathbb{N})$

Type theory

vs.

Set theory

$\text{suc zero} : \text{Tm } \mathbb{N}$

$(\text{suc zero} \in \mathbb{N}) : \text{For}$

$\dots : \text{Pf}(\text{suc zero} \in \mathbb{N})$

$\text{reflexivity} : \text{Tm}(\text{Eq}_{\mathbb{N}}(2 + 3) 5)$

$\dots : \text{Pf}(\text{Eq}(2 + 3) 5)$

Type theory

vs.

Set theory

$\text{suc zero} : \text{Nm } \mathbb{N}$

$(\text{suc zero} \in \mathbb{N}) : \text{For}$

$\dots : \text{Pf} (\text{suc zero} \in \mathbb{N})$

$\text{reflexivity} : \text{Nm} (\text{Eq}_{\mathbb{N}} (2 + 3) 5)$

$\dots : \text{Pf} (\text{Eq} (2 + 3) 5)$

not expressible

$(\text{zero} \in \text{suc zero}) : \text{For}$

Type theory

vs.

Set theory

$\text{suc zero} : \text{Tm } \mathbb{N}$

$(\text{suc zero} \in \mathbb{N}) : \text{For}$

$\dots : \text{Pf}(\text{suc zero} \in \mathbb{N})$

$\text{reflexivity} : \text{Tm}(\text{Eq}_{\mathbb{N}}(2 + 3) 5)$

$\dots : \text{Pf}(\text{Eq}(2 + 3) 5)$

not expressible

$(\text{zero} \in \text{suc zero}) : \text{For}$

everything respects isomorphisms

$0 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $0 \notin \{1, 2\}$

(Voevodsky's univalence axiom)

Type checking

parse : String \rightarrow Maybe **Pretm**

Type checking

parse : String \rightarrow Maybe **Pretm**

infer : **Pretm** \rightarrow Maybe ((A : Ty) \times Tm A)

Type checking

parse : String \rightarrow Maybe **Pretm**

infer : **Pretm** \rightarrow Maybe ((A : Ty) \times Tm A)

infer (**t \$ t'**) := if infer **t** = (A \Rightarrow B, t) and
infer **t'** = (A', t') and A = A' then (B, t \$ t')

Type checking

parse : String \rightarrow Maybe **Pretm**

infer : **Pretm** \rightarrow Maybe $((A : \text{Ty}) \times \text{Tm } A)$

infer ($t \ \$ \ t'$) := if infer $t = (A \Rightarrow B, t)$ and
infer $t' = (A', t')$ and $A = A'$ then $(B, t \ \$ \ t')$

- ▶ So equality of Ty (and Tm) should be decidable.

Type checking

parse : String \rightarrow Maybe **Pretm**

infer : **Pretm** \rightarrow Maybe ((A : Ty) \times Tm A)

infer ($t \text{ \$ } t'$) := if infer $t = (A \Rightarrow B, t)$ and
infer $t' = (A', t')$ and $A = A'$ then ($B, t \text{ \$ } t'$)

- ▶ So equality of Ty (and Tm) should be decidable.
- ▶ Implemented through normalisation.

Type checking

parse : String \rightarrow Maybe **Pretm**

infer : **Pretm** \rightarrow Maybe ((A : Ty) \times Tm A)

infer ($t \ \$ \ t'$) := if infer $t = (A \Rightarrow B, t)$ and
infer $t' = (A', t')$ and $A = A'$ then ($B, t \ \$ \ t'$)

- ▶ So equality of Ty (and Tm) should be decidable.
- ▶ Implemented through normalisation.
- ▶ Implementations: Agda, Coq, Idris, Lean

Variants of the equality type

Ty : Set

Tm : Ty \rightarrow Set⁺

Eq : (A : Ty) \rightarrow Tm A \rightarrow Tm A \rightarrow Ty

Variants of the equality type

$\text{Ty} \quad : \text{Set}$

$\text{Tm} \quad : \text{Ty} \rightarrow \text{Set}^+$

$\text{Eq} \quad : (A : \text{Ty}) \rightarrow \text{Tm } A \rightarrow \text{Tm } A \rightarrow \text{Ty}$

$: (t = t') \cong \text{Tm} (\text{Eq}_A t t')$

Variants of the equality type

Ty : Set

Tm : $Ty \rightarrow Set^+$

Eq : $(A : Ty) \rightarrow Tm A \rightarrow Tm A \rightarrow Ty$

$: (t = t') \cong Tm (Eq_A t t')$

$refl$: $Tm (Eq_A t t)$

$transport$: $(P : Tm A \rightarrow Ty) \rightarrow Tm (Eq_A t t') \rightarrow Tm (P t) \rightarrow Tm (P t')$

β : $transport P refl u = u$

Variants of the equality type

Ty : Set

Tm : $Ty \rightarrow Set^+$

Eq : $(A : Ty) \rightarrow Tm A \rightarrow Tm A \rightarrow Ty$

$: (t = t') \cong Tm (Eq_A t t')$

$refl$: $Tm (Eq_A t t)$

$transport$: $(P : Tm A \rightarrow Ty) \rightarrow Tm (Eq_A t t') \rightarrow Tm (P t) \rightarrow Tm (P t')$

β : $transport P refl u = u$

$: Eq_A t t' = (f : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow A)$ such that $f \$ 0 = t$ and $f \$ 1 = t'$

Variants of the equality type

Ty : Set

Tm : Ty \rightarrow Set⁺

Eq : (A : Ty) \rightarrow Tm A \rightarrow Tm A \rightarrow Ty

: (t = t') \cong Tm (Eq_A t t')

refl : Tm (Eq_A t t)

transport : (P : Tm A \rightarrow Ty) \rightarrow Tm (Eq_A t t') \rightarrow Tm (P t) \rightarrow Tm (P t')

β : transport P refl u = u

: Eq_A t t' = (f : $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow$ A) such that f \$ 0 = t and f \$ 1 = t'

: Eq _{\mathbb{N}} zero zero = \top

: Eq _{\mathbb{N}} (suc t) (suc t') = Eq _{\mathbb{N}} t t'

: Eq_{A \Rightarrow B} t t' = Π (x : A).Eq_B (t \$ x) (t' \$ x)

: Eq_U A A' = Iso A A'

Difficulty: what are the rules for refl?

Summary

- ▶ A language with binders is a SOGAT
- ▶ Dependent types
- ▶ Lots of static information in type theory which ensures respecting isos
- ▶ Computer implementations
- ▶ What is a good type theory with univalence?