

Binary parametricity in Rocq

The case of record types

Vojtěch Štěpančík

Outline

1 Motivation

2 Parametricity

3 Implementation

4 Conclusion

Motivation

- Automation for large libraries of mathematics

Motivation

- Automation for large libraries of mathematics
- Codegen for types of morphisms

Motivation

- Automation for large libraries of mathematics
- Codegen for types of morphisms

Turn

Record Monoid A

```
:= {  
  e : A;  
  * : A → A → A;  
  // axioms  
}.
```

Motivation

- Automation for large libraries of mathematics
- Codegen for types of morphisms

Turn

into

Record Monoid A

:= {

 e : A;

 * : A → A → A;

 // axioms

}.

Record MonoidHom M M' (f : M → M')

:= {

 eR : $\forall a, f\ M.e = M'.e;$

 mR : $\forall a\ b,$

 f (a M.* b) = (f a) M'.* (f b);

}.

Motivation

- Automation for large libraries of mathematics
- Codegen for types of morphisms

Turn

into

Record Monoid A

Record MonoidHom M M' (f : M → M')

:= {

:= {

e : A;

eR : $\forall a, f\ M.e = M'.e;$

* : A → A → A;

mR : $\forall a\ b,$

// axioms

f (a M.* b) = (f a) M'.* (f b);

}.
}

}.
}

- Maximal generality — parametricity translation

1 Motivation

2 Parametricity

3 Implementation

4 Conclusion

Parametricity translation

- Traditionally: take one interpretation, derive a relational interpretation

Parametricity translation

- Traditionally: take one interpretation, derive a relational interpretation
- With dependent types, relations are in the language:
 $\text{Rel } A \ B := (A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \mathcal{U})$

Parametricity translation

- Traditionally: take one interpretation, derive a relational interpretation
- With dependent types, relations are in the language:
 $\text{Rel } A \ B := (A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \mathcal{U})$
- Parametricity as syntactic translation/metaprogram $\llbracket - \rrbracket$

Parametricity translation

- Traditionally: take one interpretation, derive a relational interpretation
- With dependent types, relations are in the language:
 $\text{Rel } A \ B := (A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \mathcal{U})$
- Parametricity as syntactic translation/metaprogram $\llbracket - \rrbracket$
- Types translated to relations on their elements, e.g.

$$\llbracket \mathcal{U} \rrbracket := \lambda A \ B \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \mathcal{U})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Pi(x : A). P \ x \rrbracket &:= \lambda f \ f' \rightarrow \Pi(a : A)(a' : A'). \\ &\quad \Pi(aR : \llbracket A \rrbracket \ a \ a'). \llbracket P \rrbracket \ (f \ a) \ (f' \ a') \end{aligned}$$

Parametricity translation

- Traditionally: take one interpretation, derive a relational interpretation
- With dependent types, relations are in the language:
 $\text{Rel } A \ B := (A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \mathcal{U})$
- Parametricity as syntactic translation/metaprogram $\llbracket - \rrbracket$
- Types translated to relations on their elements, e.g.

$$\llbracket \mathcal{U} \rrbracket := \lambda A \ B \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \mathcal{U})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Pi(x : A). P \ x \rrbracket &:= \lambda f \ f' \rightarrow \Pi(a : A)(a' : A'). \\ &\quad \Pi(aR : \llbracket A \rrbracket \ a \ a'). \ \llbracket P \rrbracket \ (f \ a) \ (f' \ a') \end{aligned}$$

- Elements translated to witnesses of these relations:

$$\Gamma \vdash a : A \quad \Rightarrow \quad \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket a \rrbracket : \llbracket A \rrbracket \ t \ t'$$

Record types

- Idea: Type formers $K : \Pi(A : \mathcal{U}). \mathcal{U}$ translated to $\Pi(A \ A' : \mathcal{U})(AR : A \rightarrow A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}). K \ A \rightarrow K \ A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$

Record types

- Idea: Type formers $K : \Pi(A : \mathcal{U}). \mathcal{U}$ translated to $\Pi(A A' : \mathcal{U})(AR : A \rightarrow A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}). K A \rightarrow K A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$
- Instantiate $AR\ a\ a' := (f\ a = a')$ for some $f : A \rightarrow A'$

Record types

- Idea: Type formers $K : \Pi(A : \mathcal{U}). \mathcal{U}$ translated to $\Pi(A \ A' : \mathcal{U})(AR : A \rightarrow A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}). K \ A \rightarrow K \ A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$
- Instantiate $AR \ a \ a' := (f \ a = a')$ for some $f : A \rightarrow A'$
- Records are second-class, treated as inductives

Record types

- Idea: Type formers $K : \Pi(A : \mathcal{U}). \mathcal{U}$ translated to $\Pi(A A' : \mathcal{U})(AR : A \rightarrow A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}). K A \rightarrow K A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$
- Instantiate AR $a a' := (f a = a')$ for some $f : A \rightarrow A'$
- Records are second-class, treated as inductives

Record Monoid A

```
:= {  
  e : A;  
  * : A → A → A;  
}.
```

Record types

- Idea: Type formers $K : \Pi(A : \mathcal{U}). \mathcal{U}$ translated to $\Pi(A A' : \mathcal{U})(AR : A \rightarrow A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}). K A \rightarrow K A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$
- Instantiate $AR\ a\ a' := (f\ a = a')$ for some $f : A \rightarrow A'$
- Records are second-class, treated as inductives

Record Monoid A

```
:= {  
  e : A;  
  * : A → A → A;  
}.
```

Inductive Monoid A : Set :=

```
| build :  
  A →  
  (A → A → A) →  
  Monoid A.
```

Record types

- Idea: Type formers $K : \Pi(A : \mathcal{U}). \mathcal{U}$ translated to $\Pi(A A' : \mathcal{U})(AR : A \rightarrow A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}). K A \rightarrow K A' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$
- Instantiate $AR\ a\ a' := (f\ a = a')$ for some $f : A \rightarrow A'$
- Records are second-class, treated as inductives

Record Monoid A

```
:= {
  e : A;
  * : A → A → A;
}.
```

Inductive Monoid A : Set :=

```
| build :
  A →
  (A → A → A) →
  Monoid A.
```

Inductive MonoidR A A' AR : Monoid A → Monoid A' → Set :=

```
| buildR : ∀ e e' (eR : AR e e') * *' (*R : ...),
  MonoidR (build e *) (build e' *')
```

Record types

```
Inductive MonoidR A A' AR : Monoid A → Monoid A' → Set :=  
| buildR : ∀ e e' (eR : AR e e') * *' (*R : ...),  
    MonoidR (build e *) (build e' *')
```

- MonoidR is indexed, no corresponding record!

Record types

```
Inductive MonoidR A A' AR : Monoid A → Monoid A' → Set :=  
| buildR : ∀ e e' (eR : AR e e') * *' (*R : ...),  
    MonoidR (build e *) (build e' *')
```

- MonoidR is indexed, no corresponding record!
- Bespoke treatment needed

1 Motivation

2 Parametricity

3 Implementation

4 Conclusion

rocq-elpi

- "Embeddable λ Prolog Interpreter" — Prolog with first-class functions

rocq-elpi

- "Embeddable λ Prolog Interpreter" — Prolog with first-class functions
- Nice HOAS API for Rocq

rocq-elpi

- "Embeddable λ Prolog Interpreter" — Prolog with first-class functions
- Nice HOAS API for Rocq
- Contains a base implementation of binary parametricity

rocq-elpi

- "Embeddable λ Prolog Interpreter" — Prolog with first-class functions
- Nice HOAS API for Rocq
- Contains a base implementation of binary parametricity
- Naïve implementation "works"

rocq-elpi

- "Embeddable λ Prolog Interpreter" — Prolog with first-class functions
- Nice HOAS API for Rocq
- Contains a base implementation of binary parametricity
- Naïve implementation "works"

```

pred param-record-decl i:record-decl, i:string, i:list (option constant),
  i:list term, i:list term, i:term, i:term, o:record-decl.
param-record-decl end-record _ _ _ _ _ end-record.
param-record-decl (field Attrs Id Ty Rest) Suffix [some Proj|Projs]
  RevParams1 RevParams2 X X' (field Attrs IdR TyRsubst RestR) :-
  IdR is (Id ^ Suffix),
  param Ty _Ty' TyR,
  coq.mk-app [global (const Proj)] {std.rev [X|RevParams1]} Proj1,
  coq.mk-app [global (const Proj)] {std.rev [X'|RevParams2]} Proj2,
  coq.subst-fun [Proj1, Proj2] TyR TyRsubst,
  @pi-parameter IdR TyRsubst fld\
    param Proj1 Proj2 fld =>
    param-record-decl (Rest Proj1) Suffix Projs RevParams1 RevParams2 X X' (RestR fld).

```

Problem

■ Naïve implementation "works"

```
Record MonoidR A A' AR (M : Monoid A) (M' : Monoid A')
  := {
    eR : AR M.e M'.e;
    *R : ∀ a a' (aR : AR a a') b b' (bR : AR b b'),
        AR (M.* a b) (M'.* a' b');
  }.
```

Problem

■ Naïve implementation "works"

```
Record MonoidR A A' AR (M : Monoid A) (M' : Monoid A')
:= {
  eR : AR M.e M'.e;
  *R : ∀ a a' (aR : AR a a') b b' (bR : AR b b'),
      AR (M.* a b) (M'.* a' b');
}.
```

■ "Constructors relate constructors" doesn't work, wrong types:

$$\llbracket \Pi(A : \mathcal{U}). A \rightarrow (A \rightarrow A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow \text{Monoid } A \rrbracket :=$$

$$\Pi(A A' AR e e' eR * *' *R).$$

$$\text{MonoidR } A A' AR (e, *) (e', *')$$

$$\neq \Pi(A A' AR M M' eR *R). \text{MonoidR } A A' AR M M'$$

Problem

- Naïve implementation "works"

```
Record MonoidR A A' AR (M : Monoid A) (M' : Monoid A')
:= {
  eR : AR M.e M'.e;
  *R : ∀ a a' (aR : AR a a') b b' (bR : AR b b'),
      AR (M.* a b) (M'.* a' b');
}.
```

- "Constructors relate constructors" doesn't work, wrong types:

```
[[Π(A :  $\mathcal{U}$ ). A → (A → A → A) → Monoid A]] :=
Π(A A' AR e e' eR * *' *R).
MonoidR A A' AR (e, *) (e', *')
≠ Π(A A' AR M M' eR *R). MonoidR A A' AR M M'
```

- Fixed with a "compatibility constructor"

1 Motivation

2 Parametricity

3 Implementation

4 Conclusion

Conclusion

- Supported translations:
 - Simple cases like Monoid
 - Dependent fields
 - Primitive projections
- Next steps
 - Annotations à la Trocq
 - Removing irrelevant fields
 - Upstreaming