

Parametricity

Neil Ghani

and F.Forsberg, T.Revell, F.Orsanigo, R.Atkey

MSP group, The Scottish Free State

More people should know more about Parametricity!

- **Philosophy:** The world is more uniform than set-theorists think!
 - cf continuity, homotopy theory, category theory, symmetry
- **Categorically:** The correct approach to contravariance
 - Much better than (strong)-dinaturality
- **Logically:** A sophisticated principle of invariance
 - Excitingly applicable over natural and social sciences
- **Programming:** A theory of refinement
 - Rippling changes to a component though a system

So, how do I use Parametricity to make a fortune?

- **Step 1:** Take a type theory
 - Traditionally System F, but MLTT more so recently.
- **Step 2:** Give a relational interpretation of type theory
 - This exposes structural invariants within type theory
- **Step 3:** Use invariants/uniformities to prove properties
 - Theorems for free, (Di)-Naturality, Initial algebras etc.

Overview of this Course

- **Lecture 1:** Basic Parametricity
 - A concrete model using sets and relations
- **Lecture 2:** Fibrational Parametricity
 - An abstract model based upon fibrations
- **Lecture 3:** Cubical Parametricity
 - From proof-irrelevance, to proof-relevance and on!
- **Lecture 4:** MLTT-Parametricity
 - Parametricity and Dependent Types

Lecture 1: Parametricity via Sets and Relations

System F:

- **Thesis:** The world is more uniform than set-theorists think
 - It contains structural constraints (continuity, symmetry ...)
 - In logic and type theory, there is parametricity
- **Polymorphism:** A type constructor $\forall a:\text{Type}. Ta.$
 - Size \Rightarrow work with an intuitionistic meta-theory
 - We can't look at all types so there must be some uniformity.
 - Eg, how many functions $\forall a.a \rightarrow a$
 - Contrast ad-hoc polymorphism/parametric polymorphism

Motivation 1: Programming Languages

- **Free Theorems:** Parametricity shows that any function

$$\text{rev} : \forall a. \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{List } a$$

satisfies the algebraic equation

$$\text{rev}(\text{map } f \text{ } xs) = \text{map } f (\text{rev } xs)$$

- **Refinement:** Assume a system $T[X]$ containing a component X .
 - Assume related implementations X_1 and X_2 of X .
 - Are the systems $T[X_1]$ and $T[X_2]$ related?

Motivation 2: Type Theory

- **Data Types:** Parametricity ensures System F has products, sums, initial algebras (cf Church encodings), second order existentials and final coalgebras

$$A \times B = \forall X.(A \rightarrow B \rightarrow X) \rightarrow X$$

$$A + B = \forall X.(A \rightarrow X) \rightarrow (B \rightarrow X) \rightarrow X$$

$$\mu F = \forall X.(FX \rightarrow X) \rightarrow X$$

$$\exists X.T = \forall X.(\forall Y.TY \rightarrow X) \rightarrow X$$

$$\nu F = \exists X.X \times (X \rightarrow FX)$$

- **Type Isomorphisms:** Parametricity can be used to isomorphisms such as

$$\forall X.A[X, C \times X] \cong \forall X.A[C \rightarrow X, X]$$

Motivation 3: Category Theory

- **Naturality:** All elements α of $\forall X. FX \rightarrow GX$ are natural

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FX & \xrightarrow{Ff} & FY \\ \alpha X \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha Y \\ GX & \xrightarrow{Gf} & GY \end{array}$$

- **Mixed Variance?** What about $ev :: \forall X. \forall Y. (X \rightarrow Y) \times X \rightarrow Y$
 - Dinaturals and strong dinaturals don't behave well

- **Key Idea:** Parametricity intuitively offers

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FX & \xrightarrow{FR} & FY \\ \alpha X \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha Y \\ GX & \xrightarrow{GR} & GY \end{array}$$

1.1 Syntax of System F

System F

- **Key Idea:** Formalise types via judgements $\Gamma \vdash T : \text{Type}$
 - Variables: $X_1, \dots, X_n \vdash X_i : \text{Type}$
 - Functions: If $\Gamma \vdash U, V : \text{Type}$, then $\Gamma \vdash U \rightarrow V : \text{Type}$
 - Forall Types: If $\Gamma, X \vdash T : \text{Type}$, then $\Gamma \vdash \forall X.T : \text{Type}$
 - Judgements for defining terms: $\Gamma, \Delta \vdash t : T$ where we ensure $\Gamma \vdash T : \text{Type}$ and $(x_i : T_i) \in \Delta \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash T_i : \text{Type}$
- **John Reynolds:** Gave not one, but two semantics called logical relations of the following form. Let Set be a universe of sets.

$$\llbracket T \rrbracket_0 \in \text{Set}^{|\Gamma|} \rightarrow \text{Set}$$

$$\llbracket T \rrbracket_1 \in \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \text{Set}^{|\Gamma|}.$$

$$\text{Rel}^{|\Gamma|}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \rightarrow \text{Rel}(\llbracket T \rrbracket_0 \theta_1, \llbracket T \rrbracket_0 \theta_2)$$

Core Definitions of the Logical Relation

- **Variables:** Pretty Obvious

$$\llbracket X_1, \dots, X_n \vdash X_i \rrbracket_0 \theta = \theta_i$$

$$\llbracket X_1, \dots, X_n \vdash X_i \rrbracket_1 r = r_i$$

- **Arrow Types:** If $\Gamma \vdash U \rightarrow V : \text{Type}$

$$\llbracket \Gamma \vdash U \rightarrow V \rrbracket_0 \theta = \llbracket \Gamma \vdash U \rrbracket_0 \theta \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \vdash V \rrbracket_0 \theta$$

$$(f, g) \in \llbracket \Gamma \vdash U \rightarrow V \rrbracket_1 r \text{ iff } (a, b) \in \llbracket \Gamma \vdash U \rrbracket_1 r \Rightarrow \\ (fa, gb) \in \llbracket \Gamma \vdash V \rrbracket_1 r$$

- **Key Idea:** Reynolds relational semantics allows us to say
 - related functions map related inputs to related outputs

The Logical Relation for \forall -types: If $\Gamma \vdash \forall X.T : \text{Type}$, then ...

- **Forall Types I:** $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \forall X.T \rrbracket_0 \theta$ is the set

$$\{f : (S : \text{Set}) \rightarrow \llbracket T \rrbracket_0(\theta, S) \mid R \in \text{Rel}(A, B) \Rightarrow (fA, fB) \in \llbracket T \rrbracket_1(\text{Eq}\theta, R)\}$$

- Parametrically polymorphic functions are ad-hoc functions with a uniformity
- They map related types (inputs) to related values (outputs)

- **Forall Types II:** $(f, g) \in \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \forall X.T \rrbracket_1 r$ iff

$$R : \text{Rel}(A, B) \Rightarrow (fA, gB) \in \llbracket \Gamma \vdash T \rrbracket_1(r, R)$$

- two parametrically polymorphic functions are related iff
- they map related inputs to related outputs.

Finally, Properties of the Logical Relation

- **Identity Extension Lemma:** A lemma about types

$$\llbracket \Gamma \vdash T \rrbracket_1(\text{Eq}\theta) = \text{Eq}(\llbracket \Gamma \vdash T \rrbracket_0\theta)$$

Equality relations mapped to equality relations

- **Fundamental Theorem:** First give a standard semantics to terms. If $\Gamma, \Delta \vdash t : T$, then

$$\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta \vdash t : T \rrbracket_0 : (\theta : \text{Set}^{|\Gamma|}) \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \Delta \rrbracket_0\theta \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \vdash T \rrbracket_0\theta$$

and then prove that

- if $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \text{Set}^{|\Gamma|}$ and $r \in \text{Rel}^{|\Gamma|}(\theta_1, \theta_2)$, and if
- $a_1 \in \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \Delta \rrbracket_0\theta_1$ and $a_2 \in \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \Delta \rrbracket_0\theta_2$ then
- $(a_1, a_2) \in \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \Delta \rrbracket_1r \Rightarrow (\llbracket t \rrbracket_0\theta_1 a_1, \llbracket t \rrbracket_0\theta_2 a_2) \in \llbracket \Gamma \vdash T \rrbracket_1r$

Terms map related inputs to related outputs

Graph Lemma and Proofs

- **Theorem:** If F is positive and f is a morphism, then

$$\text{gr}(\llbracket F \rrbracket_0 f) = \llbracket F \rrbracket_1(\text{gr } f)$$

- **Theorem:** $\forall X. X \rightarrow X = 1$

– Proof:

- **Theorem:** All elements of $\forall X. FX \rightarrow GX$ are natural

– Proof:

- **Key Idea:** Use IEL and interesting graph relations!

Lecture 2: Fibrational Parametricity

Motivations

- **Question:** Who likes Type Theory?
 - Well, it has some uses as we have seen
 - But as formulae grow, they get hard to manipulate
 - And, more advanced systems and notions of relation?
- **Goal:** Categorify to understand and generalise
 - A respectful categorical abstraction of what the above constructions actually amount to
 - Lets abstract them so they can be generalised to other calculi
 - And lets have some diagrams!

Who's Afraid of Fibrations

- **Defn:** A categorical abstraction of a domain of computation and a logic over it. For us, Set and Rel
 - A category B , called the base and a category E , called the total category. A functor $p : E \rightarrow B$ mapping each logical formula to the object it is a property of.
 - Define E_B to be those objects of E mapped by p to B
 - Every $f : B \rightarrow B'$ defines a functor $f^* : E_{B'} \rightarrow E_B$
- **Added Structure:** Truth and opreindexing
 - Truth: Each fibre has a terminal object \top_B
 - Opreindexing: Each $f : B \rightarrow B'$ is such that f^* has a left adjoint Σ_f

A Fibrational Semantics of Types

- **Fibrations:** Define some categories

- Set is the category of small sets and functions. Rel has as objects binary relations and as morphisms, pairs of functions between the carriers of the relations preserving relatedness. $p : \text{Rel} \rightarrow \text{Set} \times \text{Set}$ maps $R : \text{Rel}(X, Y)$ to (X, Y) .

- **Semantics of Types:** If $\Gamma \vdash T : \text{Type}$, and $n = |\Gamma|$, then

$$\begin{array}{ccc} |\text{Rel}|^n & \xrightarrow{\llbracket T \rrbracket_1} & \text{Rel} \\ \downarrow |p|^n & & \downarrow p \\ |\text{Set}|^n \times |\text{Set}|^n & \xrightarrow{\llbracket T \rrbracket_0 \times \llbracket T \rrbracket_0} & \text{Set} \times \text{Set} \end{array}$$

- **Key Idea:** No action of type semantics on morphisms!!! And can generalise to all fibrations!

Identity Extension Lemma

- **Definition:** Equality defines a functor $\text{Eq} : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Rel}$
- **Identity Extension Lemma:** Simply ...

$$\begin{array}{ccc} |\text{Rel}|^n & \xrightarrow{\llbracket T \rrbracket_1} & \text{Rel} \\ \uparrow \text{Eq}^n & & \uparrow \text{Eq} \\ |\text{Set}|^n & \xrightarrow{\llbracket T \rrbracket_0} & \text{Set} \end{array}$$

- **Why Fibrations:** Equality can be defined in any bifibration with fibred terminal objects

$$\text{Eq}X = \Sigma_{\delta: X \rightarrow X \times X} \top X$$

Can We Axiomatise the Logical Relations

- **Arrow Types:** The logical relation $R \rightarrow R'$ is simply the exponential in Rel.
 - Logical relations are not ad-hoc but fundamental structure
- **\forall -types:** Strengthen notion of cone to remove non-parametric elements
 - A T -cone with vertex X is a collection of maps $X \rightarrow \llbracket T \rrbracket_0 Y$ for every Y . Terminal such are the ad-hoc polymorphic functions.
 - An T -eqcone with vertex X is a collection of maps $\alpha_Y : X \rightarrow \llbracket T \rrbracket_0 Y$ for every Y , and for every $R : \text{Rel}(X, Y)$, a map $\alpha_R : \text{Eq}X \rightarrow \llbracket T \rrbracket_1 R$ over (α_X, α_Y)
 - The parametric elements are those in the terminal T -eqcone

Fundamental Theorem of Logical Relations, Fibrationally

- **Recall:** The standard interpretation of a term $\Gamma, \Delta \vdash t : T$ is a function

$$\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta \vdash t : T \rrbracket_0 : (\theta : \text{Set}^{|\Gamma|}) \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \Delta \rrbracket_0 \theta \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \vdash T \rrbracket_0 \theta$$

or, categorically:

$$\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta \vdash t : T \rrbracket_0 : \text{Nat } \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \Delta \rrbracket_0 \llbracket \Gamma \vdash T \rrbracket_0$$

- **Question:** But what about the fundamental theorem ... its just a natural transformation

$$\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta \vdash t : T \rrbracket_1 : \text{Nat } \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \Delta \rrbracket_1 \llbracket \Gamma \vdash T \rrbracket_1$$

over $\llbracket \Gamma, \Delta \vdash t : T \rrbracket_0 \times \llbracket \Gamma, \Delta \vdash t : T \rrbracket_0$

- **Key Idea:** Types and terms are not interpreted as functors and natural transformations, but fibred functors and fibred natural transformations

Graph Functors

- **Recall:** Reynolds solved the contravariance problem by ditching the action on morphisms. Surely cheating!
 - But every function $f : A \rightarrow B$ defines a graph $grf : RelAB$
 - Reynolds key insight: replace the action of $[[T]]_0$ on f with an action of $[[T]]_1$ on grf
- **Fibrationally:** Define $gr : Set^{\rightarrow} \rightarrow Rel$ by
 - $grf = (f, id_B)^*EqB$, or
 - $grf = \Sigma_{(id_A, f)}EqA$.
 - Equivalent with BC.

Why Bifibrations

- **Graph Lemma:** We need both directions of the graph lemma
 - Reindexing gives $\llbracket F \rrbracket_1(\text{gr} f) \rightarrow \text{gr}(\llbracket F \rrbracket_0 f)$
 - Opreindexing gives $\text{gr}(\llbracket F \rrbracket_0 f) \rightarrow \llbracket F \rrbracket_1(\text{gr} f)$
- **Theorem:** $\text{gr} : \text{Set}^{\rightarrow} \rightarrow \text{Rel}$ is full and faithful when Eq is.
 - So not only do we trade morphisms in the base for objects in the total category, but ...
 - ... we trade commuting squares in the base of morphisms in the total category

Conclusions

- **Related work:** Hermida kicked off fibrational parametricity
 - Birkedal, Mogelberg, Simpson, Dunphy/Reddy
 - Us: bifibrations for the graph lemma, universal characterisation of parametric elements.
- **Future:** Clean enough to travel many directions including
 - Higher Dimensional Parametricity and intensional MLTT
 - Parametricity for Symmetry
 - Parametricity in the Natural Sciences