On the Algebraic Definition of Programming Languages

Ambrus Kaposi¹

¹Eötvös Loránd University

8 May 2020, online





Software crisis

Complex systems, many bugs.

How do we improve existing software?

Develop tools to

- ► test code (Attila Kovács)
- ► analyse code (Melinda Tóth, István Bozó)
- ▶ refactor code in a correct way (Dániel Horpácsi)



Software crisis

Complex systems, many bugs.

How do we improve future software?

Develop new programming languages

- ▶ it should be easy to write correct code
- ► hard to write incorrect code



Why do we need different programming languages?

Programming languages are the same:

- ► They are just different ways to express CPU instructions.
- ► They are all Turing-complete.



Why do we need different programming languages?

Programming languages are the same:

- ► They are just different ways to express CPU instructions.
- ► They are all Turing-complete.

They are not the same:

- ▶ If the language suits the problem, we can express the solution **directly**.
- ▶ If not, we need to **encode** the solution.



Programming is the process of encoding

Domain specific languages:

- ► HTML for hypertext
- ▶ P4 for programming switches (Sándor Laki)
- ► Erlang for programming mobile networks, distributed systems
- ► Alan Kay's example:
 - ▶ operating system with GUI, web browser, spreadsheet, word processor
 - all in 20thousand lines of code



Difficulties of creating new languages

Design the language such that it is sound

- Prove its properties
- Implementation, lots of technical details
 - ► Improvements recently, e.g. LLVM
- Interface to other languages

People usually don't bother: instead, they follow the hammer principle.



What is a domain specific language for describing languages?

This is our research project.

What is a language?

A language is a collection of programs.







PROGRAM FINANCED FROM THE NRDI FUND

(1) number







(5) well typed syntax type checking (4) syntax tree with bindings scope checking () pick variable names (3) syntax tree parsing () print (2) string decode () encode (1) number





(5) well typed syntax type checking ((4) syntax tree with bindings scope checking () pick variable names (3) syntax tree parsing () print (2) string decode () encode (1) number





(5) well typed syntax type checking ((4) syntax tree with bindings scope checking () pick variable names (3) syntax tree parsing () print (2) string decode () encode (1) number





(5) well typed syntax type checking ((4) syntax tree with bindings scope checking () pick variable names (3) syntax tree parsing () print (2) string decode () encode (1) number







(6) well typed syntax quotiented

normalise (5) well typed syntax type checking () (4) syntax tree with bindings scope checking () pick variable names (3) syntax tree parsing () print (2) string decode () encode (1) number

NATIONAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION OFFICE HUNGARY

PROGRAM FINANCED FROM THE NRDI FUND

1 + 2 = 3



A language is a collection of:



Mathematicians call this a **generalised algebraic structure**, programmers call it a **quotient inductive-inductive type**.



Results

- We created the first programming language which supports quotient inductive-inductive types (QIIT).
 - ► It is based on Martin-Löf's type theory and we call it setoid type theory.
 - Syntax (as a QIIT) and constructive semantics.
 - ► A prototype implementation in Haskell.
- ► We developed the metatheory of QIITs.
 - ► A concrete description.
 - We proved their consistency, constructive semantics.
- We developed techniques to formalise metatheoretic results in existing languages based on type theory.



Further goals

- ► Theoretical: show decidability of type checking for setoid type theory
- ► Theoretical: reduction of QIITs to basic combinators
- Practical: industrial strength implementation
- ▶ Practical: implement existing programming languages as QIITs
- Long term: implement setoid type theory in itself



Team and collaborators



Summary

- ► A good programming language admits direct representations of the domain
- Programming languages are usually encoded instead of directly represented
- Our hypothesis: the reason for this is that there is no programming language supporting QIITs
- ► We are developing such a language: the theoretical foundations are mostly done
- ► We would like to develop a practical implementation









References

- Yoshiki Ohshima, Ted Kaehler Dan Amelang, Bert Freudenberg, Aran Lunzer, Ian Piumarta Alan Kay, Takashi Yamamiya, Hesam Samimi Alan Borning, Bret Victor, and Kim Rose, Steps toward the reinvention of programming, 2012 final report. Submitted to the National Science Foundation (NSF).
- Thorsten Altenkirch and Ambrus Kaposi. 2016. Type theory in type theory using quotient inductive types. SIGPLAN Not. 51, 1 (January 2016), 18–29.
- Ambrus Kaposi, András Kovács, and Thorsten Altenkirch. 2019. Constructing quotient inductive-inductive types. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. 3, POPL, Article 2 (January 2019), 24 pages.
- Altenkirch T., Boulier S., Kaposi A., Tabareau N. (2019) Setoid Type Theory—A Syntactic Translation. In: Hutton G. (eds) Mathematics of Program Construction. MPC 2019. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 11825. Springer, Cham
- András Kovács, Ambrus Kaposi. Large and Infinitary Quotient Inductive-Inductive Types. Thirty-Fifth Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS). 8–11 July 2020
- Ambrus Kaposi, Jakob von Raumer. A Syntax for Mutual Inductive Families. To appear at the 5th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction (FSCD 2020). June 29–July 6, 2020
- Ambrus Kaposi, András Kovács and Ambroise Lafont. For induction-induction, induction is enough with. Submitted to TYPES 2019 post-proceedings