

Vectors are records, too!

Jesper Cockx¹ Gaëtan Gilbert²
Nicolas Tabareau² Matthieu Sozeau²

¹ Gothenburg University, Sweden

² INRIA, France

21 June 2018

TYPES' most popular example¹

```
data V (A : Set) : (n : ℕ) → Set where
  nil   : V A zero
  cons  : (m : ℕ)(x : A)(xs : V A m) → V A (suc m)
```

¹Disclaimer: I did not actually count all examples since 1990.

TYPES' most popular example¹

$$\forall : (A : \text{Set})(n : \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \text{Set}$$

$$\forall A \text{ zero} = \top$$

$$\forall A (\text{suc } n) = A \times \forall A n$$

¹Disclaimer: I did not actually count all examples since 1990.

TYPES' most popular example¹

```
data  $\mathbb{V}$  (A : Set) : (n :  $\mathbb{N}$ )  $\rightarrow$  Set where  
  nil   :  $\mathbb{V}$  A zero  
  cons  : (m :  $\mathbb{N}$ )(x : A)(xs :  $\mathbb{V}$  A m)  $\rightarrow$   $\mathbb{V}$  A (suc m)
```

vs.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{V} &: (A : \text{Set})(n : \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \text{Set} \\ \mathbb{V} A \text{ zero} &= \top \\ \mathbb{V} A (\text{suc } n) &= A \times \mathbb{V} A n\end{aligned}$$

¹Disclaimer: I did not actually count all examples since 1990.

Presenting...

A common representation of indexed datatypes and recursive types as **case-splitting datatypes**.

An elaboration algorithm to automatically transform an indexed datatype into a case-splitting datatype.

Inductive types vs. recursive types

Case-splitting datatypes

Elaborating indexed datatypes

Inductive types vs. recursive types

Case-splitting datatypes

Elaborating indexed datatypes

Inductive type

Recursive type

Inductive type I

- Intuitive notation

Recursive type

```
data V (A : Set) : (n : N) → Set where
  nil   : V A zero
  cons  : (m : N)(x : A)(xs : V A m) → V A (suc m)
```

Inductive type I

- Intuitive notation

Recursive type I

- Eta equality

$x : \forall A \text{ zero} \quad \vdash \quad x \equiv \text{tt}$

$x : \forall A (\text{suc } m) \quad \vdash \quad x \equiv (x . \pi_1, x . \pi_2)$

Inductive type II

- Intuitive notation
- Pattern matching

Recursive type I

- Eta equality

$\text{tail} : (m : \mathbb{N})(xs : \forall A (\text{suc } m)) \rightarrow \forall A m$

$\text{tail } m (\text{cons } [m] x xs) = xs$

Inductive type II

- Intuitive notation
- Pattern matching

Recursive type II

- Eta equality
- Forcing & detagging for free

`cons` : $(m : Nat)(x : A)(xs : \forall A m)$

$\rightarrow \forall A (\text{succ } m)$

`cons` $m \ x \ xs = (x, xs)$

Inductive type III

- Intuitive notation
- Pattern matching
- Structural recursion

Recursive type II

- Eta equality
- Forcing & detagging for free

Inductive type III

- Intuitive notation
- Pattern matching
- Structural recursion

Recursive type III

- Eta equality
- Forcing & detagging for free
- Large indices

$_ \leq _ : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Prop}$

$\text{zero} \leq n = \top$

$(\text{suc } m) \leq \text{zero} = \perp$

$(\text{suc } m) \leq (\text{suc } n) = m \leq n$

Inductive type III

- Intuitive notation
- Pattern matching
- Structural recursion
- Non-indexed / non-stratified types

Recursive type III

- Eta equality
- Forcing & detagging for free
- Large indices

$\mathbb{N} = \top \uplus \mathbb{N}$ is not a valid definition!

Inductive type IIII

- Intuitive notation
- Pattern matching
- Structural recursion
- Non-indexed / non-stratified types

Recursive type IIII

- Eta equality
- Forcing & detagging for free
- Large indices
- Non-positive types

data U : Set where

$_ \Rightarrow _ : U \rightarrow U \rightarrow U$

$\models : U \rightarrow \text{Set}$

$\models (t_1 \Rightarrow t_2) = \models t_1 \rightarrow \models t_2$

Inductive types vs. recursive types

Case-splitting datatypes

Elaborating indexed datatypes

**Indexed
datatype**

data $\forall A : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ **where**
...

**Recursive
type**

$\forall A$ **zero** = ...
 $\forall A$ (**suc** m) = ...

**Indexed
datatype**

data $\forall A : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ where
...

**Case-splitting
datatype**

$\forall A n = \text{case}_n \{ \dots \}$

**Recursive
type**

$\forall A \text{ zero} = \dots$
 $\forall A (\text{suc } m) = \dots$

**Indexed
datatype**



**Case-splitting
datatype**



**Recursive
type**

data $\forall A : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ where
...

$\forall A \ n = \text{case}_n \{ \dots \}$

$\forall A \ \text{zero} = \dots$

$\forall A \ (\text{suc } m) = \dots$

**Indexed
datatype**



**Case-splitting
datatype**



**Recursive
type**

data $\forall A : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ where
...

$\forall A \ n = \text{case}_n \{ \dots \}$

$\forall A \ \text{zero} = \dots$

$\forall A \ (\text{suc } m) = \dots$

General syntax for case-splitting datatypes

$$Q ::= c_1 \Delta_1 \mid \dots \mid c_k \Delta_k \\ \mid \text{case}_x \left\{ \begin{array}{l} c_1 \hat{\Delta}_1 \mapsto^{\tau_1} Q_1 \\ \vdots \\ c_n \hat{\Delta}_n \mapsto^{\tau_n} Q_n \end{array} \right\}$$

Case tree for $\forall A n$

$$\text{case}_n \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{zero} \mapsto \text{nil} \\ \text{suc } m \mapsto \text{cons } (x : A)(xs : \forall A m) \end{array} \right\}$$

Case tree for $m \leq n$

$$\text{case}_m \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{zero} \mapsto \text{lz} \\ \text{suc } m' \mapsto \text{case}_n \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{zero} \mapsto \\ \text{suc } n' \mapsto \text{ls } (p : m' \leq n') \end{array} \right\} \end{array} \right\}$$

From case tree to a datatype:

Ignore case splits;

gather all constructors in a flat list.

From case tree to a recursive definition:

Translate case splits with tools from

'eliminating dependent pattern matching'.

Inductive types vs. recursive types

Case-splitting datatypes

Elaborating indexed datatypes

Problem:

We don't want to write case trees, we want to write datatypes!

Problem:

We don't want to write case trees, we want to write datatypes!

Solution:

Elaborate datatypes to case trees automatically.

State of elaborating a datatype

$$\Delta \vdash \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{c}_1 \ \Delta_1 \ [\Phi_1] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{c}_k \ \Delta_k \ [\Phi_k] \end{array} \right\}$$

- Δ is 'outer' telescope of datatype indices
- $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k$ are the constructor names
- Δ_i is 'inner' telescope of arguments of \mathbf{c}_i
- Φ_i is a set of constraints $\{v_j \ /? \ p_j\}$

Initial elaboration state

$(A : \text{Set})(n : \mathbb{N}) \vdash$

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{nil} \\ \text{cons } (m : \mathbb{N})(x : A)(xs : \mathbb{V} A m) \end{array} \begin{array}{l} [\text{zero} /? n] \\ [\text{suc } m /? n] \end{array} \right\}$

Elaboration step: case split on index

$(A : \text{Set})(n : \mathbb{N}) \vdash$

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{nil} \\ \text{cons } (m : \mathbb{N})(x : A)(xs : \forall A m) \end{array} \begin{array}{l} [\text{zero} /? n] \\ [\text{suc } m /? n] \end{array} \right\}$



$(A : \text{Set}) \vdash \left\{ \text{nil } [\text{zero} /? \text{zero}] \right\}$

$(A : \text{Set})(n' : \mathbb{N}) \vdash$

$\left\{ \text{cons } (m : \mathbb{N})(x : A)(xs : \forall A m) \text{ } [\text{suc } m /? \text{suc } n'] \right\}$

Elaboration step: solve constraint

$(A : \text{Set})(n : \mathbb{N}) \vdash$

$\{ \text{cons } (m : \mathbb{N})(x : A)(xs : \forall A m) [\text{suc } m /? \text{suc } n'] \}$



$(A : \text{Set})(n : \mathbb{N}) \vdash \{ \text{cons } (x : A)(xs : \forall A n') \}$

Elaboration step: finish splitting

$(A : \text{Set})(n : \mathbb{N}) \vdash$

$\{ \text{cons } (m : \mathbb{N})(x : A)(xs : \forall A m) [\text{suc } m /? \text{suc } n'] \}$



$(A : \text{Set})(n : \mathbb{N}) \vdash \{ \text{cons } (x : A)(xs : \forall A n') \}$



$\text{cons } (x : A)(xs : \forall A n')$

Elaboration step: introduce equality proof

$$(A\ B : \text{Set})(f : A \rightarrow B)(y : B) \vdash \{ \text{image } (x : A) [f\ x\ /\? y] \}$$

$$(A\ B : \text{Set})(f : A \rightarrow B)(y : B) \vdash \{ \text{image } (x : A) (e : f\ x \equiv_B y) \}$$

Ongoing & future work

- Implement translation in Coq (WIP)
- Generate constructors & eliminator
- Generate case trees for Agda datatypes
- User syntax to control splitting?

Conclusion

Datatypes have long been denied features of record types such as η -equality.

Conclusion

Datatypes have long been denied features of record types such as η -equality.

We can *automatically* transform a datatype into an equivalent definition with η -laws.

Conclusion

Datatypes have long been denied features of record types such as η -equality.

We can *automatically* transform a datatype into an equivalent definition with η -laws.

Now you can both have the cake and eat it: vectors are records, too!