Lucas E. Morales MIT Computational Cognitive Science

Learning as Program Induction, CogSci 2018

Purpose:

• Learning programs ("child coder") is **more** than writing procedural code.

Spoken: First, there is more to learning programs than writing procedural code. We will discuss a more abstract, purely-relational aspect to programming.

Purpose:

- Learning programs ("child coder") is **more** than writing procedural code.
- Use type systems to express meaning, à la conceptual role semantics.

Spoken: We will discuss *types*, which give *meaning* to procedures at a more abstract level than concrete code.

Purpose:

- Learning programs ("child coder") is **more** than writing procedural code.
- Use type systems to express meaning, à la conceptual role semantics.
- Type systems provide a good representation for a computational study of **concept learning**.

Spoken: We will see the ways concept learning manifests in a type system.

Purpose:

- Learning programs ("child coder") is **more** than writing procedural code.
- Use type systems to express meaning, à la conceptual role semantics.
- Type systems provide a good representation for a computational study of **concept learning**.

Note:

• Technical details « key ideas.

Spoken: There will be technical details that should not discourage you. We are presenting a *formal framework* for concept representation, so there is mathematical content that is *not essential* for high-level understanding. We will look at code, but I will accompany code with natural description of the idea being demonstrated.



Spoken: Suppose we have balls of various sizes. You can..



Spoken: ...sort them, like this:



Spoken: You could also sort:



Spoken: sized boxes, or

Sort



Spoken: shaded boxes. What does it mean to learn sorting, as a program? It could be learning concrete code, *or* it could be learning the abstract definition: a program spec.

"It takes a set of things which are orderable, and gives a sequence of those things in order."

Spoken: In words, we might say that it {takes a set of things} {which are orderable} and {gives a sequence of those things} {in order}. We don't communicate "sort" by giving an algorithm, but by the defining the *type* of procedure.

"It takes a set of things which are orderable, and gives a sequence of those things in order."



Spoken: This can be expressed by type declaration, which we'll try to make more sense of it later. But for now believe me that:

"It takes a set of things which are orderable, and gives a sequence of those things in order."



• This completely defines sorting.

"It takes a set of things which are orderable, and gives a sequence of those things in order."



- This completely defines sorting.
- It does not matter what we are sorting, as long as the items have an ordering.

"It takes a set of things which are orderable, and gives a sequence of those things in order."



- This completely defines sorting.
- It does not matter what we are sorting, as long as the items have an ordering.
- Concrete implementation is irrelevant.

Spoken: This declarative style of *definition in a type system* puts us in the realm of *conceptual role*.

"It takes a set of things which are orderable, and gives a sequence of those things in order."



- This completely defines sorting.
- It does not matter what we are sorting, as long as the items have an ordering.
- Concrete implementation is irrelevant.

Realm: conceptual role

Spoken: Keep that last point in mind: *concrete implementation is irrelevant*. Also, types are useful for more than just procedures — computer scientists developed ways of representing many kinds of relations in a type system:

Some representable concepts



Spoken: For example, we can model classes of object like *container*, with instances like *box* or *shed*. If a container has distinct object and not something liquid, then the container is *traversable*. If something is traversable and the items are orderable, then we can sort those items.

• What is a type system?

- Why should cognitive scientists care about types?
- What constitutes the effects of learning?
- What does this model lack?



Spoken: In a type system, *types* are the set of values that can inhabit a *term*, where a term is a syntactic construct that — at any point during its existence at runtime — possesses exactly one *value* with its ascribed *type*.





Spoken: We call values of a type *inhabitants*.



Spoken: For example:



Spoken: The phrase "hello world" inhabits the type "String", and the number 12 inhabits the type "Int".



* String is often non-primitive, an alias for a list of characters. Spoken: Types like these are called *primitive data types*.



Spoken: *Algebraic data types* allow us to express variants, such as "red" being a "color", or {alternatively} "blue", "green", and other colors. We can also express structures of typed data, such as "car" consisting of relevant typed details.



Spoken: *Composite types* are defined in terms of other types. The "Maybe" type at the bottom, sometimes called "optional", is either {an empty value} or {some value of a particular type}. These composite types are also algebraic.



Spoken: The value-type relation is like that of an {next slide} *entity...*



entity



Spoken: ...*entity* with its referent {next slide} symbol.



Spoken: Here an aptly-named creature "Inu" is a real-world entity bearing the abstract concept of "dog".



Spoken: There is also the *kind* system — the "type system for types".



Spoken: The "TYPE" kind is for types whose values exist at runtime. Historically, this kind is written as a star.



Spoken: With kinds, we can reason about what are called *higher-kinded types*. "Maybe" is a type operator that, when given a type like "String", yields a type for optional strings.



Spoken: The kind system prevents nonsense at the type-level. What does a list of "Maybe"s mean? Perhaps the programmer meant something like this:





Spoken: Kinds help us express constraints. For example:



constraint

constraint. It says "Ord t", making "sort"only valid when "t" satisfies whatever "Ord" requires of it. Ord requires a "compare" function which takes any two values of type "t" and returns one of the variants {less than}, {equal to}, or {greater than}.



Spoken: The λ -cube here describes the type theory involved, along three orthogonal axes.



abstraction: value → value

Spoken: All corners arise from the bottom-left, *simply-typed* λ -*calculus*. This gives us a starting point of abstractions — functions that take values and return values.



abstraction: value → value polymorphism:

type → value

Spoken: One axis is polymorphism, which lets us construct values according to any given type.



abstraction: value \rightarrow value polymorphism: type \rightarrow value type operators: type \rightarrow type

Spoken: Type operators give us the *composite types* we saw earlier, like "list" and "maybe". They take types as arguments and return another type. With type operators comes {the kind system}.



abstraction: value \rightarrow value polymorphism: type \rightarrow value type operators: type \rightarrow type dependent types: value \rightarrow type

Spoken: Dependent types allow for first-order logic at the type-level that depend on values that may exist at runtime. For example:



abstraction: value \rightarrow value polymorphism: type \rightarrow value type operators: type \rightarrow type dependent types: value \rightarrow type

sort :: Ord $T \Rightarrow (i : [T]) \rightarrow (v : [T] | elems(i) = elems(v) \land nondecreasing(v)$

input type

output type

Spoken: The return type of "sort" is every list of type "t" that shares exactly all elements of the input and is also non-decreasing. This is called a "dependent function": it universally quantifies over the input and mandates that the output type is satisfied.



sort :: Ord $T \Rightarrow (i : [T]) \rightarrow (v : [T] | elems(i) = elems(v) \land nondecreasing(v)$

input type

output type

Spoken: The calculus of constructions, where all of these features are present, is the basis of many theorem provers and some programming languages — including Agda, Coq, and Idris.

- What is a type system?
- Why should cognitive scientists care about types?
- What constitutes the effects of learning?
- What does this model lack?

• conceptual role (expressivity)

Spoken: Types tell the story, so the *naming* of {variables and procedures} becomes less important. A symbol carries no meaning without its relationships. In parentheses I've denoted the relevant programming lingo.

- conceptual role (expressivity)
- no nonsense values (make illegal states unrepresentable)

Spoken: Types make illegal states unrepresentable — e.g. if I enforce "attendance" as a natural number and not an integer, I cannot assign an invalid negative number.

- conceptual role (expressivity)
- no nonsense values (make illegal states unrepresentable)
- implementation is irrelevant (illegal behavior cannot compile)

Spoken: Illegal behavior cannot compile — e.g. sort must return a list that is non-decreasing. An implementation of sort that is broken cannot exist in this framing.

Key Idea 1

Programming languages give more than composition: they enable complex declarations of relation between computational artifacts.

Spoken: There's a key idea here. (read.) This is perhaps best illustrated by thinking about the role of the programmer:

Programmers are translators



Spoken: I regard programmers as translators. They must translate a mental model into a programming language, and {next slide} vice-versa

Programmers are translators



Programmers are translators



Spoken: Many high-level programming languages prioritize ergonomics to make this translation process easier. For the programmer, an {entire computational workflow} can be modeled using {only type declarations}, without having to write any concrete code.

Key Idea 2

Type systems serve as a **framework** in which programmers **represent concepts**.

Spoken: Here's another key idea. (read.)

- What is a type system?
- Why should cognitive scientists care about types?
- What constitutes the effects of learning?
- What does this model lack?

Spoken: We can *synthesize programs...*

• Program synthesis

Spoken: ...from examples, or we can even use the type alone as a program synthesis task. For example:

• Program synthesis

sort :: Ord $T \Rightarrow (i : [T]) \rightarrow (v : [T] | elems(i) = elems(v)$

```
\land nondecreasing(v))
```

```
sort = \lambda xs . foldr f Nil xs

where f = \lambdat . \lambdah . \lambda acc .

match acc with

Nil \rightarrow Cons h Nil

Cons z zs \rightarrow if h \leq z

then Cons h (Cons z zs)

else Cons z (f zs h zs)
```

Spoken: In work by Polikarpova and others, a machine implemented sort when given an equivalent type-definition to the one I've shown you. (now slowly:) We can {start with the abstract idea of sort}, and {later} learn its implementation.

- Program synthesis
- Implementation-level refactoring

Spoken: Implementation-level refactoring can be performed by a learning process. For example:

- Program synthesis
- Implementation-level refactoring

```
(define (add2 ℓ)
  (map (λ (x) (+ x 2))) ℓ)
(define (add3 ℓ)
  (map (λ (x) (+ x 3))) ℓ)
```

Spoken: In collaboration with Kevin Ellis and others, who will be talking later today, we "compressed" common code into reusable helper functions, making useful concepts more accessible for future learning.

```
(define ((add−k k) ℓ)
(map (λ (x) (+ x k))) ℓ)
```

(define add2 (add-k 2))
(define add3 (add-k 3))

Ellis, Morales, Sablé-Meyer, Solar-Lezama, Tenenbaum (2018)

- Program synthesis
- Implementation-level refactoring
- Type-level refactoring

Spoken: Type-level refactoring allows us to go...

- Program synthesis
- Implementation-level refactoring
- Type-level refactoring

Spoken: From a representation of natural numbers that is incremental...

- Program synthesis
- Implementation-level refactoring
- Type-level refactoring

```
Incremental (Peano)
                                         Digital (Arabic numeral)
enum Nat {
    Zero,
                                         enum Digit {
    Succ(Nat),
                                             Zero,
                                             One,
let twenty: Nat = Succ(Succ(Succ(Succ(
                  Succ(Succ(Succ(Succ(
                                             Nine,
                  Succ(Succ(Succ(Succ(
                  Succ(Succ(Succ(Succ(
                                         type Nat = [Digit];
                  Succ(Succ(Succ(Succ(
                                         let twenty: Nat = [Two, Zero];
                  ))))
```

Spoken: to a digital representation, as in the Arabic numeral system. A representation transformation like this corresponds to *conceptual change*.

- Program synthesis
- Implementation-level refactoring
- Type-level refactoring
- Type generation

Spoken: Generating types, whether by {intentional learning} or by {creative imagination}, is fundamental to a type-based representation. For example:

- Program synthesis
- Implementation-level refactoring
- Type-level refactoring
- Type generation

```
class Organism o where
   procreate :: ... -- permits random mutation
type Environment = ...
evolution :: Organism o => (Environment, [o]) → (Environment, [o])
```

Spoken: Darwinian evolution can be discovered by creatively writing some types, and trying to resolve missing pieces with more types or by iterating on the definition existing types.

- What is a type system?
- Why should cognitive scientists care about types?
- What constitutes the effects of learning?
- What does this model lack?

• Learning the framework vs. learning within the framework

Spoken: We've been assuming a very sophisticated type system, but maybe it must be learned via a prototypical type system.

 Learning the framework vs. learning within the framework — what is innate?

Spoken: If the whole system is not innate, there must be faculty to learn it.

- Learning the framework vs. learning within the framework — what is innate?
- The language is formal

Spoken: If types, or "concepts", do not match, the type system does not {try harder} to {find a way} of fitting them — types either fit or they don't.

- Learning the framework vs. learning within the framework — what is innate?
- The language is formal
- Types must be fully formulated (no "holes")

Spoken: Types cannot have "holes" in their declarations, they must be completely valid. However, types can be iterated upon, as we saw earlier with the placeholder example.

Purpose:

- Learning programs ("child coder") is **more** than writing procedural code.
- Use type systems to express meaning, à la conceptual role semantics.
- Type systems provide a good representation for a computational study of **concept learning**.

Lucas E. Morales

lucasem@mit.edu

Learning as Program Induction, CogSci 2018