# Conservativity of Two-Level Type Theory Corresponds to Staged Compilation

András Kovács

Eötvös Loránd University

21 June 2022, TYPES, Nantes

### Overview

#### Two-level TT:

- Voevodsky: A simple type system with two identity types
- Annekov, Capriotti, Kraus, Sattler: Two-Level Type Theory and Applications
- Goal: synthetic homotopy theory

### Overview

#### Two-level TT:

- Voevodsky: A simple type system with two identity types
- Annekov, Capriotti, Kraus, Sattler: Two-Level Type Theory and Applications
- Goal: synthetic homotopy theory

#### Staged compilation:

- Template Haskell, MetaOCaml
- Goal: code generation (for performance, code reuse)

### Overview

#### Two-level TT:

- Voevodsky: A simple type system with two identity types
- Annekov, Capriotti, Kraus, Sattler: Two-Level Type Theory and Applications
- Goal: synthetic homotopy theory

#### Staged compilation:

- Template Haskell, MetaOCaml
- Goal: code generation (for performance, code reuse)
- Remark: staged compilation ≠ staged computation

f 1 Two universes  $U_0$ ,  $U_1$ , closed under arbitrary type formers.

- $oldsymbol{0}$  Two universes  $U_0$ ,  $U_1$ , closed under arbitrary type formers.
- 2 No elimination allowed from one universe to the other.

- $\bullet$  Two universes  $U_0$ ,  $U_1$ , closed under arbitrary type formers.
- 2 No elimination allowed from one universe to the other.
- **3** Lifting: for  $A: U_0$ , we have  $\uparrow A: U_1$ .

- $\bullet$  Two universes  $U_0$ ,  $U_1$ , closed under arbitrary type formers.
- 2 No elimination allowed from one universe to the other.
- **3** Lifting: for  $A : U_0$ , we have  $\uparrow A : U_1$ .
- 4 Quoting: for  $A : U_0$  and t : A, we have  $\langle t \rangle : \uparrow A$ .

- $\bullet$  Two universes  $U_0$ ,  $U_1$ , closed under arbitrary type formers.
- 2 No elimination allowed from one universe to the other.
- **3** *Lifting:* for  $A : U_0$ , we have  $\uparrow A : U_1$ .
- 4 Quoting: for  $A : U_0$  and t : A, we have  $\langle t \rangle : \uparrow A$ .
- **5** *Splicing:* for  $t: \uparrow A$ , we have  $\sim t: A$ .

- 1 Two universes  $U_0$ ,  $U_1$ , closed under arbitrary type formers.
- 2 No elimination allowed from one universe to the other.
- **3** *Lifting:* for  $A : U_0$ , we have  $\uparrow A : U_1$ .
- 4 Quoting: for  $A : U_0$  and t : A, we have  $\langle t \rangle : \uparrow A$ .
- **5** *Splicing:* for  $t: \uparrow A$ , we have  $\sim t: A$ .
- 6 Quoting and splicing are definitional inverses.

### Inlined definitions

### Staging input:

two : 
$$\Uparrow \mathsf{Nat}_0$$
  
two =  $<\mathsf{suc}_0$  ( $\mathsf{suc}_0$  zero<sub>0</sub>)>  
 $\mathsf{f}: \mathsf{Nat}_0 \to \mathsf{Nat}_0$   
 $\mathsf{f} = \lambda x. x + \sim \mathsf{two}$ 

### Inlined definitions

### Staging input:

two : 
$$\uparrow$$
Nat<sub>0</sub>  
two =  $<$ suc<sub>0</sub> (suc<sub>0</sub> zero<sub>0</sub>) $>$   
f : Nat<sub>0</sub>  $\rightarrow$  Nat<sub>0</sub>  
f =  $\lambda x. x + \sim$ two

$$\begin{split} & \mathsf{f} : \mathsf{Nat}_0 \to \mathsf{Nat}_0 \\ & \mathsf{f} = \lambda \, x. \, x + \mathsf{suc}_0 \, (\mathsf{suc}_0 \, \mathsf{zero}_0) \end{split}$$

# Compile-time functions

Input:

$$\mathsf{id} : (A : \mathsf{U}_1) \to A \to A$$
$$\mathsf{id} = \lambda \, A \, x. \, x$$

$$\mathsf{idBool}_0 : \mathsf{Bool}_0 \to \mathsf{Bool}_0$$
  
 $\mathsf{idBool}_0 = \lambda x. \sim (\mathsf{id} (\Uparrow \mathsf{Bool}_0) < x >)$ 

# Compile-time functions

Input:

$$\begin{split} & \mathsf{id} : (A : \mathsf{U}_1) \to A \to A \\ & \mathsf{id} = \lambda \, A \, x. \, x \\ \\ & \mathsf{idBool}_0 : \mathsf{Bool}_0 \to \mathsf{Bool}_0 \\ & \mathsf{idBool}_0 = \lambda \, x. \, {\sim} (\mathsf{id} \, (\mathop{\Uparrow} \mathsf{Bool}_0) \, {<} x {>}) \end{split}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathsf{idBool}_0 : \mathsf{Bool}_0 \to \mathsf{Bool}_0 \\ &\mathsf{idBool}_0 = \lambda \, x. \, x \end{aligned}$$

### Inlined map arguments

### Input:

```
\begin{split} &\mathsf{inIMap}: \{A\,B: \Uparrow \mathsf{U}_0\} \to (\Uparrow \sim \! A \to \Uparrow \sim \! B) \to \Uparrow (\mathsf{List}_0 \sim \! A) \to \Uparrow (\mathsf{List}_0 \sim \! B) \\ &\mathsf{inIMap} = \lambda\,f\,\, as. <\! \mathsf{foldr}_0 \, (\lambda\,a\,bs.\, \mathsf{cons}_0 \sim \! (f <\! a >)\,bs) \, \mathsf{nil}_0 \sim \! as > \end{split}
```

```
\begin{split} & \text{f}: \mathsf{List}_0 \, \mathsf{Nat}_0 \, \to \, \mathsf{List}_0 \, \mathsf{Nat}_0 \\ & \text{f} = \lambda \, \mathsf{xs}. \, \sim \!\! (\mathsf{inIMap} \, (\lambda \, \mathsf{n}. < \sim \! \mathsf{n} + 2 >) < \! \mathsf{xs} >) \end{split}
```

### Inlined map arguments

#### Input:

```
\begin{split} &\mathsf{inIMap}: \{A\,B: \Uparrow \mathsf{U}_0\} \to (\Uparrow \sim \! A \to \Uparrow \sim \! B) \to \Uparrow (\mathsf{List}_0 \sim \! A) \to \Uparrow (\mathsf{List}_0 \sim \! B) \\ &\mathsf{inIMap} = \lambda\,f\,\, as. <\! \mathsf{foldr}_0 \, (\lambda\,a\,bs.\, \mathsf{cons}_0 \sim \! (f <\! a >)\,bs) \, \mathsf{nil}_0 \sim \! as > \end{split}
```

$$\begin{split} & \text{f}: \mathsf{List}_0 \, \mathsf{Nat}_0 \, \to \mathsf{List}_0 \, \mathsf{Nat}_0 \\ & \text{f} = \lambda \, \mathsf{xs}. \, \sim \!\! \left( \mathsf{inIMap} \left( \lambda \, \mathsf{n}. < \!\! \sim \!\! \mathsf{n} + 2 \!\! > \right) < \!\! \mathsf{xs} \!\! > \right) \end{split}$$

f: List<sub>0</sub> Nat<sub>0</sub> 
$$\rightarrow$$
 List<sub>0</sub> Nat<sub>0</sub>  
f =  $\lambda xs$ . foldr<sub>0</sub> ( $\lambda a bs$ . cons<sub>0</sub> ( $a + 2$ )  $bs$ ) nil<sub>0</sub>  $xs$ 

# Staging Types

Input:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{Vec} : \mathsf{Nat}_1 \to \mathop{\Uparrow} \mathsf{U}_0 \to \mathop{\Uparrow} \mathsf{U}_0 \\ \mathsf{Vec} \, \mathsf{zero}_1 \quad A = < \top_0 > \\ \mathsf{Vec} \, (\mathsf{suc}_1 \, n) \, A = < \sim A \times_0 \sim (\mathsf{Vec} \, n \, A) > \\ \\ \mathsf{Tuple3} : \mathsf{U}_0 \to \mathsf{U}_0 \\ \\ \mathsf{Tuple3} \, A = \sim (\mathsf{Vec} \, 3 < A >) \end{array}$$

# Staging Types

#### Input:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{Vec} : \mathsf{Nat}_1 \to \mathop{\Uparrow} \mathsf{U}_0 \to \mathop{\Uparrow} \mathsf{U}_0 \\ \mathsf{Vec} \, \mathsf{zero}_1 \quad A = <\top_0 > \\ \mathsf{Vec} \, (\mathsf{suc}_1 \, \mathit{n}) \, A = <\!\! \sim \!\! A \times_0 \sim \!\! (\mathsf{Vec} \, \mathit{n} \, A) > \end{array}$$

Tuple3 : 
$$U_0 \rightarrow U_0$$
  
Tuple3  $A = \sim (\text{Vec } 3 < A >)$ 

Tuple3 : 
$$U_0 \rightarrow U_0$$
  
Tuple3  $A = A \times_0 (A \times_0 (A \times_0 \top_0))$ 

# map for Vec

Input:

```
\begin{split} \mathsf{map} : \{AB: \Uparrow \mathsf{U}_0\} &\to (n:\mathsf{Nat}_1) \to (\Uparrow \sim A \to \Uparrow \sim B) \\ &\to \Uparrow (\mathsf{Vec}\, n\, A) \to \Uparrow (\mathsf{Vec}\, n\, B) \\ \mathsf{map}\, \mathsf{zero}_1 \quad f\, as = <\mathsf{tt}_0> \\ \mathsf{map}\, (\mathsf{suc}_1\, n)\, f\, as = <(\sim (f < \mathsf{fst}_0 \sim as >), \, \sim (\mathsf{map}\, n\, f < \mathsf{snd}_0 \sim as >))> \\ \mathsf{f} : \sim (\mathsf{Vec}\, 2 < \mathsf{Nat}_0 >) \to \sim (\mathsf{Vec}\, 2 < \mathsf{Nat}_0 >) \\ \mathsf{f}\, xs = \sim (\mathsf{map}\, 2\, (\lambda\, x. < \sim x + 2 >) < xs >) \end{split}
```

# map for Vec

Input:

```
\begin{split} \mathsf{map} : \{AB: \Uparrow \mathsf{U}_0\} &\to (n:\mathsf{Nat}_1) \to (\Uparrow \sim A \to \Uparrow \sim B) \\ &\to \Uparrow (\mathsf{Vec}\, n\, A) \to \Uparrow (\mathsf{Vec}\, n\, B) \\ \mathsf{map}\, \mathsf{zero}_1 \quad f\, \mathit{as} = <\mathsf{tt}_0 > \\ \mathsf{map}\, (\mathsf{suc}_1\, n)\, f\, \mathit{as} = <(\sim (f < \mathsf{fst}_0 \sim \mathit{as} >), \, \sim (\mathsf{map}\, n\, f < \mathsf{snd}_0 \sim \mathit{as} >)) > \\ \mathsf{f} : \sim (\mathsf{Vec}\, 2 < \mathsf{Nat}_0 >) \to \sim (\mathsf{Vec}\, 2 < \mathsf{Nat}_0 >) \\ \mathsf{f}\, \mathit{xs} = \sim (\mathsf{map}\, 2\, (\lambda\, x. < \sim x + 2 >) < \mathit{xs} >) \end{split}
```

$$\begin{split} & \text{f}: \mathsf{Nat}_0 \times_0 (\mathsf{Nat}_0 \times_0 \top_0) \to \mathsf{Nat}_0 \times_0 (\mathsf{Nat}_0 \times_0 \top_0) \\ & \text{f} \ xs = (\mathsf{fst}_0 \ xs + 2, \ (\mathsf{fst}_0 \ (\mathsf{snd}_0 \ xs) + 2, \ \mathsf{tt}_0)) \end{split}$$

### **Ergonomics**

In the demo implementation:

- Bidirectional elaboration
- Standard unification techniques

Almost all quotes and splices are inferable in practice.

# Staging as Conservativity

The **object theory** is the TT supporting only  $U_0$  and its type formers.

# Staging as Conservativity

The **object theory** is the TT supporting only  $U_0$  and its type formers.

The **object-level fragment** of 2LTT contains types in  $U_0$ , their terms, and only allows contexts with entries in  $U_0$ .

# Staging as Conservativity

The **object theory** is the TT supporting only  $U_0$  and its type formers.

The **object-level fragment** of 2LTT contains types in  $U_0$ , their terms, and only allows contexts with entries in  $U_0$ .

#### Conservativity of 2LTT means

- There's a bijection between object-theoretic types and object-fragment 2LTT types.
- There's also a bijection between object-theoretic terms and object-fragment 2LTT terms.
- (Both up to  $\beta\eta$ -conversion).

(See proof in the preprint)

ICFP preprint, implementation, tutorial: github.com/AndrasKovacs/staged

Thanks for your attention!