

# There is Life in the Universes Beyond $\omega$

ANONYMOUS AUTHOR(S)

The first draft of Martin-Löf's type theory proposed the assumption  $\text{Type}:\text{Type}$ . Subsequently, universe levels have been introduced to avoid the resulting inconsistencies by assuming  $\text{Type}_i:\text{Type}_{i+1}$ . Proof assistants based on type theory support such universe levels to varying degree, but they impose restrictions that can make coding awkward.

Specifically, we consider the ramifications of Agda's approach to handling levels using a denotational semantics of a stratified version of System F as a motivating example. We propose a simple fix that extends Agda's capabilities for handling universe levels parametrically up to  $\varepsilon_0$ .

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Dependent types, universes, ordinal numbers

## ACM Reference Format:

Anonymous Author(s). 2018. There is Life in the Universes Beyond  $\omega$ . In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 3 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction

The origin of universe levels.

How do universe levels work in Agda?

What becomes awkward with Agda's approach?

How do we propose to fix it?

Contributions.

## 2 Preliminaries

Agda, Ordinals, IR-Universes

### 2.1 Ordinals

Ordinal numbers are an important concept in mathematics and computer science. They are closely related to well-ordered sets as any well-ordered set is order-isomorphic to an ordinal. The significance to computer science is that such well-orders can be used for termination proofs.

The best known construction of ordinals is a set-theoretic one due to von Neumann. It starts with the smallest ordinal 0 represented by the empty set  $\emptyset$ . To construct the successor of an ordinal  $\alpha$ , we define  $\alpha + 1 := \alpha \cup \{\alpha\}$ . This way, we construct  $1, 2, 3, \dots$ . Then, we can scoop them all up into the smallest limit ordinal  $\omega = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ , which contains 0 and all finite applications of the successor to it. We continue with  $\omega + 1 = \omega \cup \{\omega\}$  and carry on until we build the next limit ordinal  $\omega \cdot 2$ , then  $\omega \cdot 3$ , and so on. Constructing the limit at this level yields  $\omega^\omega$  and continuing further leads to  $\omega^{\omega^\omega}$ ,  $\omega^{\omega^{\omega^\omega}}$ , and so on. The limit of this sequence is  $\varepsilon_0$  which is the smallest ordinal that fulfills the equation  $\varepsilon_0 = \omega^{\varepsilon_0}$ .

---

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

In the context of this paper, we plan to use ordinals as universe levels where the well-ordering avoids collapsing levels. The construction of ordinals does not stop at  $\varepsilon_0$ , but we wish to carve out a particular set of ordinals that fits well in an implementation context. Concretely, we consider ordinals less than  $\varepsilon_0$  as they can be represented by binary trees. To see this, recall that every ordinal  $\alpha$  can be written in Cantor normal form

$$\alpha = \omega^{\beta_1} + \omega^{\beta_2} + \dots + \omega^{\beta_n}$$

for some  $n \geq 0$  and ordinals  $\beta_i$  such that  $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \dots \geq \beta_n$ . If  $\alpha < \varepsilon_0$ , then it can be shown that each exponent satisfies  $\beta_i < \alpha$ . If we, again, write  $\beta_i = \omega^{\gamma_1} + \dots + \omega^{\gamma_m}$  in Cantor normal form, then clearly  $\gamma_j < \beta_i < \alpha$ . As the ordering on ordinals is a well-order, we know this decreasing sequence must terminate and we obtain a finite representation for each ordinal less than  $\varepsilon_0$ .

[?] developed Agda formalizations for three equivalent representations for precisely this set of ordinals. They define addition and multiplication of ordinals, prove the principle of transfinite induction, and use that to prove that the represented subset of ordinals is well-ordered.

We build on one of their representations, called `MutualOrd`, define some additional operations, and prove some properties which are needed in the context of universe levels.<sup>1</sup>

TODO: Insert

- Definition of `MutualOrd`
- Explanation
- Example(s)
- any additional properties that we had to prove

## 2.2 Universes in Agda

TODO: typeset in Agda style

Agda contains significant support for a universe hierarchy [?]. It provides an abstract datatype `LEVEL` of universe levels along with constants `ZERO`, `SUC`, and `MAX` that denote the base-level of the hierarchy, the successor, and the maximum of two levels. It provides a level-parametric type `SET` which obeys the typing `SET i : SET (SUC i)`. Type formation handles the universe levels in the same way as finitely stratified System F [?]. That is,

- if  $A_1 : \text{Set } i_1$  and  $A_2 : \text{Set } i_2$ , then  $A_1 \rightarrow A_2 : \text{Set}(i_1 \sqcup i_2)$ ;
- if  $\alpha : \text{Set } i$  is a type variable and  $A : \text{Set } j$ , then  $\forall \alpha. A : \text{Set}(suc\ i \sqcup j)$ .

To avoid inconsistencies, Agda does not allow pattern matching on the type `LEVEL`. However, quantification over `LEVEL` is allowed and results in a type at level  $\omega$  (if the level-typed variable is used in a significant way). Unfortunately, levels  $\omega$  and higher are **not** handled in a parametric way in Agda. Rather there are predefined type constants `SETω`, `SETω1`, `SETω2`, and so on. This design can be inconvenient, as most notions in the standard library (e.g., the equality type) are in a level-parametric way, and thus they cannot be used with `SETω` and higher universe levels.

<sup>1</sup>Technically, the mechanization of [?] relies on cubical Agda [?]. We back-ported the definitions for `MutualOrd` to standard Agda, as cubical is not needed for this representation.

## 2.3 Encoding Universes

### 3 Running Example

As a running example for demonstrating various encodings, we consider different extensions of finitely stratified System F [? ]. More precisely, we start from an intrinsically typed encoding of types and expressions, then we construct denotational semantics for different encodings and discuss their respective merits.

We choose this system as it is significant, presents non-trivial challenges, and it has been studied in the literature. Our encoding of syntax is inspired by [? ], who develop the syntactic metatheory of System- $F\omega$  (without stratification). It has been picked up by [? ], who give denotational and operational semantics for finitely stratified System-F and develop a logical relation for it. [? ] use a similar syntax representation for a finitely stratified version of System- $F\omega$  extended with qualified types. They also develop a denotational semantics for their calculus. All these papers come with Agda formalizations.

### 4 Constructions

### 5 Related Work

How do other proof assistants (Coq, Lean) handle universes? Cumulativity, Impact of impredicativity

### 6 Conclusions