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Abstract
This paper describes a new embedding technique of invertible programming languages, through the case of the FliPpr language. Embedded languages have the advantage of inheriting host languages’ features and supports; and one of the influential methods of embedding is the tagless-final style, which enables a high level of programmability and extensibility. However, it is not straightforward to apply the method to the family of invertible/reversible/bidirectional languages, due to the different ways functions in such domains are represented. We consider FliPpr, an invertible pretty-printing system, as a representative of such languages, and show that Atkey et al.’s unembedding technique can be used to address the problem. Together with a reformulation of FliPpr, our embedding achieves a high level of interoperability with the host language Haskell, which is not found in any other invertible languages. We implement the idea and demonstrate the benefits of the approach with examples.
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1 Introduction
Embedded languages, languages expressed via libraries in host languages, are popular. The great advantage of the approach is that an embedded language inherits the generic features of its host language, as well as the ecosystem including compilers, editors, IDEs etc. Haskell, featuring strong abstraction mechanisms (higher-order functions, type classes and so on) and a powerful type system, serves as a good platform for embedded languages [6, 8, 16, 18, 20, 25, 33, 36].

To embed a language, one needs to specify a way to express the guest language’s constructs in the host language. Among the various ways to embed syntax, the tagless-final style [4] is known for its programmability and extensibility. For example, for the simply-typed λ-calculus, one can express its syntax by the following type class.

class Lam e where
  abs :: (e a → e b) → e (a → b)
  app :: e (a → b) → e a → e b

In the tagless-final style, guest-language binders are expressed by host-language functions, enabling the construction of embedded terms via the host language’s (higher-order) functions. In this case, the functions abs and app provide a way to interconvert functions of the two levels. The semantics of the guest language are given by instances of the type class. For example, using the identity functor is enough for the usual evaluation (where the guest and host language functions coincide).

One may take this promotion of the guest-language’s binders to host-language functions for granted, and indeed for most cases straightforward definitions of abs and app exist. However for some semantic domains, where one language’s functions are not naturally the other’s, such promotion becomes much more difficult to implement. One typical class of examples are the invertible/reversible/bidirectional programming languages [10, 24, 29, 37], where a “function” can be executed in both forward and backward directions (in the remainder of this paper, we will use “invertible languages” to refer to this class of languages). In this case, a function in such a domain is actually a (encapsulated) pair of functions (one in each direction) in a conventional unidirectional language, which is problematic as a bound value serves as an input of one function and output of the other,
but the tagless-final style expects the binder to be realized by a single function.

This mismatch of function representations creates a barrier in effective embedding. To the best of the authors' knowledge, existing embedded implementations of invertible programming languages, such as implementations (e.g., 1ens, pointless-lenses [30] and putlenses [31]) of lens [10] variants and invertible-syntax [34], do not have any binders. As a result, the ability to construct invertible programs using host language functions is limited: programming with names and binders is simply unavailable and strictly point-free composition is the only means for program construction. In addition to the problem of binder promotion, invertible languages sometimes treat recursive definitions explicitly for efficiency or safety [10, 12, 13, 23, 24, 29], and there are very often specialized syntactic restrictions [23, 24, 29]. These characteristics together make the embedding of inverting languages particularly challenging.

In this paper, we provide a solution to the problem exemplified by embedding in Haskell an invertible programming language FlirPr [24]. FlirPr is a language for writing pretty-printers based on Wadler [36]'s pretty-printing combinators, which can be inverted to produce parsers that are correct with respect to the pretty-printers:

\[
\text{parse} \ (\text{prettyprint} \ t) = t \quad (\text{Correctness Law})
\]

We choose FlirPr as it is representative of an invertible language and is independently useful. It focuses on a certain application (development of pretty-printers and parsers in synchronization), and adopts syntactic restrictions to enable (outsourced) complex analysis. Specifically, the FlirPr system generates context-free grammar with actions that is compatible with existing parsing algorithms and tools. Moreover, FlirPr features a conventional programming style, allowing function definitions, calls and pattern matching; the preservation of them in the embedding is a challenge that is of general interest.

The key idea underpinning our approach is the use of a technique known as unembedding [1, 2, 19], which transforms syntax in a tagless-final style to de Bruijn terms. The original motivation of unembedding is to convert a user-friendly syntax to a program-manipulation-friendly form. We show in this paper that the same technique is useful for embedding invertible languages as it gives access to type environments via de Bruijn terms. Of course, to embed an invertible language requires more than unembedding. In addition, we reformulate FlirPr to accept arbitrary user-defined Haskell datatypes, and deal with features such as syntactic restrictions and explicit handling of recursions.

As far as we are aware, this work is the first dedicated effort to embed an invertible language with enhanced interoperability, and we have successfully embedded FlirPr to achieve a good result. Despite the success, we also recognize that there are significant differences among different invertible languages, and the techniques proposed in this paper alone will not be sufficient for embedding arbitrary invertible languages. Nevertheless, we believe that the progress made in this paper is a significant step towards a general solution.

In summary, our contributions are:

- We use the unembedding transformation [1, 2, 19] to address the binder representation problem in embedding invertible programming languages.
- We reformulate FlirPr to enhance its interoperability with Haskell. Specifically, FlirPr functions now can take arbitrary Haskell datatypes as input.
- We discuss how we treat rather complex features in FlirPr, including the treeless restriction [35] and explicit treatment of recursions to produce CFGs with actions.

The implementation of the system is available from https://bitbucket.org/kztk/flipre/ zero/lens/.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the techniques our paper relies on, namely FlirPr and the unembedding transformation. Section 3 describes how we embed non-recursive FlirPr, including its reformulation. Section 4 shows our treatment of recursions. Section 5 proposes improvements of our embedding both from programmability and efficiency aspects. Section 7 explores embedding of general invertible languages and discusses related work, and Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly review the techniques on which our paper is based on, namely FlirPr [24] and the unembedding transformation [1, 2, 19].

2.1 FlirPr: Invertible Pretty-Printing System

FlirPr is a system that derives a parser from a pretty-printer definition so that the parser is correct with respect to the printer. The FlirPr system has a designated programming language, which is also called FlirPr, that is based on Wadler’s pretty-printing combinators [36]. FlirPr guarantees that it always generates a parser representable as a context-free grammar (CFG) with actions.

More specifically, FlirPr consists of two languages: a core and a surface one. The core language has strong syntactic restrictions, namely being treeless and linear, and is directly subjected to inversion [23]. The surface language is translated to the core via program transformations such as deforestation [35].

For example, let us consider a subset of arithmetic expressions that consist of only “+” and “−”. A pretty-printer in Fig. 1 is written in the surface language, which will be converted to the pretty-printer in Fig. 2. After that, the FlirPr system generates the CFG in Fig. 3.
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Figure 1. A Program in FliPpr’s Surface Language.

pprMain x = nil ⊲ ppr False x ⊲ nil
ppr b x = manyParens (ppr’ b x)
ppr’ b One = text "1"
ppr’ b (Sub x y) = parensIf (group (ppr False x ⊲
    nest 2 (lineN ⊲ text "-" ⊲ spaceN ⊲ ppr True y)))
manyParens d = d ⊲ parens (manyParens d)
parens d = text "(" ⊲ nil ⊲ d ⊲ nil ⊲ text ")"
parensIf d b = if b then parens d else d

Figure 2. A Corresponding Program in the Core Language.

PprMain → Nil PprF Nil {§2}
PprF → PprF’ {§1}
PprF’ → "(" Nil PprF Nil ")" {§3}
PprF’ → "1" {One}
PprF’ → PprF LineN ")" SpaceN PprT {Sub §1 $5}
... 

Figure 3. The CFG with actions obtained from Fig. 2

prog ::= r1 ... rn
r ::= 1 ... p n = e
s ::= text s | e1 ⊲ e2 | line | nest n e | group e
    | e1 <? e2 | f x1 ... xn
p ::= x | C p1 ... p n

Figure 4. The syntax of the core language of FliPpr

In this paper, we only focus on the core language and its
parser generation semantics because (1) the host language,
Haskell, will provide the functionalities of the surface lan-
guage and thus eliminate the need of it, and (2) the part
about pretty-printing semantics is rather straightforward,
involving only Wadler’s combinators, and is thus omitted.

2.1.1 The Core Language of FliPpr

Figure 4 gives the syntax of the core language. A program
consists of rules of the form f p1 ... p n = e, where each p i is

a pattern defined in the standard way and e is an expression.
An expression ranges over Wadler’s combinators (text s, e1 ⊲ e2, line, nest n e and group e), biased choice e1 <? e2,
and treeless [35] function call f x1 ... x n. Here, being
treeless means that only variables can serve as arguments of
functions. The programs are expected to be linear, which is
checked statically in the original FliPpr, but at run-time in
this paper.

We briefly explain the behavior of Wadler’s combina-
tors [36] in pretty-printing.

* text s renders the string s in pretty-printing.
  * e1 ⊲ e2 represents concatenation.
  * line represents a new line with indentation according
to the current indentation level. However, when placed
under group, it can also be rendered as a single space.
  * nest n e increases the current indentation level by n
in e.
  * group e smartly chooses layouts in e with line that
either works as a new line or a single space.

More specifically, group e says that “render e as horizontal as
possible, and otherwise render e with newlines with appro-
priate indentation indicated by nest”. Thus, the pretty-printer
in Fig. 1 and 2 will print Sub (Sub One One) (Sub One One) as

```
1 - 1 - (1 - 1) or 1 - 1 - (-1 - 1) or 1 - 1
```

depending on the screen width, assuming that nil, lineN and
spaceN behaves as text "", line and text " ", respectively.

Parsing semantics is designed to parse all the printer’s
outputs, and in addition non-pretty strings which cannot
be produced by a pretty-printer but are nevertheless valid
grammatically. To achieve this, FliPpr reinterprets Wadler’s
combinators in the parsing direction to accommodate a vari-
yety of strings. Specifically, line is reinterpreted as arbitrary
non-empty spaces, and nest and group are simply ignored
because they only affect the behavior of lines. Moreover, a
new operator e1 <? e2 is introduced to admit redundant spaces
and extra parentheses in places. Intuitively, e1 <? e2 means
that e2 is also a valid string representation but e1 is prettier.
That is, in pretty-printing, the operator simply ignores e2
and behaves as e1, but in parsing, it behaves as nonder
ministic choice between e1 and e2. The derived operators nil, lineN,
and spaceN we have seen in Figure 1 are defined by using
<? as below.

```
white = text " " <? text "\n" -- parses a white space
space = white nil -- parses one-or-more whites
nilN = text " " <? space -- parses zero-or-more whites
lineN = line <? text " " -- parses zero-or-more whites
spaceN = space <? text " " -- parses zero-or-more whites
```

Notice that the last three functions have the same behavior
in parsing, but not in pretty-printing.
As a result, non.pretty strings such as “(1 ¬ (1 ))” become parsable, together with the pretty ones we have seen above.

2.1.2 Parser-Generation Semantics

A CFG with actions is generated from a pretty-printer defined in the FilPpr language. From a program in the FilPpr core language, the following steps are taken for the generation.

1. Prepare nonterminals \( F_f \) and \( E_e \) for each function \( f \) and expression \( e \) in a program, where parsing results of \( F_f \) and \( E_e \)’s are arguments of \( f \) and a value environment for \( e \) such that they evaluate to a parsed string, respectively.

2. For each rule \( f \, p_1 \ldots p_n = e \), add the rule:
   \[
   F_f \to E_e \quad \{ \text{let } \theta = \text{\$1 in } (p_1 \theta, \ldots, p_n \theta) \}.
   \]

3. For each expression \( e \), add the rule(s) as below.
   - When \( e = \text{text } s \), add:
     \[
     E_{\text{text } s} \to s \quad \{ \emptyset \}
     \]
   - When \( e = e_1 \oplus e_2 \), add:
     \[
     E_{e_1 \oplus e_2} \to E_{e_1} \quad \{ \$1 \}
     \]
   - When \( e = \text{line} \), add:
     \[
     E_{\text{line}} \to \text{White}^+ \quad \{ \emptyset \}
     \]
   - When \( e = \text{nest } n \, e' \) or \( e = \text{group } e' \), add:
     \[
     E_e \to E_{e'} \quad \{ \$1 \}
     \]
   - When \( e = f \, x_1 \ldots x_n \), add:
     \[
     E_f \, x_1 \ldots x_n \to F_f \quad \{ \text{let } (v_1, \ldots, v_n) = \text{\$1 in } (x_1 = v_1, \ldots, x_n = v_n) \}
     \]

Here, \( \text{White}^+ \) is the nonterminal that generates non-empty white spaces.

The parser is correct with respect to the (Correctness Law) [24].

2.2 Unembedding Transformation

In this section, we review the unembedding transformation [2, 19], which transforms syntax in a tagless-final style [4] to de Bruijn terms. We use the simply-typed \( \lambda \) calculus as an example, whose syntax in the tagless-final style is already given in Section 1. The de Bruijn terms are represented by the following GADTs.\(^1\)

\[
\text{data DLam } \Gamma \ a \text{ where } \\
\text{Var} :: \text{In a } \Gamma \to \text{DLam } \Gamma \ a
\]

\(\text{Abs} :: \text{DLam } (\Gamma, a) \ b \to \text{DLam } (a \to b)\)

\(\text{App} :: \text{DLam } (a \to b) \to \text{DLam } a \to \text{DLam } \Gamma \ b\)

\(\text{data In a } \Gamma \text{ where }\)

\(\text{Z} :: \text{In a } (\Gamma, a)\)

\(\text{S} :: \text{In a } \Gamma \to \text{In a } (\Gamma, b)\)

Converting de Bruijn terms to the tagless-final style is rather easy. However, the opposite is not straightforward because we need to recover the type environment information.

The conversion is realized by preparing an instance of Lam; to do so, we prepare the following datatypes.

\(\text{data U a = U \{ unU :: \forall \Gamma. \text{TEnv } \Gamma \to \text{DLam } \Gamma \ a \}}\)

\(\text{data TEnv } \Gamma \text{ where }\)

\(\text{TEmp :: TEnv } (\emptyset)\)

\(\text{Text :: TEnv } \Gamma \to \text{Proxy } a \to \text{TEmp } (\Gamma, a)\)

The type \( U a \) essentially represents the dependent product \( \Pi f. \text{DLam } \Gamma f \ a \), but since Haskell does not allow value-level pattern matching on types, we pass \( \Gamma \)’s value-level representation \( \text{TEnv } \Gamma \) instead. The datatype \( \text{Proxy } a \) is a phantom type defined as \( \text{data Proxy } a = \text{Proxy in Data.Typeable } \).

Then, we are ready to give an instance of Lam. It is rather straightforward to define \( \text{app} \), which just passes \( \text{TEmp } \Gamma \).

\(\text{instance Lam U where }\)

\(\text{app } (U \ f) \ (U \ a) = U \ (\lambda y' \to \text{app } (f \ y') \ (a \ y))\)

However, the definition of \( \text{abs} \) is much trickier. Its basic structure is as below.

\(\text{abs } f = U \ \lambda y' \to \text{let } y_a = \text{Text } y \ \text{Proxy}\)

\(\text{in } \text{Abs } (\text{unU } (f \ (U \ \lambda y' \to \text{Var } ???))) \ y_a\)

Since the Abs’s argument must have the type \( \text{DLam } (\Gamma, a) \ b \), we pass \( y_a :: \text{TEnv } (\Gamma, a) \) to the result of \( f :: U a \to U b \) to obtain a value of the type. But, the problem comes in the ??? part, which must have type in \( a \Gamma' \) where \( \Gamma' \) comes from the argument \( y' :: \text{TEnv } \Gamma' \). We must convert the variable \( Z :: \text{In a } (\Gamma, a) \) introduced by Abs to \( \text{In a } \Gamma' \).

Atkey [1] proved by parametricity that \( \Gamma' \) must be as big as \( (\Gamma, a) \); that is, \( \Gamma' = (\ldots ((\ldots (\ldots a_n), a_{n-1}), \ldots), a_1) \) for some \( n \). Intuitively, this says that \( f \) must be a context consisting of Abs, App, Var and a hole, and thus its argument can only occur in a deeper position. This suggests a coercion \( \text{coer} :: \text{TEnv } \Gamma \to \text{TEnv } \Gamma' \to \text{In a } \Gamma \to \text{In a } \Gamma' \) that applies \( S n \) times to complete the definition.

\(\text{abs } f = U \ \lambda y' \to \text{let } y_a = \text{Text } y \ \text{Proxy}\)

\(\text{in } \text{Abs } (\text{unU } (f \ (U \ \lambda y' \to \text{Var } (\text{coer } y \ y' \ Z))) \ y_a\)

The coercion function fails if \( \Gamma' \) is not as big as \( (\Gamma, a) \), but such a case cannot happen due to parametricity [1]. Thus, the following conversion is indeed total.

\(\text{unemb} :: (\forall e. \text{Lam } e \to e \ a) \to \text{DLam } () \ a\)

\(\text{unemb } (U \ e) = e \ \text{TEmp}\)
We first reformulate FliPpr so that it admits user-defined Haskell datatypes. The treatment of recursion is left for Section 4.

3 Embedding Non-Recursive FliPpr

This and the next sections discuss embedding of FliPpr by using the unembedding transformation [2]. This section focuses on non-recursive programs and a slight reformulation of FliPpr so that it can pretty-print arbitrary user-defined Haskell datatypes.

3.1 Interoperable FliPpr

We first reformulate FliPpr so that it admits user-defined Haskell types. We replace global function definitions with λ abstractions/applications while keeping the treeless restriction. Also, we give a semantics based on parser combinators.

3.1.1 New Syntax and Type System

The new syntax of FliPpr is as below.

\[
\begin{align*}
e & ::= \lambda x. e \mid e \mid x \mid text s \mid e_1 \bowtie e_2 \mid e_1 \bowtie e_2 \\
& \mid \text{case } x \text{ of } \{(\phi_1 \rightarrow x_1) \rightarrow e_1\}_i \\
& \mid \text{let } () = x \text{ in } e \mid \text{let } (x_1, x_2) = x \text{ in } e
\end{align*}
\]

For simplicity, we omit line, nest n e and group e because their treatments are straightforward (from a parsing perspective). Here, pattern-matching functionality in the original core language is separated into case analysis by case and decomposition by let, where \(\phi_1\) in case is a (expected to be decidable) partial injection of which failure indicates that the pattern \((\phi_1 \rightarrow x_1)\) does not match. Notice that the language still has the treeless restriction; the second operand of a function application must be a variable, and scrutinee expressions must also be variables.

The language has the following types.

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau & ::= D \mid i \rightarrow \tau \quad \text{(first-order printer types)} \\
i & ::= \text{(Haskell’s datatypes)} \quad \text{(input types)}
\end{align*}
\]

Notice that \(i\) can be any Haskell datatype as it will be manipulated by \(\phi\) that also comes from Haskell. The typing rules are shown in Fig. 5. The judgment \(\Gamma \vdash e : \tau\) reads that, under type environment \(\Gamma\), \(e\) has type \(\tau\), where \(\Gamma\) maps variables to \(i\) types. Here, Partiallnj is defined by

\[
\text{type Partiallnj } i' i'' (i \rightarrow \text{Maybe } i', i'' \rightarrow i)
\]

representing partial injections.

3.1.2 Semantics of New FliPpr

We give its semantics based on Haskell programs with applicative [28] parser combinators. We assume a parser type \(\text{Parser } a\) and the following combinators.

- \((\bowtie)\) : \((a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow \text{Parser } a \rightarrow \text{Parser } b\)
- \((\bowtie)\) : \(\text{Parser } (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow \text{Parser } a \rightarrow \text{Parser } b\)
- \(\text{ptext}\) : \(\text{String} \rightarrow \text{Parser } \text{String}\)
- \(\text{pfail}\) : \(\text{Parser } a\)
- \((\bowtie)\) : \(\text{Parser } a \rightarrow \text{Parser } a \rightarrow \text{Parser } a\)

Here, \(\bowtie\) is the merging function defined as:

\[
(\bowtie) : \text{Eq } a \Rightarrow \text{Maybe } a \rightarrow \text{Maybe } a \rightarrow \text{Maybe } a
\]

Nothing \(\bowtie b\) is defined as:

\[
\text{Nothing } \bowtie b = b
\]

We omit the definition of \(\text{coer}\) (see Appendix A.1).

Here, \(\bowtie\) is \(\text{ fmap } p_1 \bowtie p_2\) parses the concatenation of \(p_1\) and \(p_2\) and then applies a parsing result of \(p_1\) to that of \(p_2\); \(\text{ptext } s\) parses \(s\) and returns \(s\) itself; \(\text{pfail}\) always fails; and \(p_1 \bowtie p_2\) nondeterministically choose between \(p_1\) and \(p_2\). We do not assume any concrete implementation of these combinators, but state that \(\text{Parser } a\) with the combinators denotes non-recursive CFGs.

Then, we look at the translation of terms-in-context.

\[
\begin{align*}
[\Gamma \vdash e : \tau] & \Rightarrow \text{Sem}_{\tau, \tau} \\
\text{Sem}_{\tau, D} & \sim \text{Parser } \Gamma \\
\text{Sem}_{\tau, i \rightarrow \tau} & \sim \text{Sem}_{\tau, x, \tau, \tau}
\end{align*}
\]

The former isomorphism says that a \(D\)-typed expression will be translated to a parser of which the parsing results are the values of the free variables in it. The latter says that \(\text{Sem}\) must have a “closed” structure to have abstractions and applications. Following this observation we can define \(\text{Sem}_{\tau, \tau} = \text{Parser } (R [\Gamma])\). Here, \([\Gamma]\) is defined as:

\[
[\emptyset] = () \\
[\Gamma, x : i] = ([\Gamma], \text{Maybe } i)
\]

Accordingly, \(R\), representing parsing results, is defined as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{data } R & \rightarrow a \text{ where } \\
\text{ResD} & :: a \rightarrow R a D \\
\text{ResF} & :: \text{Eq } i \Rightarrow R (a, \text{Maybe } i) \rightarrow R a (i \rightarrow \tau)
\end{align*}
\]

The constraint \(\text{Eq}\) will be used for handling non-linear uses of variables.

We also provide functions that manipulate these datatypes. It is convenient to have a map function for \(R a \tau\).

\[
\text{rmap } :: (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow R a \tau \rightarrow R b \tau
\]

We omit the definition of \(\text{rmap}\), which is straightforward. The function \(\text{upd}\) tries to update a given position in an environment.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{upd} & :: \text{Eq } i \Rightarrow \text{ln } (\text{Maybe } i) \rightarrow \text{Maybe } i \rightarrow \Gamma \\
\text{upd} Z & = (\theta, a') = (\theta, a \oplus a') \\
\text{rmap } (S n) & (a, b) = (\text{upd } n a \theta, b)
\end{align*}
\]

Here, \(\oplus\) is the merging function defined as:

\[
(\oplus) : \text{Eq } a \Rightarrow \text{Maybe } a \rightarrow \text{Maybe } a \rightarrow \text{Maybe } a
\]

Nothing \(\oplus b\) is defined as:

\[
\text{Nothing } \oplus b = b
\]
\[ \Gamma \vdash \lambda x. e : \tau \rightarrow \tau \]  
\[ \Gamma \vdash e \ x : \tau \]  
\[ \Gamma \vdash \text{text } s : \text{D} \]  
\[ \Gamma \vdash e_1 \mapsto e_2 : \text{D} \]  
\[ \Gamma \vdash e_1 \not\mapsto e_2 : \text{D} \]  
\[ \Gamma \vdash \text{case } x \text{ of } ((e_1 \mapsto e_2) \Rightarrow e_1) \]  
\[ \Gamma \vdash \text{let } \{ x \mapsto e \text{ in } s \} \]  
\[ \Gamma \vdash \text{funpair } \{ (1, i_1, i_2, i_3) \} \]

**Figure 6. Translation of Terms-in-Context**

Just \( a \) \( \oplus \) Nothing = Just \( a \)  
Just \( a \) \( \oplus \) Just \( a' \) \( | a a = \) Just \( a \)

Intuitively, \( \text{upd } a \ x \theta \) computes \( \theta \bigcup \{ x \mapsto a \} \), which fails when \( \theta \) maps \( x \) to some value other than \( a \). The merging function can be extended to environments \( \text{mergeEnv}\{\Gamma\} \vdash [\Gamma] \rightarrow [\Gamma] \rightarrow [\Gamma] \), and then to parsing results \( \text{merge}\{\Gamma\} \vdash \text{R } [\Gamma] \bigcup \text{D } [\Gamma] \rightarrow [\Gamma] \bigcup [\Gamma] \bigcup [\Gamma]. \) Intuitively, \( \text{mergeEnv}\{\Gamma\} \uparrow \theta \) represents \( \theta \bigcup \theta' \), which fails when \( \theta(x) \neq \theta'(x) \) for some \( x \). These merging functions are type-indexed and are not directly expressible in Haskell, but as we have seen in Section 2 the solution is to use the unembedding technique of passing the value-level representation of \( \Gamma \) as a parameter. We also assume the typed-indexed function \( \text{emptyEnv}\{\Gamma\} \vdash [\Gamma] \) which denotes the environment that consists only of Nothing.

In advance to defining the translation of terms-in-context, we define the translation \( [\Gamma(x) = i] \vdash \text{In } \text{(Maybe i)} [\Gamma] \) of variable look-up as below.

\[
\begin{align*}
[\Gamma, y : i'](x) &= i \\
[\Gamma, x : i(i)] &= Z
\end{align*}
\]

For example, for \( \Gamma = [x_1 : t_1, \ldots, x_n : t_n] \), we have \( \Gamma[x_1 = i_1] \) \( S^n \times i \equiv Z \). That is, a variable is translated to a de Bruijn index.

Now we are ready to define the translation of terms-in-context as in Fig. 6. To emphasize the compositionality of the definition, the translation uses the Haskell functions \( \text{fabs, fapp, ..., funpair} \) given in Fig. 7, which can be seen as a shallowly embedded version of de Bruijn representation of the new FliPpr, and will be used in the unembedding. The definitions look complicated due to the manipulation of \( \text{R } \Gamma \) \( \tau \) values, but actually implement the same translation as shown in Section 2.1.2, except that function definitions and calls are separated into smaller steps. Note that branching is implemented by \( \text{fcase} \), conversions of input data is by \( \text{br} \), and \( \text{fununit} \) and \( \text{funpair} \) are responsible for data decomposition.

### 3.2 Embedded Non-Recursive FliPpr

With the ground prepared, the embedding itself is rather straightforward. We simply represent the syntax in the tagless-style and then converts it to de Bruijn terms. Here, we use shallow-embedding instead of ASTs in a datattype for the representation of de Bruijn terms.

**3.2.1 Typeclass FliPprE**

The following is the type class that represents the syntax of non-recursive FliPpr in the tagless-style.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{class FliPprE } a @ e @ a \text{ where} \\
\text{abs} : \text{Eq } i \Rightarrow (a @ i \rightarrow e @ e) \rightarrow e @ (i \rightarrow e) \\
\text{app} : \text{Eq } i \Rightarrow e @ (i \rightarrow e) \rightarrow a @ e \rightarrow e @ e \\
\text{text} : \text{String } \rightarrow e @ D \\
\text{el} : \text{String } \rightarrow e @ D \rightarrow e @ D \\
\text{case} : \text{Eq } i \Rightarrow (a @ e @ i \rightarrow e @ e) \\
\text{unpair} : \text{Eq } i_1, i_2 \Rightarrow a @ (i_1 @ a @ i_2 \rightarrow e @ e) \rightarrow e @ e \\
\text{ununit} : a @ () \rightarrow e @ e \rightarrow e @ e \\
\text{data } \text{Branch } a @ e @ i @ e @ \text{where} \\
\forall i'. \text{Eq } i' \Rightarrow \text{Branch } (\text{PartiallNj } i' ) @ (a @ i' \rightarrow e @ e)
\end{align*}
\]

Since FliPpr has two syntactic categories: variables and expressions, the class FliPprE \( a @ e @ a \) takes two type variables \( a @ e \) respectively. The code is similar to the syntax in Section 3.1.1 except that we used functions for binders.
3.2.2 Instance of FlippE for Parsing

We then implement the semantics of FlippE by giving instances of FlippE. Here, we focus on the parsing semantics, as the implementation of the pretty-printing semantics is straightforward.

First, we prepare the datatypes to which $a$ and $e$ of FlippE $\alpha e$ are instantiated to. Recall that a variable look-up and an expression (in a context) are translated to values in $\text{In}$ (Maybe $i$) $\Gamma$ and $\text{Parser}$ $(R \Gamma \tau)$, respectively. Accordingly, $a$ and $e$ will be instantiated to the following datatypes.

$$\text{data} \ PA \ i = PA \ \{ \text{unPA} :: \forall \Gamma. \text{TEnv} \Gamma \rightarrow \text{In} \ (\text{Maybe} \ i) \ \Gamma \}$$

$$\text{data} \ PE \ \tau = PE \ \{ \text{unPE} :: \forall \Gamma. \text{TEnv} \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Parser} \ (R \ \Gamma \ \tau) \}$$

Similarly to the original unembedding (Section 2.2), these types take value-level representations of $\Gamma$, $\text{TEnv} \ \Gamma$. A subtle difference is that we use shallow embedding instead of datatypes for de Bruijn terms. Also, since elements of $\Gamma$ can be Nothing, we have changed the definition of $\text{TEnv}$ as:

$$\text{data} \ \text{TEnv} \ \gamma \ where$$

$$\text{TEnv} \ :: \ \text{TEnv} \ (\gamma)$$

$$\text{TEnv} \ x \ \gamma \ = \ \text{TEnv} \ r \ \rightarrow \ \text{Proxy} \ i \ \rightarrow \ \text{TEnv} \ (r, \ \text{Maybe} \ i)$$

Then, we implement the method of FlippE step-by-step. Again, $\text{app}$ is rather easy to implement; we just pass $\gamma$ around.

$$\text{instance} \ \text{FlippE} \ \text{PA} \ \text{PE} \ \text{where}$$

$$\text{app} :: \ \text{PE} \ (i \ \rightarrow \ \tau) \ \rightarrow \ \text{PA} \ i \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ \tau$$

$$\text{app} \ (\text{PE} \ f) \ (\text{PA} \ a) = \ \text{PE} \ \lambda \gamma \ \rightarrow \ \text{fapp} \ (f \ \gamma) \ (a \ \gamma)$$

Notice that we use shallowly embedded construct $\text{fapp}$ instead of a constructor. This applies to the implementation of other methods as well, such as $\text{abs}$, as below:

$$\text{abs} :: (\text{PA} \ i \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ \tau) \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ (i \ \rightarrow \ \tau)$$

$$\text{abs} \ f = \ \text{PE} \ \lambda \gamma \ \rightarrow$$

$$\text{let} \ \gamma_i = \ \text{TEnv} \ \gamma \ \text{Proxy}$$

$$\text{in} \ \text{fabs} \ \text{unPE} \ (f \ \lambda \gamma \ \rightarrow \ \text{coer} \ (\gamma_1 \ \gamma_2 \ \text{Z})) \ \gamma_i$$

One would notice that we simply replaced Abs in Section 2.2 by its semantics $\text{fabs}$ in the above program.

The implementation of Wadler’s combinators and non-deterministic choice is easy, as it does not involve binders.

$$\text{text} :: \ \text{String} \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ \text{D}$$

$$\text{text} \ = \ \text{String} \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ \text{D}$$

$$\text{let} \ \gamma_i = \ \text{TExt} \ \text{Proxy}$$

$$\text{in} \ \text{fabs} \ \text{unPE} \ (f \ \lambda \gamma \ \rightarrow \ \text{coer} \ (\gamma_1 \ \gamma_2 \ \text{Z})) \ \gamma_i$$

Notice that now $\text{fext}$ and $\text{fcat}$ take $\gamma$ for type-indexed functions $\text{emptyEnv}$ and $\text{merge}$ that are used inside.

The $\text{case}$ method is implemented by $\text{fcase}$ and $\text{br}$ as below.

$$\text{case} :: \text{Exp} \ \tau \rightarrow \ [\text{Branch} \ \text{PA} \ \text{PE} \ \text{i} \ \tau] \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ \tau$$

$$\text{case} \ (\text{PA} \ a) \ \text{bs} = \ \text{PE} \ \lambda \gamma \ \rightarrow$$

$$\text{let} \ \text{h} \ (\text{Branch} \ \phi \ \text{f}) =$$
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$$\text{let} \ \gamma_i = \ \text{TExt} \ \gamma \ \text{Proxy}$$

$$x = \ \text{PA} \ \lambda \gamma' \ \rightarrow \ \text{coer} \ (\gamma_i \ \gamma')$$

$$\text{in} \ \text{br} \ \phi \ (\text{unPE} \ (f \ \gamma_1) \ \gamma_i)$$

$$\text{in} \ \text{fcase} \ (a \ \gamma) \ (\text{map} \ h \ \text{bs})$$

Notice that $\gamma_i$ has type $\text{TEnv} \ (\Gamma, \ \text{Maybe} \ i')$, where $\Gamma$ and $i'$ come from $\gamma :: \text{TEnv} \ \Gamma$ and $\phi :: \text{PartialInj} \ i \ i'$. The implementation of $\text{ununit}$ is also straightforward as it does not change the type environment.

$$\text{ununit} :: \ (PA \ \lambda \gamma \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ \tau) \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ \tau$$

$$\text{ununit} \ (\text{PA} \ a) \ (\text{PE} \ e) = \ \text{PE} \ \lambda \gamma \ \rightarrow \ \text{fununit} \ (a \ \gamma) \ (e \ \gamma)$$

In contrast, we need to use coercions in $\text{unpair}$ as it involves binders.

$$\text{unpair} :: (\text{Eq} \ t_1, \ \text{Eq} \ t_2) \ \rightarrow$$

$$\text{PA} \ (t_1, \ t_2) \ \rightarrow (PA \ t_1 \ \rightarrow \ PA \ t_2 \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ \tau) \ \rightarrow \ \text{PE} \ \tau$$

$$\text{unpair} \ (PA \ a) \ k = \ \text{PE} \ \lambda \gamma \ \rightarrow$$

$$\text{let} \ \gamma_i = \ \text{TExt} \ (\text{Text} \ \gamma \ \text{Proxy}) \ \text{Proxy}$$

$$x_1 = \ \text{PA} \ \lambda \gamma' \ \rightarrow \ \text{coer} \ (\gamma_2 \ \gamma') \ (S \ \text{Z})$$

$$x_2 = \ \text{PA} \ \lambda \gamma' \ \rightarrow \ \text{coer} \ (\gamma_2 \ \gamma') \ \text{Z}$$

$$\text{in} \ \text{funpair} \ \text{unPE} \ (k \ x_1 \ x_2) \ \gamma_i$$

Both functions just call corresponding implementations $\text{fununit}$ and $\text{funpair}$, but the latter involves coercions.

3.3 Programming with FlippE

Using raw $\text{unpair}/\text{ununit}$ with $\text{Branch}$ is sometimes tedious as they are too primitive. Haskell programming actually helps in this situation. For example, let us consider the subtraction language (Section 2.1.1) again. Assume that it is defined by the following datatype.

$$\text{data} \ \text{Exp} \ = \ \text{One} \ | \ \text{Sub} \ \text{Exp} \ \text{Exp} \$$

Then, we can define the following functions.

$$\text{unOne} :: \ \text{FlippE} \ \alpha \ \text{e} \ \Rightarrow \ e \ \rightarrow \ \text{Branch} \ a \ \text{e} \ \text{Exp} \ t$$

$$\text{unOne} \ e = \ \text{Branch} \ (p, \lambda \lambda \rightarrow \ \text{One}) \ (\lambda a \rightarrow \ \text{ununit} \ a \ e)$$

$$\text{where} \ p \ \text{One} = \ \text{Just} \ ()$$

$$p \_ = \ \text{Nothing}$$

$$\text{unSub} :: \ \text{FlippE} \ \alpha \ \text{e} \ \Rightarrow$$

$$(a \ \text{Exp} \ \rightarrow \ a \ \text{Exp} \ \rightarrow \ e \ \text{t}) \ \Rightarrow \ \text{Branch} \ a \ \text{e} \ \text{Exp} \ t$$

$$\text{unSub} \ k = \ \text{Branch} \ (p, \text{q}) \ (\lambda x \rightarrow \ \text{unpair} \ x \ k)$$

$$\text{where} \ p \ (\text{Sub} \ x \ y) = \ \text{Just} \ (x, \ y)$$

$$p \_ = \ \text{Nothing}$$

$$\text{q} \ (x, \ y) = \ \text{Sub} \ x \ y$$

These functions serve as invertible pattern matching for better programming. For example, a prefix-notation printer for $\text{Exp}$ can be defined as below.

$$\text{prefix} :: \ \text{FlippE} \ \alpha \ \text{e} \ \Rightarrow \ \text{a Exp} \ \rightarrow \ e \ \text{D}$$

$$\text{prefix} \ x = \ \text{case} \ x$$

$$\text{[unOne} \ \text{t text} \ "1"

$$\text{unSub} \ \lambda x \ y \rightarrow \ \text{text} \ "-" \ \text{prefix} \ x \ \text{prefix} \ y$$
Here, we used Haskell recursions, which is enough for LL grammars and certain parser combinators such as parsec.

4 Embedding Recursive Definitions

Using Haskell-level recursions is nice, but it severely limits the expressive power. For example, we cannot express pretty-printers that are converted to left-recursive grammars (such as Fig. 2 and 3); parser combinators without explicit handling of recursions loop for them. Thus, we need to treat recursions explicitly so that we can generate arbitrary CFGs with conversions or analysis on them.

One natural solution would be having a fixed-point combinator. This would be achieved by adding a method fix :: (e τ → e τ) → e τ to the class FliPpr a e. This solution works, but is unsatisfactory. The method itself does not provide a way to share generated sub-grammars, and will result in grammar-size blow-up for mutual recursions. We could use a variant that supports mutual recursions like gmark :: Grammar s a e τ where

The method gmark marks recursive definitions. For example, nil and space in Section 2.1.1 will be implemented as below.

data Grammar s a = G {unG :: ST s (StParser s a)}

Here, we assumed that nil appears in a context. Notice that it does not make sense to share manyParens d as it must yield different grammars for d. The use of local is also prompted by static typing, as without it manyParens will end up with a monadic type as a result of mark.

4.1 Representation of Grammars

Similar to the previous section, we focus on parsing semantics. Since now we need to generate recursive grammars, we need to specify how we represent them. For simplicity we shall use references provided by ST s monad; it also has the added benefit of working well with the marking approach.

nt :: STRef s (ST s (StParser s a)) -> StParser s a

Intuitively, nt ref represents a non-terminal, where ref points to its definition.

One of the uses of nt is to represent sharing.

gmark :: Grammar s a -> ST s (Grammar s a)
gmark (G m) = do ref <-> newSTRef m
   return $ G (return (nt ref))

The gmark can be used to construct recursive grammars via MonadFix operations.

as :: ST s (Grammar s String)
as = do rec x <- gmark $(ptext "") <$> ((+) <$> ptext "a" <*> x)
   return x

The argument of nt is a reference to a monadic computation instead of a pure expression, which essentially represents laziness. This is not so useful for now, but will be when we manipulate grammars, where we want also to delay monadic computation such as dereferencing.

4.2 Instance of FliPprD for Parsing

The changes to the underlying parser means that the PE type in Section 3.2.2 needs to be adapted; it now takes an additional type parameter s and uses Grammar s (R Γ τ) instead of Parser (R Γ τ). The rest of the code remains unchanged because Grammar s a and Parser a share the same APIs.

Now, we are ready to give a parsing instance. The first step is to prepare the following monad.

data PM s a = PM (VT.TEnv Γ -> ST s a)
5.1 Wrapping Raw Type Variables

The current APIs of the embedded FliPpr expose raw type variables \(a\) and \(e\). This is inconvenient if we want to make FliPpr syntax as an instance of a type class. For example, we may want to use the same APIs for both FliPpr programs and the usual pretty-printing.

Let us assume that the APIs developed so far are located under a module Core. Then, we provide a “wrapped” version of the APIs as below.

```haskell
newtype A a i = A {unA :: a i}
newtype E a τ = E {unE :: a τ}

abs :: (FliPprE a e, Eq i) ⇒ (A a i → E e τ) → E e (t → τ)

abs f = E (Core.abs (unE o f o A))
...
```

With this wrapped APIs, we can make instances without worrying about overlapping instances. For example, we can make FliPpr programs as a Monoid instance.

```haskell
instance (τ ∼ D) ⇒ Monoid (E e τ) where
mempty = text ""
mappend = mappend (E e1) (E e2) = E (e1, Core. ◦ e2)
```

Here, the constraint \(τ ∼ D\) saves us from cluttering the constraints Monoid (E e τ) for uses of mempty and mappend.

5.2 Inter-conversion from/to Haskell Functions

Using `app` and `abs` explicitly for every function definition and application is tedious. To resolve the issue, we provide the following type class for inter-conversion between \(E e (t_1 → ⋯ → t_n → D)\) and \(A a t_1 → ⋯ → A a t_n → E e D\), by using `abs` and `app`.

```haskell
class Repr (a :: s → s) e τ r |
| e → a, e τ → r, r → a e τ where


toFunction :: E e τ → r
fromFunction :: r → E e τ
```

The type class has the following instances.

```haskell
instance FliPprE a e ⇒ Repr a e D (E e D) where . . .
instance (FliPprE a e, Repr a e τ r, Eq i) ⇒ Repr a e (t → τ) (A a i → τ) where . . .
```

We omit the definitions of `toFunction` and `fromFunction`, which follow straightforwardly from their types.

With this type class, we can define the following function.

```haskell
define :: (FliPprD m a e, Repr a e τ r) ⇒ r → m r
define f = fmap toFunction $ mark (fromFunction f)
```

Function `define` eliminates direct use of `app` and `abs`. Now we can write

```haskell
  do rec f ← define $ λx → . . . f x . . .
      . . . f y . . .
```

instead of:
The function fromJust

Figure 8. An Embedded FliPpr Program Equivalent to Fig. 1

5.3 Parameterized Recursions

When writing pretty-printers, we often pass a precedence level of a context to decide whether a pretty-printer produces a pair of opening and closing parentheses. For the simple subtraction language, there are only two precedence levels, and thus we pass booleans in Fig. 1. This way of handling precedence is not directly allowed by mark or define.

Thus, we define defines as below.

defines :: (Eq k, Ord k, FliPprD m a e, Repr a e τ r) ⇒ [k] → (k → r) → m (k → r)
defines ks f = do
rs ← mapM (define o f) ks
let tab = Data.Map.fromList $ zip ks rs
return $ λk → fromJust $(Data.Map.lookup k tab)

The function fromJust in Data.Maybe removes Just, which fails if the input is Nothing. The definition might look complicated, but defines [k₁, . . . , kₙ] f essentially defines each f k, and makes a table for looking-up a defined function.

As a result, we can write the pretty-printer for the simple subtraction language as Fig. 8.

5.4 Special Treatment of Spacing Combinators

One may find it tedious to copy the definitions of nil, space, spaceN and lineN to every pretty-printing definition. We may apply local to these functions, but then the grammars generated by the combinators are no longer shared.

Thus we include them to the FliPpr APIs, i.e., FliPprD’s class methods. This is also useful when we parse languages that support comment syntax, where we want spacing combinators to in addition skip comments in parsing. By including them in the APIs, white can be specified at parser generation time, making invertible pretty-printing combinators like manyParens more reusable.

5.5 Implementation of Type/Variable Environments

The value-level type TEnv is represented as a list-like structure, and as a result the coercion coer γ γ′ takes time quadratic to the size of γ, which is unacceptable. Another source of inefficiency is the representation of value environments; mergeEnv γ θ θ′ takes time linear to the size of γ/θ/θ′, while most of elements in θ and θ′ are often Nothing.

To avoid these overhead, we just pass the size of γ (i.e., the nesting depth of binders) and use unsafeCoerce if needed. We also change the representation of value environments so that a consecutive block of elements can be Nothing. This makes coer, mergeEnv, emptyEnv and embedEnv efficient. The function upd n still takes time linear to n, but it is less problematic as n tends to concern recently introduced variables and therefore is usually small.

6 A Larger Example

In this section, we demonstrate the programmability of embedded FliPpr by defining an invertible pretty-printer for the following AST. As we will see, the embedding not only have preserved the benefits of FliPpr, but also enhanced its programmability through the interaction with the host language. Reference code for the original FliPpr version and non-invertible pretty-printer version can be found in Appendix A.2 for comparison.


Despite being simple, the above expression language contains common features in programming languages: keywords, constants and operators with precedence. We assume decomposing functions such as unSub for the constructors. Our current implementation uses Template Haskell to generate such functions.

Let us consider constants and variables. In the original FliPpr, this is done by using the text (f x) as r expression that pretty-prints f x and parses the regular expression r with conversion f⁻¹, for an injection f. For example, an integer n is printed by text (itoa n) as ?[0-9]+ and variable x is printed by text x as [a-z][a-zA-Z0-9]*-let, where - outside of square brackets represents subtraction.

So our first goal is to give an equivalent expression in the embedded FliPpr. First, we prepare a function that makes a printer from a deterministic finite-state automaton (DFA).

type Q = Int
data DFA = DFA Q [(Q,(Char, Q))] Q
fromDFA :: FliPprD m a e ⇒ DFA → m (A a String → E e D)
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In this paper, we looked at the embedding of FliPpr. Through the techniques are presented in the specific context, some of the results are expected to be of more general interests.

Recall that there are three characteristics of FliPpr language: (1) treelessness, (2) first-orderliness and (3) explicit handling of recursions. These characteristics are actually rather common in invertible languages. For example, Mat-suda et al. [23] and Nishida et al. [29] also discuss the inversion of treeless languages. Since treelessness essentially characterizes transducer-like computation, where the inputs and outputs are separated, we believe a similar technique would be applicable to invertible transducers [15, 22].

Not all languages require an elaborate treatment of recursions like the case of FliPpr. For lenses [10] and reversible functional languages such as RFUN [38], the usual (i.e., Haskell-level) fixed-point is sufficient. Consequently, there is no need to have abs and app, as using Haskell-level functions on the guest-language’s expressions would suffice. However, there are still other binders (such as let and case expressions) where the unembedding transformation is needed.

Some program inversion methods are realized by whole program analysis and transformation [12]. That is, they are transformations from a programming language to another, which is similar to the original spirit of the unembedding.

There are other embedded systems for defining pairs of parser and printer. Rendel and Ostermann [34] propose an embedded invertible syntax description framework based on arrow combinators [17], in which users define printers and parsers in the same language. But they do not support control on pretty-printing (i.e., group and nest), nor point-wise programming. Despite being based on arrow combinators, invertible syntax description is not proper arrows and thus not subject to the arrow syntax [32]. Moreover, the framework is hardwired to a certain parsing semantics, whereas ours generates CFGs open to different parsing algorithms.

Danielsson [7] develops a framework in Agda, in which users write a grammar and a pretty-printer, where the correctness of the pretty-printer with respect to the grammar is guaranteed by construction with the help of dependent types, as the pretty-printing combinators convey proofs. Unlike ours and the invertible syntax framework, users write both a
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pretty-printer and a grammar, which leads to a maintenance problem: changes to one may imply non-trivial changes to the other.

We use the ST monad for representing grammars, while Baars et al. [3] use de Bruijn index for type-safe representation of recursive grammars. To use de Bruijn index in our setting requires elaborating type-level programming to deal with mutually defined functions. We also note that the idea of using monads to express laziness and sharing can be found in Fischer et al. [9], and Matsuda and Asada [21].

Parametric higher-order abstract syntax (PHOAS) [5] is another technique for reusing host language’s binders. This representation has the similar problem with the tagless-final style in embedding invertible languages. Moreover, mark-like methods that do not return the expression type are not well expressed in PHOAS.

Polakow [33] proposes an embedding method of the linear λ calculus to Haskell, which does not require explicit weakening of terms. Although there is no weakening in the linear λ calculus, he considers a variant of which typing judgment has the form of \( \Gamma_1 \backslash \Gamma_2 \vdash e : \tau \), where the difference between \( \Gamma_1 \) and \( \Gamma_2 \) represents the original linear type environment, but allows weakening-like conversion from \( \Gamma_1 \backslash \Gamma_2 \vdash e : \tau \) to \( (\Gamma_1, \Gamma') \backslash (\Gamma_2, \Gamma') \vdash e : \tau \). He avoids explicit conversion by abstracting a type environment through polymorphism; type instantiation suffices for weakening because de Bruijn levels are used instead of indices. The technique is also useful for a non-linear setting as in FliPpr. However, being polymorphic complicates manipulation of terms. For example, explicit type signatures are mandatory for recursive definitions [14], while being optional in unembedding.

Matsuda and Wang [25, 26] provide a way to convert lenses [10] to functions via Yoneda embedding, which enables us to compose lenses via Haskell’s usual higher-order functions. Since invertible functions are a special case of lenses, we could use this approach for pretty-printing primitives. However, the method does not handle lens combinators well and is not sufficient for our purpose. For example, there will be a restriction that case branches must be closed, ruling out programs such as fromDFA. The language HO-BiT is designed [27] to overcome this problem. But just like FliPpr, HO-BiT is standalone, which may also benefit from the techniques proposed in this paper for an embedded implementation.

8 Conclusion

We have developed an embedded version of FliPpr using the unembedding transformation [1, 2]. The benefit is enhanced interoperability with Haskell (as the host language): one can interconvert FliPpr functions and Haskell functions, and FliPpr functions can manipulate Haskell’s datatypes. This newly gained power is useful. We are now able to construct FliPpr programs using Haskell functions, avoiding rather complex programs transformations and syntactic restrictions of the original FliPpr—they can be mimicked by the new APIs (mark and local) and Haskell function (defines).

A Appendix

A.1 Implementation of coer

The implementation is a bit different from the untyped case [2] and the Agda implementation case [19]. The basic structure of coer is as follows.

\[
\text{coer} \ y \ y' \ x \mid \text{Just Refl} \leftarrow \text{eqEnv} \ y \ y' = x \\
\text{coer} \ y \ (\text{Text} \ y' \ _) = \mathcal{S} (\text{coer} \ y \ y')
\]

Here, Refl is the constructor of the following datatype that represents propositional equality.

\[
\text{data} \ a : \sim : b \ where \ \text{Refl} :: a : \sim : a
\]

There are two ways to implement eqEnv. One approach is to use eqT from Data.Typeable.

\[
\text{eqEnv} :: (\text{Typeable} \ \Gamma, \text{Typeable} \ \Gamma') \Rightarrow \\
\text{TEnv} \ \Gamma \rightarrow \text{TEnv} \ \Gamma' \rightarrow \text{Maybe} (\Gamma : \sim : \Gamma')
\]

\[
\text{eqEnv} \ |- _ = \text{eqT}
\]

This works and is efficient (eqT runs in O(1) time as it performs comparison (only) on hash values), but requires \( \Gamma \) and \( \Gamma' \) to be Typeable instances, scattering Typeable constraints to coer and the TEnv definition and so on.

Thus, for simplicity of presentation, we avoid the above definition and use the following definition instead.

\[
\text{eqEnv} :: \text{TEnv} \ \Gamma \rightarrow \text{TEnv} \ \Gamma' \rightarrow \text{Maybe} (\Gamma : \sim : \Gamma')
\]

\[
\text{eqEnv} \ TEnv \ TEnv = \text{Just Refl}
\]

\[
\text{eqEnv} (\text{Text} \ y \ _) (\text{Text} \ y' \ _) = \\
\text{case} \ \text{eqEnv} \ y \ y' \ of \\
\text{Nothing} \rightarrow \text{Nothing}
\]

\[
\text{Just Refl} \rightarrow \text{Just} (\text{unsafeCoerce} \ \text{Refl})
\]

\[
\text{eqEnv} \ |- _ = \text{Nothing}
\]

Notice that we have \( \Gamma = \Gamma' \) if \( y \) and \( y' \) have the same size [1], and the use of unsafeCoerce does not risk type safety. This version of coer \( y \ y' \) takes time quadratic to the size of \( y \). As discussed in Section 5.5, we use a more efficient implementation with more aggressive use of unsafeCoerce to make coer constant time. The actual implementation can be found in the module Text.FliPpr.Internal_PARTIALEnv in the implementation site.

A.2 Code Comparison

The following is a program in the original FliPpr’s surface language, which corresponds to Section 6.

\[
\text{ppr} \ x = \text{nil} \leftarrow \text{pprE} \ 0 \ x \leftarrow \text{nil}
\]

\[
\text{pprVar} \ x = \text{text} \ as \ ([\text{a-z}][\text{a-zA-Z-0-9}]* \) \leftarrow \text{let}
\]

\[
\text{pprE} \ k \ x = \text{manyParen} (\text{pprE} \ k \ x)
\]

\[
\text{pprE}' \ k \ (\text{Num} \ n) = \text{text} \ (\text{itoa} \ n) \text{ as } -?[0-9]+ \\
\text{pprE}' \ k \ (\text{Var} \ x) = \text{pprVar} \ x
\]
Embedding Invertible Languages with Binders

would be as follows.

One might find that Sub and Div branches are similar, but since the original FliPpr is first-order, we cannot extract the common pattern between the branches. A subtle difference is that we replaced $\leftrightarrow$ with its definition as the original FliPpr does not allow users to define binary operators.

If we just use Wadler’s combinators in Haskell, the code would be as follows.

Here, we use Doc for the objects that retain pretty-printing information in Wadler’s combinators[36]. Notice that we do not use many Parens, nil, space and spaceN here because we do not specify parsing behavior in pure pretty-printing. It is interesting see that the definition of opP is the same as that in Section 6, which is impossible in the original FliPpr. On the other hand, both original FliPpr and Haskell versions use ordinary pattern matching, which has to be simulated by deconstructing functions such as unSub in embedded FliPpr.
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