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Abstract
We describe a new approach to domain specific languages (DSLs), called Quoted DSLs (QDSLs), that resurrects two old ideas: quotation, from McCarthy’s Lisp of 1960, and the subformula property, from Gentzen’s natural deduction of 1935. Quoted terms allow the DSL to share the syntax and type system of the host language. Normalising quoted terms ensures the subformula property, which guarantees that one can use higher-order types in the source while guaranteeing first-order types in the target, and enables using types to guide fusion. We test our ideas by re-implementing Feldspar, which was originally implemented as an Embedded DSL (EDSL), as a QDSL; and we compare the QDSL and EDSL variants.

Categories and Subject Descriptors D.1.1 [Applicative (Functional) Programming]; D.3.1 [Formal Definitions and Theory]; D.3.2 [Language Classifications]: Applicative (functional) languages
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1. Introduction
Don’t throw the past away  
You might need it some rainy day  
Dreams can come true again  
When everything old is new again  
— Peter Allen and Carole Sager

Implementing domain-specific languages (DSLs) via quotation is one of the oldest ideas in computing, going back at least to McCarthy’s Lisp, which was introduced in 1960 and had macros as early as 1963. Today, a more fashionable technique is Embedded DSLs (EDSLs), which may use shallow embedding, deep embedding, or a combination of the two. Our goal in this paper is to reinvigorate the idea of building DSLs via quotation, by introducing an approach we dub Quoted DSLs (QDSLs). A key feature of QDSLs is the use of normalisation to ensure the subformula property, first proposed by Gentzen in 1935.

Imitation is the sincerest of flattery.  
— Charles Caleb Colton

Cheney et al. (2013) describe a DSL for language-integrated query in F# that translates into SQL. Their technique depends on quotation, normalisation of quoted terms, and the subformula property—an approach which we here dub QDSL. They conjecture that other DSLs might benefit from the same technique, particularly those that perform staged computation, where host code at generation-time computes target code to be executed at run-time.

Generality starts at two. Here we test the conjecture of Cheney et al. (2013) by reimplementing the EDSL Feldspar (Axelsson et al. 2010) as a QDSL. We describe the key features of the design, and show that the performance of the two versions is comparable. We compare the QDSL and EDSL variants of Feldspar, and assess the tradeoffs between the two approaches.

Davies and Pfenning (2001) also suggest quotation as a foundation for staged computation, and note a propositions-as-types connection between quotation and a modal logic; our type $\alpha$ corresponds to their type $\square \alpha$. They also mention in passing the utility of normalising quoted terms, although they do not mention the subformula property.

The .NET Language-Integrated Query (LINQ) framework as used in C# and F# (Meijer et al. 2006; Syme 2006), and the Lightweight Modular Staging (LMS) framework as used in Scala (Rompf and Odersky 2010), exhibit overlap with the techniques described here. Notably, they use quotation to represent staged DSL programs, and they make use to a greater or lesser extent of normalisation. In F# LINQ quotation is indicated in the normal way (by writing quoted programs inside special symbols), while in C# LINQ and Scala LMS quotation is indicated by type inference (quoted terms are given a special type).

Perhaps we may express the essential properties of such a normal proof by saying: it is not roundabout.  
— Gerhard Gentzen

Our approach exploits the fact that normalised terms satisfy the subformula property, first introduced in the context of natural deduction by Gentzen (1935), and improved by Prawitz (1965).

The subformulas of a formula are its subparts; for instance, the subformulas of $A \to B$ are the formula itself and the subformulas of $A$ and $B$. The subformula property states that every proof can be put into a normal form where the only propositions that appear in the proof are subformulas of the hypotheses and conclusion of the proof. Applying the principle of Propositions as Types (Howard 1980; Wadler 2015), the subformula property states that every lambda term can be put into a normal form where the only types that appear in the term are subformulas of the types of the free variables and the type of the term itself.
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The subformula property provides users of the DSL with useful guarantees, such as the following:

- they may write higher-order terms while guaranteeing to generate first-order code;
- they may write a sequence of loops over arrays while guaranteeing to generate code that fuses those loops;
- they may write intermediate terms with nested collections while guaranteeing to generate code that operates on flat data.

The first and second are used in this paper, and are key to generating C; while the first and third are used by Cheney et al. (2013) and are key to generating SQL.

The subformula property is closely related to conservativity. A conservativity result expresses that adding a feature to a system of logic, or to a programming language, does not make it more expressive. Consider intuitionistic logic with conjunction; conservativity states that adding implication to this logic proves no additional theorems that can be stated in the original logic. Such a conservativity result is an immediate consequence of the subformula property; since the hypotheses and conjunction of the proof only mention conjunction, any proof, even if it uses implication, can be put into a normal form that only uses conjunction. Equivalently, any lambda calculus term that mentions only pair types in its free variables and result, even if it uses functions, can be put in a normal form that only uses pairs. Such a result is related to the first bullet point above; see Proposition 4.4 in Section 4.

As another example, the third bullet point above corresponds to a standard conservativity result for databases, namely that nested queries are no more expressive than flat queries (Wong 1996). This conservativity result, as implied by the subformula property, is used by Cheney et al. (2013) to show that queries that use intermediate nesting can be translated to SQL, which only queries flat tables and does not support nesting of data.

The subformula property holds only for terms in normal form. Previous work, such as Cheney et al. (2013) uses call-by-name normalisation algorithm that may cause computations to be repeated. Here we present call-by-value and call-by-need normalisation algorithms that guarantee to preserve sharing of computations. We also present a sharpened version of the subformula property, which we apply to characterise the circumstances under which a QDSL may guarantee to generate first-order code.

Good artists copy, great artists steal. — Picasso

EDSL is great in part because it steals the type system of its host language. Arguably, QDSL is greater because it steals the type system, the syntax, and the normalisation rules of its host language.

In theory, an EDSL should also steal the syntax of its host language, but in practice the theft is often only partial. For instance, an EDSL such as Feldspar (Axelsson et al. 2010) or Nikola (Mainland and Morrisett 2010), when embedded in Haskell, can exploit overloading so that arithmetic operations in both languages appear identical, but the same is not true of comparison or conditionals. In QDSL, the syntax of the host and embedded languages is identical. For instance, this paper presents a QDSL variant of Feldspar, again in Haskell, where arithmetic, comparison, and conditionals are all represented by quoted terms, and hence identical to the host.

An EDSL may also steal the normalisation rules of its host language, using evaluation in the host to normalise terms of the target, but again the theft is often only partial. Section 5 compares QDSL and EDSL variants of Feldspar. In the first example, it is indeed the case that the EDSL achieves by evaluation of host terms what the QDSL achieves by normalisation of quoted terms. However, in other cases, the EDSL must perform normalisation of the deep embedding corresponding to how the QDSL normalises quoted terms.

Try to give all of the information to help others to judge the value of your contribution; not just the information that leads to judgment in one particular direction or another.

— Richard Feynman

The subformula property depends on normalisation, but normalisation may lead to exponential blowup in the size of the normalised code when there are nested conditionals; and hyperexponential blowup in recondite cases involving higher-order functions. We explain how uninterpreted constants allow the user to control where normalisation does and does not occur, while still maintaining the subformula property. Future work is required to consider trade-offs between full normalisation as required for the subformula property and special-purpose normalisation as used in many DSLs; possibly a combination of both will prove fruitful.

Some researchers contend an essential property of a DSL which generates target code is that every type-correct term should successfully generate code in the target language. EDSL Feldspar satisfies this property; but neither P-LINQ of Cheney et al. (2013) nor QDSL Feldspar satisfy this property, since the user is required to eyeball quoted code to ensure it mentions only permitted operators. If this is thought too onerous, it is possible to ensure the property with additional preprocessing.

This is the short and the long of it. — Shakespeare

The contributions of this paper are:

- To introduce QDSLs as an approach to building DSLs based on quotation, normalisation of quoted terms, and the subformula property by presenting the design of a QDSL variant of Feldspar (Section 2).
- To measure QDSL and EDSL implementations of Feldspar, and show they offer comparable performance (Section 3).
- To present normalisation algorithms for call-by-value and call-by-need that preserve sharing, and to formulate a sharpened version of the subformula property and apply it to characterise when higher-order terms normalise to first-order form (Section 4).
- To compare the QDSL variant of Feldspar with the deep and shallow embedding approach used in the EDSL variant of Feldspar, and show they offer tradeoffs with regard to ease of use (Section 5).

Section 6 describes related work, and Section 7 concludes.

Our QDSL and EDSL variants of Feldspar and benchmarks are available at https://github.com/shayan-najd/QFeldspar

2. Feldspar as a QDSL

Feldspar is an EDSL for writing signal-processing software, that generates code in C (Axelsson et al. 2010). We present a variant, QDSL Feldspar, that follows the structure of the previous design closely, but using the methods of QDSL rather than EDSL. Section 5 compares the QDSL and EDSL designs.

2.1 The top level

In QDSL Feldspar, our goal is to translate a quoted term to C code. The top-level function has the type:

$$qds :: \text{Rep } a, \text{Rep } b \rightarrow \text{Qt } (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow C$$

Here $\text{Qt } a$ represents a Haskell term of type $a$, its quoted representation, and type $C$ represents code in C. The top-level function...
expects a quoted term representing a function from type $a$ to type $b$, and returns C code that computes the function.

Not all types representable in Haskell are easily representable in C. For instance, we do not wish our target C code to manipulate higher-order functions. The argument type $a$ and result type $b$ of the main function must be representable, which is indicated by the type-class restrictions $\text{Rep} \ a$ and $\text{Rep} \ b$. Representable types include integers, floats, and pairs where the components are both representable.

\begin{verbatim}
instance Rep Int
instance Rep Float
instance (Rep a, Rep b) ⇒ Rep (a,b)
\end{verbatim}

2.2 A first example

Let’s begin with the “hello world” of program generation, the power function. Since division by zero is undefined, we arbitrarily choose that raising zero to a negative power yields zero. Here is an optimised power function represented using QDSL:

\begin{verbatim}
power :: Int → Qt (Float → Float)
power n =
  if n < 0 then
    l (λx → if x == 0 then 0 else 1 / (power (-n)) x)]
  else if n == 0 then
    l (λx → 1)
  else if even n then
    l (λx → let y = power (n div 2) x in y × y)]
  else
    l (λx → x × (power (n - 1) x)]
\end{verbatim}

The type quasi-quoting mechanism of Template Haskell is used to indicate which code executes at which time. Unquoted code executes at generation-time while quoted code executes at run-time. Quoting is indicated by $l[\ldots]$ and unquoting by $\mathrm{Qt}(\ldots)$.

Invoking \textit{qdsl (power \ (-6))} generates code to raise a number to its $-6$ power. Evaluating $\text{power} \ (-6)$ yields the following:

\begin{verbatim}
\begin{align*}
& l (λx → if x == 0 then 0 else 1 / (λx → let \{ y = (λx → x × (λx → x × (λx → x × x)) x) in y × y \} in y × x)]
& l (λx → let \{ y = (λx → x × (λx → x × x)) x \} in y × x)]
\end{align*}
\end{verbatim}

Normalising as described in Section\textsuperscript{[4]} with variables renamed for readability, yields the following:

\begin{verbatim}
\begin{align*}
& l (λx → if u == 0 then 0 else
  let v = u × 1 in
  let w = u × (v × v) in
  1 / (w × w)]
\end{align*}
\end{verbatim}

With the exception of the top-level term, all of the overhead of lambda abstraction and function application has been removed; we explain below why this is guaranteed by the subformula property. From the normalised term it is easy to generate the final C code:

\begin{verbatim}
float prog (float u) {
  float v, float w, float r;
  if (u == 0.0) {
    r = 0.0;
  } else {
    v = (u * 1.0);
    w = (u * (v * v));
    r = (1.0f / (w * w));
  }
  return r;
}
\end{verbatim}

By default, we always generate a routine called \textit{prog}; it is easy to provide the name as an additional parameter if required.

Depending on your point of view, quotation in this form of QDSL is either desirable, because it makes manifest the staging, or undesirable because it is too noisy. QDSL enables us to “steal” the entire syntax of the host language for our DSL. In Haskell, an EDSL can use the same syntax for arithmetic operators, but must use a different syntax for equality tests and conditionals, as explained in Section\textsuperscript{[5]}.

Within the quotation brackets there appear lambda abstractions and function applications, while our intention is to generate first-order code. How can the QDSL Feldspar user be certain that such function applications do not render transformation to first-order code impossible or introduce additional runtime overhead? The answer is the subformula property.

2.3 The subformula property

Gentzen’s subformula property guarantees that any proof can be normalised so that the only formulas that appear within it are subformulas of one of the hypotheses or of the conclusion of the proof. Viewed through the lens of Propositions as Types, Gentzen’s subformula property guarantees that any term can be normalised so that the type of each of its subterms is a subformula of either the type of one of its free variables (corresponding to hypotheses) or of the term itself (corresponding to the conclusion). Here the subformulas of a type are the type itself and the subformulas of its parts, where the parts of $a \rightarrow b$ are $a$ and $b$, the parts of $(a, b)$ are $a$ and $b$, and types $\text{Int}$ and $\text{Float}$ have no parts. (See Proposition\textsuperscript{[4,2]}.)

Further, it is easy to adapt the original proof to guarantee a sharpened subformula property: any term can be normalised so that the type of each of its proper subterms is a proper subformula of either the type of one of its free variables (corresponding to hypotheses) or the term itself (corresponding to the conclusion). Here the proper subterms of a term are all subterms save for free variables and the term itself, and the proper subformulas of a type are all subformulas save for the type itself. In the example of the previous subsection, the sharpened subformula property guarantees that after normalisation a closed term of type $\text{float} \ → \text{float}$ will only have proper subterms of type $\text{float}$, which is indeed true for the normalised term. (See Proposition\textsuperscript{[4,3]}.)

The subformula property depends on normalisation of terms, but complete normalisation is not always possible or desirable. The extent of normalisation may be controlled by introducing uninterpreted constants. In particular, we introduce the uninterpreted constant

\begin{verbatim}
save :: Rep a ⇒ a → a
\end{verbatim}

of arity 1, which is equivalent to the identity function on representable types. Unfolding of an application $L \ M$ can be inhibited by rewriting it in the form \textit{save} $L \ M$, where $L$ and $M$ are arbitrary terms. A use of \textit{save} appears in Section\textsuperscript{[2,6]} In a context with recursion, we take

\begin{verbatim}
fix :: (a → a) → a
\end{verbatim}

as an uninterpreted constant.

2.4 A second example

In the previous code, we arbitrarily chose that raising zero to a negative power yields zero. Say that we wish to exploit the \textit{Maybe} type of Haskell to refactor the code, by separating identification of the exceptional case (negative exponent of zero) from choosing a value for this case (zero). We decompose \textit{power} into two functions \textit{power}‘ and \textit{power}″, where the first returns \textit{Nothing} in the exceptional case, and the second maps \textit{Nothing} to a suitable value.

The \textit{Maybe} type is a part of the Haskell standard Prelude.
data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
maybe :: b → (a → b) → Maybe a → b
return :: a → Maybe a
(≫=) :: Maybe a → (a → Maybe b) → Maybe b

Here is the refactored code:

\[
\text{power} :: \mathbb{N} \to \text{Q} (\mathbb{F} \to \text{Maybe} \mathbb{F})
\]
\[
\text{power} \ n =
\begin{cases}
\text{Nothing} & \text{if } n < 0 \\
\text{return} \ ((1 / y)) & \text{else if } n \equiv 0 \\
\text{return} \ ((1 / y)) & \text{else if } n \ \text{even} \\
\text{return} \ ((x \times y)) & \text{else}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\text{power''} :: \mathbb{N} \to \text{Q} (\mathbb{F} \to \text{Maybe} \mathbb{F})
\]
\[
\text{power''} \ n =
\begin{cases}
\text{nothing} & \text{if } n \not\equiv 0 \\
\text{return} \ ((1 / y)) & \text{else if } n \ \text{even} \\
\text{return} \ ((x \times y)) & \text{else}
\end{cases}
\]

Evaluation and normalisation of \(\text{power} (-6)\) and \(\text{power''} (-6)\) yield identical terms (up to renaming), and hence applying qdsl to these yields identical C code.

The subformula property is key: because the final type of the result does not involve \textit{Maybe} it is certain that normalisation will remove all its occurrences. Occurrences of do notation are expanded to applications of \((≫=)\) as usual. Rather than taking \textit{return}, \((≫=)\), and \textit{maybe} as uninterpreted constants (whose types have subformulas involving \textit{Maybe}), we treat them as known definitions to be eliminated by the normaliser. Type \textit{Maybe} is a sum type, and is normalised as described in Section 4.

2.5 While

Code that is intended to compile to a while loop in C is indicated in QDSL Feldspar by application of \textit{while}.

\[
\text{while} :: (\text{Rep } s) \Rightarrow (s \to \text{Bool}) \to (s \to s) \to s \to s
\]

Rather than using side-effects, while takes three arguments: a predicate over the current state, of type \(s \to \text{Bool}\); a function from current state to new state, of type \(s \to s\); and an initial state of type \(s\); and it returns a final state of type \(s\). So that we may compile while loops to C, the type of the state is constrained to representable types.

We can define a for loop in terms of a while loop.

\[
\text{for} :: (\text{Rep } s) \Rightarrow \text{Q} (\text{Int} \to s \to (\text{Int} \to s \to s) \to s)
\]
\[
\text{for} = \lambda n s_0 b \to snd \ (\text{while} \ (\lambda i, s) \ i < n)
\]
\[
\lambda (i, s) \ i + 1, b i s))
\]
\[
\lambda (0, s_0))
\]

The state of the while loop is a pair consisting of a counter and the state of the for loop. The body \(b\) of the for loop is a function that expects both the counter and the state of the for loop. The counter is discarded when the loop is complete, and the final state of the for loop returned. Here while, like snd and (+), is a constant known to QDSL Feldspar, and so not enclosed in $$ antiques.

As an example, we can define Fibonacci using a for loop.

\[
\text{fib} :: \text{Q} (\text{Int} \to \text{Int})
\]
\[
\text{fib} = \lambda n \to \text{fst} \ (\forall \ n (0, 1) \ (\lambda i (a, b) \ (b, a + b)))\]

Again, the subformula property plays a key role. As explained in Section 5, primitives of the language to be compiled, such as \((\times)\) and \textit{while}, are treated as free variables or constants of a given arity. As described in Section 4, we can ensure that after normalisation every occurrence of \textit{while} has the form

\[
\text{while} \ (\lambda s \ as \ \cdots) \ (\lambda s \ as \ \cdots) \ (\cdots)
\]

where the first ellipsis has type \textit{Bool}, and both occurrences of the bound variable \(s\) and the second and third ellipses all have the same type, that of the state of the while loop.

Unsurprisingly, and in accord with the subformula property, each occurrence of \textit{while} in the normalised code will contain subterms with the type of its state. The restriction of state to representable types increases the utility of the subformula property. For instance, since we have chosen that \textit{Maybe} is not a representable type, we can ensure that any top-level function without \textit{Maybe} in its type will normalise to code not containing \textit{Maybe} in the type of any subterm. In particular, \textit{Maybe} cannot appear in the state of a \textit{while} loop, which is restricted to representable types. An alternative choice is possible, as we will see in the next section.

2.6 Arrays

A key feature of Feldspar is its distinction between two types of arrays, manifest arrays, \textit{Arr}, which may appear at run-time, and “pull arrays”, \textit{Vec}, which are eliminated by fusion at generation-time. Again, we exploit the subformula property to ensure no subtrees of type \textit{Vec} remain in the final program.

The type \textit{Arr} of manifest arrays is simply Haskell’s array type, specialised to arrays with integer indices and zero-based indexing. The type \textit{Vec} of pull arrays is defined in terms of existing types, as a pair consisting of the length of the array and a function that given an index returns the array element at that index.

\[
\text{type } \text{Arr } a = \text{Array } \text{Int } a
\]

\[
\text{data } \text{Vec } a = \text{Vec } \text{Int } (\text{Int} \to a)
\]

Values of type \textit{Arr} are representable, assuming that the element type is representable, while values of type \textit{Vec} are not representable.

\[
\text{instance } (\text{Rep } a) \Rightarrow (\text{Rep } \text{Arr } a)
\]

For arrays, we assume the following primitive operations.

\[
\text{mkArr} :: (\text{Rep } a) \Rightarrow (\text{Int} \to a) \to \text{Arr } a
\]
\[
\text{lnArr} :: (\text{Rep } a) \Rightarrow \text{Arr } a \to \text{Int}
\]
\[
\text{ixArr} :: (\text{Rep } a) \Rightarrow \text{Arr } a \to \text{Int}
\]

The first populates a manifest array of the given size using the given indexing function, the second returns the length of the array, and the third returns the array element at the given index. Array components must be representable.

We define functions to convert between the two representations in the obvious way.

\[
\text{toVec} :: \text{Rep } a \Rightarrow \text{Q} (\text{Arr } a \to \text{Vec } a)
\]
\[
\text{toVec} = \lambda a \to \text{Vec} \ (\text{lnArr } a \to \text{Arr } a \to \text{Int})
\]
\[
\text{fromVec} :: \text{Rep } a \Rightarrow \text{Q} (\text{Vec } a \to \text{Arr } a)
\]
\[
\text{fromVec} = \lambda a \to \text{Vec} \ (\text{ixArr } a \to \text{Arr } a)
\]

It is straightforward to define operations on vectors, including combining corresponding elements of two vectors, summing the elements of a vector, dot product of two vectors, and norm of a vector. When combining two vectors, the length of the result is the minimum of the lengths of the arguments.

\[
\text{minim} :: \text{Ord } a \Rightarrow \text{Q} (a \to a \to a)
\]
\[
\text{minim} = \lambda x y \to \text{if } x < y \text{ then } x \text{ else } y
\]
3. Implementation

The original EDSL Feldspar generates values of a GADT (called $Dp$ in Section 5), with constructs that represent while and manifest arrays similar to those above. A backend then compiles values of type $Dp$ a to C code. QDSL Feldspar provides a transformer from $Qt$ a to $Dp$ a, and shares the EDSL Feldspar backend.

The transformer from $Qt$ to $Dp$ performs the following steps.

- In any context where a constant $c$ is not fully applied, it replaces $c$ with $\lambda x . c \, x$. It replaces identifiers connected to the type $Maybe$, such as return, ($\_\_\_\_\_\_$), and maybe, by their definitions.
- It normalises the term to ensure the subformula property, using the rules of Section 4. The normaliser supports a limited set of types, including tuples, $Maybe$, and $Vec$.
- It performs simple type inference, which is used to resolve overloading. Overloading is limited to a fixed set of cases, including overloading arithmetic operators at types $Int$ and $Float$.
- It traverses the term, converting $Qt$ to $Dp$. It checks that only permitted primitives appear in $Qt$, and translates these to their corresponding representation in $Dp$. Permitted primitives include: $(\_\_\_\_\_), (<), (+), (\times)$, and similar, plus while, makeArr, lenArr, ixArr, and save.

An unfortunate feature of typed quasiquotation in GHC is that the implementation discards all type information when creating the representation of a term. Type $Qt$ a is a synonym for the type $TH.\, Qt\, a$ where $TH$ denotes the library for Template Haskell. $TH.\, Q$ is the quotation monad (used to look up identifiers and generate fresh names), and $TH.\, TExp\, a$ is the parse tree for a quoted expression returning a value of type $a$ (a wrapper for the type $TH.\, TExp$ of untyped expressions, with $a$ as a phantom variable). Thus, the translator from $Qt$ a to $Dp$ a is forced to re-infer all type for subterms, and for this reason we support only limited overloading, and we translate the $Maybe$ monad as a special case rather than supporting overloading for monad operations in general.

The backend performs three transformations over $Dp$ terms before compiling to C. First, common subexpressions are recognised and transformed to $let$ bindings. Second, $Dp$ terms are normalised using exactly the same rules used for normalising $Qt$ terms, as described in Section 4. Third, $Dp$ terms are optimised using $\eta$ contraction for conditionals and arrays:

\[
\text{if } L \text{ then } M \text{ else } M \rightarrow M
\]

\[
\text{makeArr} (\text{lenArr} M) (\text{ixArr} M) \rightarrow M
\]

and a restricted form of linear inlining for $let$ bindings that preserves the order of evaluation.

Figure 6 lists lines of code, benchmarks used, and performance results. The translator from $Dp$ to C is shared by QDSL and EDSL Feldspar, and listed in a separate column. All five benchmarks run under QDSL and EDSL Feldspar generate identical C code, up to permutation of independent assignments, with identical compile and run times. The columns for QDSL and EDSL Feldspar give compile and run times for Haskell, while the columns for generated code give compile and run times for the generated C. QDSL compile times are slightly greater than EDSL, and QDSL run times range from identical to four times that of EDSL, the increase being due to normalisation time (our normaliser was not designed to be particularly efficient).

4. The subformula property

This section introduces reduction rules for normalising terms that enforce the subformula property while preserving sharing. The rules adapt to both call-by-need and call-by-value. We work with simple types. The only polymorphism in our examples corresponds to instantiating constants (such as while) at different types.
Types, terms, and values are presented in Figure 2. Let \( A, B, C \) range over types, including base types \((\epsilon)\), functions \((A \rightarrow B)\), products \((A \times B)\), and sums \((A + B)\). Let \( L, M, N \) range over types, and \( x, y, z \) range over variables. Let \( c \) range over constants, which are fully applied according to their arity, as discussed below. As constant applications are non-values, we represent literals as free variables.

Terms in normal form satisfy the subformula property. The sharpened subformula property says nothing about the terms of a type other than the type itself.

Let \( \Gamma \) range over type environments, which pair variances with types, and write \( \Gamma \vdash M : A \) to indicate that term \( M \) has type \( A \) under type environment \( \Gamma \). Typing rules are standard.

Reduction rules for normalisation are presented in Figure 3. The rules are confluent, so order of application is irrelevant to the final answer, but we break them into three phases to ease the proof of strong normalisation. It is easy to confirm that all of the reduction rules preserve sharing and preserve order of evaluation.

Write \( M \rightarrow i, N \) to indicate that \( M \) reduces to \( N \) in phase \( i \). Let \( F \) and \( G \) range over two different forms of evaluation frame used in Phases 1 and 2 respectively. Write \( FV(F) \) for the set of free variables of \( F \), and similarly for \( G \). Reductions are closed under compatible closure.

The normalisation procedure consists of exhaustively applying the reductions of Phase 1 until no more apply, then similarly for Phase 2, and finally for Phase 3. Phase 1 performs let-insertion, naming subterms, along the lines of a translation to A-normal form ([Flanagan et al. 1993] or reductions (let.1) and (let.2) in Moggi's metalanguage for monads [Moggi 1991]. Phase 2 performs two kinds of reduction: \( \beta \) rules apply when an introduction (construction) is immediately followed by an elimination (deconstruction), and \( \kappa \) rules push eliminators closer to introducers to enable \( \beta \) rules. Phase 3 "garbage collects" unused terms as in the call-by-need lambda calculus ([Marais et al. 1998]). Phase 3 should be omitted if the intended semantics of the target language is call-by-value rather than call-by-need.

Every term has a normal form.

**Figure 1.** Comparison of QDSL and EDSL Feldspar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>QDSL Feldspar</th>
<th>EDSL Feldspar</th>
<th>Generated Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compile</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>17.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>15.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Times in seconds; minimum time of ten runs.

Quad-core Intel i7-2640M CPU, 2.80 GHz, 3.7 GiB RAM.

GHC 7.8.3; GCC 4.8.2; Ubuntu 14.04 (64-bit).
Types $A, B, C ::= \tau | A \to B | A \times B | A + B$

Terms $L, M, N ::= x \mid \lambda x. N \mid L \cdot M \mid \text{let } x = M \text{ in } N \mid \text{fst } L \mid \text{snd } L \mid \text{inl } M \mid \text{inr } M \mid \text{case } L \text{ of } \{ \text{inl } x. M; \text{inr } y. N \}$

Values $V, W ::= x \mid \lambda x. N \mid (V, W) \mid \text{inl } V \mid \text{inr } W$

**Figure 2.** Types and Terms

Phase 1 (let-insertion)

\[ F ::= [] \mid M \mid V \mid [(\cdot, M) \mid (V, \cdot)] \mid \text{fst } \mid \text{snd } \mid \text{inl } \mid \text{inr } \mid \text{case } \mid \{ \text{inl } x. M; \text{inr } y. N \} \]

\[(let) \quad F[M] \mapsto_1 \quad \text{let } x = M \text{ in } F[x], \quad x \text{ fresh, } M \text{ not a value} \]

Phase 2 (symbolic evaluation)

\[ G ::= \text{let } x = [] \text{ in } N \]

\[ (\kappa , \text{let}) \quad G[\text{let } x = M \text{ in } N] \mapsto_2 \quad \text{let } x = M \text{ in } G[N], \quad x \notin FV(G) \]

\[ (\kappa , \text{case}) \quad G[\text{case } V \text{ of } \{ \text{inl } x. M; \text{inr } y. N \}] \mapsto_2 \quad \text{case } V \text{ of } \{ \text{inl } x. G[M]; \text{inr } y. G[N] \}, \quad x, y \notin FV(G) \]

\[ (\beta , \to) \quad (\lambda x. V) \mapsto_2 \quad \text{let } x = \cdot \text{ in } V \]

\[ (\beta , \times 1) \quad \text{fst } (V, W) \mapsto_2 \quad V \]

\[ (\beta , \times 2) \quad \text{snd } (V, W) \mapsto_2 \quad W \]

\[ (\beta , + 1) \quad \text{case } (\text{inl } V) \text{ of } \{ \text{inl } x. M; \text{inr } y. N \} \mapsto_2 \quad M[x := V] \]

\[ (\beta , + 2) \quad \text{case } (\text{inr } V) \text{ of } \{ \text{inl } x. M; \text{inr } y. N \} \mapsto_2 \quad N[y := W] \]

\[ (\beta , \text{let}) \quad \text{let } x = V \text{ in } N \mapsto_2 \quad N \]

Phase 3 (garbage collection)

\[(\text{need}) \quad \text{let } x = M \text{ in } N \mapsto_3 \quad N, \quad x \notin FV(N) \]

**Figure 3.** Normalisation Rules

Subterm is representable, in the sense introduced in Section 2.1, but this is not quite right. The top-level term is a function from a representable type to a representable type, and the constant while expects subterms of type $s \to \text{Bool}$ and $s \to s$, where the state $s$ is representable. Fortunately, the property required is not hard to formulate in a general way, and is easy to ensure by applying the sharpened subformula property.

Take the representable types to be any set closed under subformulas that does not include function types. We introduce a variant of the usual notion of rank of a type, with respect to a notion of representability. A term of type $A \to B$ has rank $\min(m + 1, n)$ where $m$ is the rank of $A$ and $n$ is the rank of $B$, while a term of representable type has rank 0. We say a term is first-order when every subterm is either representable, or is of the form $\lambda x. N$ where each bound variable and the body is of representable type.

The following characterises translation to a first-order language.

**Proposition 4.4 (First-order).** Consider a term of rank 1, where every free variable has rank 0 and every constant has rank at most 2. Then the term normalises to a term that is first-order.

The property follows immediately by observing that any term $L$ of rank 1 can be rewritten to the form $\lambda \tilde{x}. (L \tilde{x})$ where each bound variable and the body has representable type, and then normalising and applying the sharpened subformula property.

In QDSL Feldspar, while is a constant with type of rank 2 and other constants have types of rank 1. Section 2.6 gives an example of a normalised term. By the proposition, each subterm has a representable type (boolean, integer, float, or a pair of an integer and float) or is a lambda abstraction with bound variables and body of representable type; and it is this property which ensures it is easy to generate C code from the term.

5. Feldspar as an EDSL

This section reviews the combination of deep and shallow embeddings required to implement Feldspar as an EDSL, and considers the trade-offs between the QDSL and EDSL approaches. Much of this section reprises Svenningsson and Axelsson (2012).

The top-level function of EDSL Feldspar has the type:

\[ \text{edsl} :: (\text{Rep } a, \text{Rep } b) \to (\text{Dp } a \to \text{Dp } b) \to C \]

Here $Dp a$ is the deep representation of a term of type $a$. The deep representation is described in detail in Section 5.3 below, and is chosen to be easy to translate to C. As before, type $C$ represents code in C, and type class Rep restricts to representable types.

5.1 A first example

Here is the power function of Section 2.2 written as an EDSL:

\[ \text{power} :: \text{Int} \to \text{Dp Float} \to \text{Dp Float} \]

\[ \text{power } n \ x = \]

\[ \text{if } n < 0 \text{ then} \]

\[ \quad x := 0 \ ? (0, 1 / \text{power } (-n) \ x) \]

\[ \text{else if } n == 0 \text{ then} \]

\[ \quad 1 \]

\[ \text{else if } \text{even } n \text{ then} \]

\[ \quad \text{let } y = \text{power } (n \ \text{div } 2) \ x \ \text{in } y \times y \]

\[ \text{else} \]

\[ \quad x \times \text{power } (n - 1) \ x \]

Type $Q$ (Float $\to$ Float) in the QDSL variant becomes the type $\text{Dp Float} \to \text{Dp Float}$ in the EDSL variant, meaning that $\text{power } n$ accepts a representation of the argument and returns a representation of that argument raised to the $n$’th power.

In the EDSL variant, no quotation is required, and the code looks almost—but not quite!—like an unstaged version of power,
but with different types. Clever encoding tricks, explained later, permit declarations, function calls, arithmetic operations, and numbers to appear the same whether they are to be executed at generation-time or run-time. However, as explained later, comparison and conditionals appear differently depending on whether they are to be executed at generation-time or run-time, using \( M = N \) and if \( L \) then \( M \) else \( N \) for the former but \( M \neq N \) and \( L \)? \((M, N)\) for the latter.

Invoking \texttt{edsl (power \((\neg 6)\))} generates code to raise a number to its \(-6\) power. Evaluating \texttt{power \((\neg 6) \ u\)} where \( u \) is a term representing a variable of type \texttt{Dp Float}, yields the following:

\[
\begin{aligned}
(u \equiv 0) ? (0, 0) \\
1 \div ((u \times ((u \times 1) \times (u \times 1))) \times \\
(u \times ((u \times 1) \times (u \times 1))))
\end{aligned}
\]

Applying common-subexpression elimination permits recovering the sharing structure.

\[
\begin{aligned}
v \equiv (u \times 1) \\
w \equiv u \times (v \times v) \\
\text{top} \equiv (u \equiv 0) ? (0, 1 / (w \times w))
\end{aligned}
\]

From the above, it is easy to generate the final C code, which is identical to that in Section 2.4. Here are points of comparison between the two approaches.

- A function \( a \to b \) is embedded in QDSL as \texttt{Qt \((a \to b)\)} a representation of a function, and in EDSL as \texttt{Dp a \to Dp b}, a function between representations.

- QDSL enables the host and embedded languages to appear identical. In contrast, in Haskell, EDSL requires some term forms, such as comparison and conditionals, to differ between the host and embedded languages. Other languages, notably Scala Virtualised [Rompf et al. 2013], may support more general overloading that allows even comparison and conditionals to be identical.

- QDSL requires syntax to separate quoted and unquoted terms. In contrast, EDSL permits the host and embedded languages to intermingle seamlessly. Depending on your point of view, explicit quotation syntax may be considered as an unnecessary distraction or as drawing a useful distinction between generation-time and run-time. If one takes the former view, the type-based approach to quotation found in C# and Scala might be preferred.

- QDSL may share the same representation for quoted terms across a range of applications; the quoted language is the host language, and does not vary with the specific domain. In contrast, EDSL typically develops custom shallow and deep embeddings for each application; a notable exception is the LMS and Delite frameworks for Scala, which provide a deep embedding shared across several disparate DSLs [Sujeeth et al. 2013].

- QDSL yields an unwieldy structure that requires normalisation. In contrast, EDSL yields the term in normalised form in this case, though there are other situations where a normaliser is required (see Section 5.2).

- QDSL requires traversing the quoted term to ensure it only mentions permitted identifiers. In contrast, EDSL guarantees that if a term has the right type it will translate to the target. If the requirement to eyeball code to ensure only permitted identifiers are used is considered too onerous, it should be easy to build a preprocessor that checks this property. For example, in Haskell, it is possible to incorporate such a preprocessor using MetaHaskell [Mainland 2012].

- Since QDSLs may share the same quoted terms across a range of applications, the cost of building a normaliser or a preprocessor might be amortised across multiple QDSLs for a single language. In the conclusion, we consider the design of a tool for building QDSLs that uses a shared normaliser and preprocessor.

- Once the deep embedding or the normalised quoted term is produced, generating the domain-specific code is similar for both approaches.

5.2 A second example

In Section 2.4 we exploited the \texttt{Maybe} type to refactor the code. In EDSL, we must use a new type, where \texttt{Maybe}, \texttt{Nothing}, \texttt{Just}, and \texttt{maybe} become \texttt{Opt}, \texttt{none}, \texttt{some}, and \texttt{option}, and return and (\texttt{\textasciitilde}) are similar to before.

The term of \texttt{Undef} is explained in Section 5.2 and details of type \texttt{Opt} are given in Section 5.7. Here is the refactored code.

\[
\begin{aligned}
\texttt{power' ::} & \texttt{Int} \to \texttt{Dp Float} \to \texttt{Opt} \texttt{(Dp Float)} \\
\texttt{power' \ n \ x =} & \\
\text{if} \ n < 0 \text{ then} & (x == 0) \text{ ? (\texttt{none},} & \\
& \text{do} \ y \leftarrow \texttt{power'} (-n) \ x & \\
& \text{return} (1 / y)) & \\
\text{else} & \text{if} \ n == 0 \text{ then} & \\
& \text{return} 1 & \\
\text{else} & \text{if} \ even \ n \text{ then} & \\
& \text{do} \ y \leftarrow \texttt{power'} (n \div 2) \ x & \\
& \text{return} (y \times y) & \\
\text{else} & \text{do} \ y \leftarrow \texttt{power'} (n - 1) \ x & \\
& \text{return} (x \times y) & \\
\texttt{power'' ::} & \texttt{Int} \to \texttt{Dp Float} \to \texttt{Dp Float} \\
\texttt{power'' \ n \ x =} & \texttt{option} 0 \ (\lambda y \to y) \ (\texttt{power'} \ n \ x)
\end{aligned}
\]

The term of type \texttt{Dp Float} generated by evaluating \texttt{power \((\neg 6) \ x\)} is large and unscreutable:

\[
\begin{aligned}
&(((\texttt{fst} ((x \equiv 0.0)) ? (((\texttt{False} \ ? (True, False)), (False \ ? (undef, undef))))), (True, 1.0 / ((x \times ((x \times 1.0) \times (x \times 1.0)))))) \times (x \times ((x \times 1.0) \times (x \times 1.0)))))) ) \times (x \times ((x \times 1.0) \times (x \times 1.0)))) \\
&(((\texttt{fst} ((x \equiv 0.0)) ? (((\texttt{False} \ ? (True, False)), (False \ ? (undef, undef))))), (True, 1.0 / ((x \times ((x \times 1.0) \times (x \times 1.0)))))) \times (x \times ((x \times 1.0) \times (x \times 1.0)))))) ) \times (x \times ((x \times 1.0) \times (x \times 1.0))))))
\end{aligned}
\]

Before evaluating \texttt{power} yielded a term essentially in normal form. However, here rewrite rules need to be repeatedly applied, as described in Section 3. After applying these rules, common subexpression elimination yields the same structure as in the previous subsection, from which the same C code is generated.

Here we have described normalisation via rewriting, but some EDSLs achieve normalisation via smart constructors, which ensure deep terms are always in normal form [Rompf 2012]. The two techniques are roughly equivalent.
5.4 Class Syn

We introduce a type class Syn that allows us to convert shallow embeddings to and from deep embeddings.

```haskell
class Rep (Internal a) ⇒ Syn a where
  type Internal a
  toDp :: a → Dp (Internal a)
  fromDp :: Dp (Internal a) → a
```

Type Internal is a GHC type family (Chakravarty et al. 2005). Functions toDp and fromDp translate between the shallow embedding and the deep embedding Dp (Internal a).

The first instance of Syn is Dp itself, and is straightforward.

```haskell
instance Rep a ⇒ Syn (Dp a) where
  type Internal (Dp a) = a
  toDp = id
  fromDp = id
```

Our representation of a run-time Bool will have type Dp Bool in both the deep and shallow embeddings, and similarly for Int and Float.

We do not code the target language using its constructs directly. Instead, for each constructor we define a corresponding “smart constructor” using class Syn.

```haskell
true, false :: Dp Bool
true = LitB True
false = LitB False
(?) :: Syn a ⇒ Dp Bool → (a, a) → a
c ? (t, e) = fromDp (If c (toDp t) (toDp e))

while :: Syn a ⇒ (a → Dp Bool) → (a → a) → a → a
while c b i = fromDp (While (c ∘ fromDp)
  (toDp o b) ∘ fromDp)
  (toDp i))
```

Numbers are made convenient to manipulate via overloading.

```haskell
instance Num (Dp Int) where
  a + b = Prim2 "(" a b
  a - b = Prim2 "-" a b
  a × b = Prim2 "*" a b
  fromInteger a = LitI (fromInteger a)
```

With this declaration, 1 + 2 :: Dp Int evaluates to

```haskell
Prim2 "(" (LitI 1) (LitI 2)
```

permitting code executed at generation-time and run-time to appear identical. A similar declaration works for Float.

Comparison also benefits from smart constructors.

```haskell
(.==.) :: (Syn a, Eq (Internal a)) ⇒ a → a → Dp Bool
(.==.) a b = Prim2 "=" (toDp a) (toDp b)

(<.) :: (Syn a, Ord (Internal a)) ⇒ a → a → Dp Bool
(<.) a b = Prim2 "<" (toDp a) (toDp b)
```

Overloading cannot apply here, because Haskell requires (==) return a result of type Bool, while (.==.) returns a result of type Dp Bool, and similarly for (<.).

Here is how to compute the minimum of two values.

```haskell
minim :: (Syn a, Ord (Internal a)) ⇒ a → a → a
minim a b = (Syn a, Ord (Internal a)) ⇒ a → a → a
```

5.5 Embedding pairs

Host language pairs in the shallow embedding correspond to target language pairs in the deep embedding.
and a loop in terms of a which may require common subexpression elimination as dis-
type, it will prove convenient to work with types which have a
for loop returned.
for while The state of the
a loop is a pair consisting of a counter and the state of the for loop. The body b of the for loop is a function that
expects both the counter and the state of the for loop. The counter is discarded when the loop is complete, and the final state of the for loop returned.

Thanks to our machinery, the above definition uses only ordi-

nary Haskell pairs. The condition and body of the while loop pattern match on the state using ordinary pair syntax, and the initial state is constructed as an ordinary pair.

5.6 Embedding undefined

For the next section, which defines an analogue of the Maybe
type, it will prove convenient to work with types which have a
distinguished value at each type, which we call undef.

It is straightforward to define a type class Unde
f, where type a belongs to Undefined if it belongs to
Syn and it has an undefined value.

class Syn a ⇒ Unde
f a where
unde
f :: a

instance Unde
f (Dp Bool) where
unde
f = false

instance Unde
f (Dp Int) where
unde
f = 0

instance Unde
f (Dp Float) where
unde
f = 0

instance (Unde
f a, Unde
f b) ⇒ Unde
f (a, b) where
unde
f = (unde
f, unde
f)

For example,

(/#) :: Dp Float → Dp Float → Dp Float
x /# y = (y =/= 0)? (unde
f, x / y)

behaves as division, save that when the divisor is zero it returns the
undefined value of type Float, which is also zero.

[Svenningsson and Axelsson][2012] claim that it is not possible to
support unde
f without changing the deep embedding, but here we
have defined unde
f entirely as a shallow embedding. (It appears
they underestimated the power of their own technique!)

5.7 Embedding option

We now explain in detail the Opt type seen in Section 2.4.

The deep-and-shallow technique represents deep embedding
Dp (a, b) by shallow embedding (Dp a, Dp b). Hence, it is
tempting to represent Dp (Maybe a) by Maybe (Dp a), but this
cannot work, because fromDp would have to decide at generation-
time whether to return Just or Nothing, but which to use is not
known until run-time.

Instead, [Svenningsson and Axelsson][2012] represent values of
type Maybe a by the type Opt a, which pairs a boolean with a
value of type a. For a value corresponding to Just x, the boolean is
true and the value is x, while for one corresponding to Nothing, the
boolean is false and the value is unde
f. We define some', none',
and option' as the analogues of Just, Nothing, and maybe.

The Syn instance is straightforward, mapping options to and from the
pairs already defined for Dp.

data Opt' a = Opt' { def :: Dp Bool, val :: a }

instance Syn a ⇒ Syn (Opt' a) where

type Internal (Opt' a) = (Bool, Internal a)

toDp (Opt' b x) = Pair b (toDp x)

fromDp p = = Opt' (Fst p) (fromDp (Snd p))

some' :: a ⇒ Opt' a

some' x = Opt' true x

none' :: Unde
f a ⇒ Opt' a

none' = Opt' false unde
f

option' :: Syn b ⇒ b → (a → b) → Opt' a → b

option' d f o = def o ? (f (val o), d)

The next obvious step is to define a suitable monad over the type
Opt'. The natural definitions to use are as follows:

return :: a ⇒ Opt' a

return x = some' x

(r=>) :: (Unde
f b) ⇒ Opt' a ⇒ (a → Opt' b) → Opt' b

o r=> g = Opt' ((def o ? (def (g (val o)), false))

(d (val o) (val o), unde
f))

However, this adds type constraint Unde
f b to the type of (r=>),
which is not permitted. The need to add such constraints often
arises, and has been dubbed the constrained-monad problem
[Hughes][1999] Svenningsson and Svensson[2013]. We solve it
with a trick due to Persson et al.[2011].

We introduce a continuation-passing style (CPS) type, Opt',
defined in terms of Opt'. It is straightforward to define Monad
and Syn instances, operations to lift the representation type to lift
and lower one type to the other, and to lift some', none, and option

to the CPS type. The lift operation is closely related to the (r=>) operation we could not define above; it is properly typed, thanks to
the type constraint on b in the definition of Opt a.

newtype Opt a =

O { anO : ∀b. Unde
f b ⇒ ((a → Opt' b) → Opt' b) }

instance Monad Opt where

return x = O (λg → g x)

m r=> k = O (λg → unO m (λx → unO (k x) g))

instance Unde
f a ⇒ Syn (Opt a) where

type Internal (Opt a) = (Bool, Internal a)

fromDp = lift o fromDp

toDp = toDp o lower

lift :: Opt' a ⇒ Opt a

lift o = O (λg → Opt' (def o ? (def (g (val o)), false))

(d (val o) (val o), unde
f))

lower :: Unde
f a ⇒ Opt a → Opt' a

lower m = unO m some'

none :: Unde
f a ⇒ Opt a

none = lift none'

some :: a ⇒ Opt a

some a = lift (some' a)
option :: (Undef a, Syn b) \to b \to (a \to b) \to Opt a \to b
option d f o = option' d f (lower a)

These definitions support the EDSL code presented in Section 5.2.

5.8 Embedding vector

Recall that values of type Array are created by construct MkArr, while LnArr extracts the length and IzArr fetches the element at the given index. Corresponding to the deep embedding Array is a shallow embedding Vec.

data Vec a = Vec (Dp Int) (Dp Int \to a)

instance Syn a \Rightarrow Syn (Vec a) where
  type Internal (Vec a) = Array Int (Internal a)
  toDp (Vec n g) = MkArr n (toDp \circ g)
  fromDp a = Vec (LnArr a) (fromDp \circ IzArr a)

instance Functor Vec where
  fmap f (Vec n g) = Vec n (f \circ g)

Constructor Vec resembles Arr, but the former constructs a high-level representation of the array and the latter an actual array. It is straightforward to make Vec an instance of Functor.

It is easy to define operations on vectors, including combining corresponding elements of two vectors, summing the elements of a vector, dot product of two vectors, and norm of a vector.

It is easy to define operations on vectors, including combining corresponding elements of two vectors, summing the elements of a vector, dot product of two vectors, and norm of a vector.

zipVec :: (Syn a, Syn b) \Rightarrow (a \to b \to c) \to Vec a \to Vec b \to Vec c
zipVec f (Vec m g) (Vec n h) = Vec (m * ‘minim’ n) (\lambda i \to f (g i) (h i))

sumVec :: (Syn a, Num a) \Rightarrow Vec a \to a
sumVec (Vec n g) = for n 0 (\lambda x \to x + g i)

dotVec :: (Syn a, Num a) \Rightarrow Vec a \to Vec a \to a
dotVec u v = sumVec (zipVec (\times) (u \times v))

normVec :: Vec (Dp Float) \Rightarrow Dp Float
normVec v = sqrt (dotVec v v)

Invoking edsl on

  normVec \circ toVec

generates C code to normalise a vector. If we used a top-level function of type (Syn a, Syn b) \Rightarrow (a \to b \to c), then it would insert the toVec coercion automatically.

This style of definition again provides fusion. For instance, we can extend type Syn enables conversion between types Arr and Vec. Hence for EDSL, unlike QDSL, explicit calls toVec and fromVec are not required. Invoking edsl normVec produces the same C code as in Section 5.2.

As with QDSL, there are some situations where fusion is not beneficial. We may materialise a vector as an array with the following function.

memorise :: Syn a \Rightarrow Vec a \to Vec a
memorise = fromDp \circ Save \circ toDp

Here we interpose Save to forestall the fusion that would otherwise occur. For example, if

   blur :: Syn a \Rightarrow Vec a \to Vec a
   blur v = zipVec (\lambda x y \to sqrt (x \times y))

computes the geometric mean of adjacent elements of a vector, then one may choose to compute either

   blur \circ blur \text{ or } blur \circ \text{memorise} \circ blur

with different trade-offs between recomputation and memory use.

QDSL forces all conversions to be written out, while EDSL silently converts between representations; following the pattern that QDSL is more explicit, while EDSL is more compact. For QDSL it is the subformula property which guarantees that all intermediate uses of Vec are eliminated, while for EDSL this is established by operational reasoning on the behaviour of the type Vec.

6. Related work

DSLs have a long and rich history (Bentley 1986). An early use of quotation in programming is Lisp (McCarthy 1960), and perhaps the first application of quotation to domain-specific languages is Lisp macros (Hart 1963).

This paper uses Haskell, which has been widely used for EDSLs (Hudak 1997). We constrain QDSL with an EDSL technique that combines deep and shallow embedding, as described by Svenningsson and Axelson (2012), and as used in several Haskell EDSLs including Feldspar (Axelson et al. 2010), Obsidian (Svenningsson et al. 2011), Nikola (Mainland and Morrisett 2010), Hydra (Giorgidze and Nilsson 2011), and Meta-Repa (Ankner and Svenningsson 2013).


A proposition-as-types principle for quotation as a modal logic was proposed by Davies and Pfenning (2001). As they note, their technique has close connections to two-level languages (Nielsen and Nelson 2005) and partial evaluation (Jones et al. 1993).

Other approaches to DSL that make use of quotation include C# and F# versions of LINQ (Meijer et al. 2006) Synec (2006) and Scala Lightweight Modular Staging (LMS) (Rompf and Odersky 2010). Scala LMS exploits techniques found in both QDSL (quototation and normalisation) and EDSL (combining shallow and deep embeddings), see Rompf et al. (2013), and exploits reuse to allow multiple DSLs to share infrastructure see Sujeth et al. (2013).

The underlying idea for QDSLs was established for F# LINQ by Cheney et al. (2013), and extended to nested results by Cheney et al. (2014b). Related work combines language-integrated query with effect types (Cooper 2009; Lindley and Cheney 2012), Cheney et al. (2014a) compare approaches based on quotation and effects.

7. Conclusion

A good idea can be much better than a new one.

- Gerard Berry

We have compared QDSLs and EDSLs, arguing that QDSLs offer competing expressiveness and efficiency.

The subformula property may have applications in DSLs other that QDSLs. For instance, after Section 5.7 of this paper was drafted, it occurred to us that a different approach would be to extend type Dp with constructs for type Maybe. So long as type Maybe does not appear in the input or output of the program, a normaliser that ensures the subformula property could guarantee that C code for such constructs need never be generated.

Rather than building a special-purpose tool for each QDSL, it should be possible to design a single tool for each host language. Our next step is to design a QDSL library for Haskell that restores...
the type information for quasi-quotations currently discarded by GHC and uses this to support type classes and overloading in full, and to supply a more general monad. Such a tool would subsume the special-purpose translator from $Q\ell$ to $D\ell$ described at the beginning of Section 3 and lift most of its restrictions.

These forty years now I’ve been speaking in prose without knowing it! — Mollière

Like Mollière’s Monsieur Jourdain, many of us have used QD-DSLs for years, if not by that name. DSL via quotation lies at the heart of Lisp macros, Microsoft LINQ, and Scala LMS, to name but three. By naming the concept and drawing attention to the benefits of normalisation and the subformula property, we hope to help the concept to prosper for years to come.
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