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Abstract
This paper proposes a possible axiomatisation for mutually recursive free types for the draft Z standard.

1 Introduction

Ian Toyn has provided an excellent summary of his current thinking on the Z language as a whole in a recent paper [3]. This includes a description of the semantics of free types using the transformation rules (due to Ian and Sam Valentine). The axiomatisation given for the global variables introduced by a free type definition ingeniously avoids many of the dependencies on the toolkit that make the description in Spivey [2] unsuitable for use in the standard.

The present paper describes how the treatment in [3] may be generalised to provide an axiomatisation for mutually recursive free types — a language feature not currently supported in Z but widely considered to be highly desirable (e.g., for modelling the abstract syntax of programming languages). En passant, I describe a reworking of the axiomatisation that is slightly more economical of abstract syntax; this may help to address a concern mentioned in the list of known problems in [3].
2 Review of Proposed Axiomatisation

With a few slight adjustments\(^1\) to the notation, Ian Toyn’s proposed axiomatisation is as follows:

Given a free type paragraph:

\[
T := C_1 | \ldots | C_m \mid D_1 \ll e_1 \gg | \ldots | D_n \ll e_n \gg
\]

where at least one of \(m\) and \(n\) is non-zero, the transformations derive the declarations:

\[
[T] \\
C_j : T \\
D_k : \mathcal{P}(e_k \times T)
\]

and the axioms:

\[
\forall u : e_k \bullet \exists ! y : D_k \bullet y \cdot 1 = u \\
\forall u, v : e_k \mid D_k u = D_k v \bullet u = v \\
\forall y_1, y_2 : (1, C_1) \ldots (m, C_m) \mid y_1 \cdot 2 = y_2 \cdot 2 \bullet y_1 \cdot 1 = y_2 \cdot 1 \\
\forall u : e_k \bullet \neg D_k u = C_j \\
\forall u : e_k; v : e_l \bullet \neg D_k u = D_l v \\
\forall A : \mathcal{P}T \\
\mid C_1 \in A \land \ldots \land C_m \in A \\
(\forall x : (\mu T \equiv A \bullet e_1) \bullet D_1 x \in A) \land \\
\ldots \\
(\forall x : (\mu T \equiv A \bullet e_n) \bullet D_n x \in A) \\
\bullet A = T
\]

Here, (Fnc) together with the declarations say that each \(D_k\) is a function with domain \(e_k\); (Inj) says that each function \(D_k\) is an injection; (Dsj1), (Dsj2) and (Dsj3) together say that the sets \(\{C_1\}, \ldots, \{C_m\}\), \(\text{ran}D_1, \ldots, \text{ran}D_n\) are pairwise disjoint; and (Ind) gives a principle of proof by induction.

For free types with many nullary constructors (large \(m\)) and many non-nullary constructors (large \(n\)), the axiomatisation has the disadvantage that (Dsj2) will produce a very large number \((m \times n)\) of individual axioms. This can be ameliorated by replacing (Dsj1), (Dsj2) and (Dsj3) with a portmanteau axiom along the lines of (Dsj1). Following the idea behind (Dsj1), what one would like to write is:

\[
\forall y_1, y_2 : (1, C_1) \ldots (m, C_m) \cup \{z : D_1 \bullet (m + 1, z \cdot 2)\} \cup \ldots \cup \{z : D_n \bullet (m + n, z \cdot 2)\} \mid y_1 \cdot 2 = y_2 \cdot 2 \bullet y_1 \cdot 1 = y_2 \cdot 1
\]

---

\(^1\)For clarity and to simplify the subscripts later on, I have distinguished various names, in particular, the names of the nullary and non-nullary constructors and numbered the two sorts of constructor in separate sequences.
3 Mutual Recursion

The mutually recursive definitions to be considered simply comprise two or more “simultaneous” free type definitions. The concrete syntax used for these is not important here, but for definiteness, I will adopt the use of an ‘&’ to join together the constituent free type definitions. The general case will therefore have the following form:

\[
T_i ::= C_{i1} \mid \ldots \mid C_{i_{m_i}} \mid D_{i1} \ll e_{i1} \gg \ldots D_{im_i} \ll e_{i_m_i} \gg \\
\&
\vdots
\&
T_r ::= C_{r1} \mid \ldots \mid C_{r_{m_r}} \mid D_{r1} \ll e_{r1} \gg \ldots D_{r_{m_r}} \ll e_{r_{m_r}} \gg
\]

The type rules must arrange for the \( T_i \) to be in scope in each of the expressions \( e_{ij} \). The semantics (via the transformation rules) must then require the \( T_i \) to provide a minimal solution to the above viewed as a system of simultaneous fixed point equations (in an appropriate sense of finding fixed points modulo a bijection, as discussed in [1]).

But what do we expect the defining properties for the least fixed point of such a system of equations to be? Clearly, we want the constructors, \( D_{ij} \) to be injective functions and we want the sets \( \{ C_{i_1}, \ldots, C_{i_{m_i}} \} \), \( \text{ran} \ D_{i_1}, \ldots, \text{ran} \ D_{i_{m_i}} \) to be pairwise disjoint subsets of \( T_i \) for each \( i \). So far, there is no difference from the case of \( r \) independent free type definitions and the axioms (Fnc), (Inj), and (Dsj) (or (Ds1j) (Ds2j) and (Ds3j)) express our requirements nicely.

It is the induction axiom that fails to generalise so easily. Consider, for a concrete example, the following:

\[
\text{YIN} ::= \text{Yin} \ll \text{YANG} \gg \\
&
\text{YANG} ::= \text{Yang} \ll \text{YIN} \gg
\]

It is not hard to see that any two sets of the same cardinality will provide a fixed point model for the above definition (with the constructor functions corresponding to bijections between the two sets showing they have the same cardinality). So, for example, a model might take \( \text{YIN} = 1..10 \) and \( \text{YANG} = 11..20 \) with \( \text{Yang}(i) = i + 10 \) and \( \text{Yin}(j) = j - 10 \) (\( 1 \leq i \leq 10, 11 \leq j \leq 20 \)).

The least fixed point solution that we want actually has both \( \text{YIN} \) and \( \text{YANG} \) empty.\(^3\) Unfortunately, the appropriate instances of (Ind) do not characterise the desired minimal solution. Indeed, after simplifying the \( \mu \)-term, the two axioms become:

\(^2\)In this and other axiom schemata, formulae such as \( m + 1 \) and \( m + n \) are to be read as the numeric literals obtained by carrying out the addition rather than as object language formulae.

\(^3\)Depending on our views on whether given sets are allowed to be empty and on some other rather more obscure issues, we might prefer to insist on non-empty solutions, in which case we would take two singleton sets for the preferred model.
Unfortunately, all that these axioms tell us is that the constructor functions are surjective; this is insufficient to characterise the solution of interest. Indeed, it is not surprising that the induction principle (Ind) for a single free type definition is too weak in this case, since when we view the two free type definitions separately, they are not recursive.

The required axiom must correspond to a principle of proof by induction of a property of each of the component free type definitions simultaneously. Using the style of the proposed axiom for a single free type definition (Ind), we can capture this in the following axiom (MutInd):

\[
\forall A_1 : PT_1 ; \ldots ; A_r : PT_r \quad \text{(MutInd)}
\]

\[
| \quad C_{11} \in A_1 \land \ldots \land C_{1n_1} \in A_1 \land \\
\quad \ldots \\
\quad C_{r1} \in A_1 \land \ldots \land C_{rn_r} \in A_r \land \\
\quad (\forall x : (\mu T_1 \equiv A_1 ; \ldots ; T_r \equiv A_r \cdot e_{11}) \cdot D_{11} \ x \in A_1) \land \\
\quad \ldots \land (\forall x : (\mu T_1 \equiv A_1 ; \ldots ; T_r \equiv A_r \cdot e_{1n_1}) \cdot D_{1n_1} \ x \in A_1) \land \\
\quad \ldots \\
\quad (\forall x : (\mu T_1 \equiv A_1 ; \ldots ; T_r \equiv A_r \cdot e_{r1}) \cdot D_{r1} \ x \in A_r) \land \\
\quad \ldots \land (\forall x : (\mu T_1 \equiv A_1 ; \ldots ; T_r \equiv A_r \cdot e_{rn_r}) \cdot D_{rn_r} \ x \in A_r) \\
\quad \bullet \ A_1 = T_1 \land \ldots \land A_r = T_r
\]

For the \textsc{YIN}-and-\textsc{YANG} example, this gives us the following:

\[
\forall A_1 : \textsc{PyIN} ; A_2 : \textsc{PyANG} \quad \text{such that} \\
\quad (\forall x : (\mu \textsc{YIN} \equiv A_1 ; \textsc{YANG} \equiv A_2 \cdot \textsc{YANG}) \cdot \text{Yin} \ x \in A_1) \land \\
\quad (\forall x : (\mu \textsc{YIN} \equiv A_1 ; \textsc{YANG} \equiv A_2 \cdot \textsc{YIN}) \cdot \text{Yang} \ x \in A_2) \\
\quad \bullet \ A_1 = \textsc{YIN} \land A_2 = \textsc{YANG}
\]

It remains to assess whether the axioms proposed here and in [3] are the right ones to use. An evident economy would be to simplify away the \(\mu\)-expressions. To check correctness of detail and fitness for purpose one can consider examples and one can work through proofs of specific properties in particular cases and of general meta-theoretic properties. This can perhaps wait until the general approach of [3] and of this paper has been reviewed and the details agreed.
4 Summary

An induction principle (MutInd) has been proposed generalising the axiomatisation for free types in [3] to the mutually recursive case. A minor variant to the treatment in [3] has also been proposed to make the complexity of the axiomatisation linear, rather than quadratic, with respect to the size of the free type definition.
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