

Comp 311
Principles of Programming Languages
Lecture 11
The Semantics of Recursion II

Corky Cartwright
September 17, 2010

Recursive Definitions

- Given a Scott-domain D , we can write equations of the form:

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{E}_f$$

where \mathbf{E}_f is an expression constructed from constants in D , operations (continuous functions) on D , and \mathbf{f} .

- Example: let D be the domain of Scheme values. Then

```
fact =  
  (lambda (n) (if (zero? n) 1 (* n (fact (- n 1)))))
```

is such an equation.

- Such equations are called *recursive definitions*.

Solutions to Recursion Equations

Given an equation:

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{E}_f$$

what is a solution? All of the constants and operations in \mathbf{E}_f are known except \mathbf{f} .

A solution is any function \mathbf{f}^* such that

$$\mathbf{f}^* = \mathbf{E}_{f^*}$$

is a solution. But there may be more than one solution. We want to select the “best” solution. Note that \mathbf{f}^* is an element of whatever domain D^* is the type of \mathbf{E}_f . In the most common case, it is $D \rightarrow D$, but it can be D , $D^k \rightarrow D$, ... The best solution (the one that always exists, is unique, and is *computable*) is the *least* solution under the approximation ordering in D^* .

Constructing the Least Solution

How do we know that any solution exists to the equation $f = E_f$?

We will construct the least solution and prove it is a solution!

Since the domain D^* for f is a Scott-Domain, it has a least element bot_{D^*} . Hence, bot_{D^*} approximates every solution to the equation

$$f = E_f.$$

Now form the function $F: D^* \rightarrow D^*$ defined by

$$F(f) = E_f$$

or equivalently,

$$F = \lambda f . E_f$$

Consider the sequence $S: \text{bot}_{D^*}, F(\text{bot}_{D^*}), F(F(\text{bot}_{D^*})), \dots, F^k(\text{bot}_{D^*}), \dots$

Claim: S is an ascending chain (chain for short) in $D^* \rightarrow D^*$.

Proof. $\text{bot}_{D^*} \leq F(\text{bot}_{D^*})$ by the definition of Bot_{D^*} . If $M \leq N$, then $F(M) \leq F(N)$ by monotonicity. Hence, $F^k(\text{bot}_{D^*}) \leq F^{k+1}(\text{bot}_{D^*})$ for all k . Q.E.D.

Claim: S has a least upper bound f^*

Proof. Trivial. S is a chain in D^* and hence must have a least upper bound because D^* is a Scott-Domain.

Proving f^* is a fixed point of F

Must show: $F(f^*) = f^*$ where $F = \lambda f . E_f$.

Claim: By definition $f^* = \cup F^k(\text{bot}_{D^*})$. Since F is continuous

$$\begin{aligned} F(f^*) &= F(\cup F^k(\text{bot}_{D^*})) \\ &= \cup F^{k+1}(\text{bot}_{D^*}) && \text{(by continuity)} \\ &= \cup F^k(\text{bot}_{D^*}) && \text{(since } \text{bot}_{D^*} \leq F(\text{bot}_{D^*}) \text{)} \\ &= f^* \end{aligned}$$

Q.E.D.

Note: all of the steps in the preceding proof are trivial except for the step justified by continuity.

Examples

Look at factorial in detail using DrScheme.

How Can We Compute f^* Given F ?

Need to construct $F^\infty(\perp)$ from F . Let

$$Y(F) = f^* = F^\infty(\perp).$$

Can we write code for Y ?

Idea: use syntactic trick in Ω to build a potentially infinite stack of F s.

- Preliminary attempt:

$$(\lambda \mathbf{x}. F(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x})) \ (\lambda \mathbf{x}. F(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x}))$$

- Reduces to (in one step):

$$F \ ((\lambda \mathbf{x}. F(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x})) \ (\lambda \mathbf{x}. F(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x})))$$

- Reduces to (in k steps):

$$F^k \ ((\lambda \mathbf{x}. F(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x})) \ (\lambda \mathbf{x}. F(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x})))$$

What Is the Code for **Y**?

$\lambda F. (\lambda x. F(x x)) (\lambda x. F(x x))$

- Does this work for Scheme (or Java with an appropriate encoding of functions as anonymous inner classes)? No!
- Why not? What about divergence? Assume **G** is a λ -expression defining a functional like FACT

$(\lambda F. (\lambda x. F(x x)) (\lambda x. F(x x))) G$
 $= G((\lambda x. G(x x)) (\lambda x. G(x x)))$
 $= \dots$ (diverging)

What If We Use Call-by-name?

By assumption \mathbf{G} must have the form $(\lambda \mathbf{f}. (\lambda \mathbf{n}. \mathbf{M}))$

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda \mathbf{F}. (\lambda \mathbf{x}. \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x})) (\lambda \mathbf{x}. \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x}))) \ \mathbf{G} \\ &= \mathbf{G} \ ((\lambda \mathbf{x}. \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x})) (\lambda \mathbf{x}. \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x}))) \\ &= (\lambda \mathbf{f}. (\lambda \mathbf{n}. \mathbf{M})) \ ((\lambda \mathbf{x}. \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x})) (\lambda \mathbf{x}. \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x}))) \\ &= (\lambda \mathbf{n}. \mathbf{M}[\mathbf{x} := (\lambda \mathbf{x}. \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x})) (\lambda \mathbf{x}. \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x}))]) \end{aligned}$$

If the evaluation \mathbf{M} of does not require evaluating an occurrence of \mathbf{f} , then \mathbf{x} is not evaluated. Otherwise, the binding of \mathbf{x} is unwound only as many times as required to get to the base case in the definition $\mathbf{f} = \lambda \mathbf{n}. \mathbf{M}$.

Exercise: how can we workaround this problem to create a version of the \mathbf{Y} operator that works for call-by-value Scheme and Jam? Hint: if \mathbf{M} is a divergent term denoting a unary function $\lambda \mathbf{x}. \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}$ is an “equivalent” term that is not divergent! (As a concrete example, assume that \mathbf{M} is the term Ω .)