

# **Specware 4.0 Language Manual**

## **Specware 4.0 Language Manual**

Copyright © 2001, 2002 by Kestrel Development Corporation

Copyright © 2001, 2002 by Kestrel Technology LLC

All rights reserved

The name Specware® is a registered trademark of Kestrel Development Corporation

# Table of Contents

<b>Disclaimer .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>1. Introduction to Specware .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. What Is Specware?.....	1
1.2. What Is Specware For? .....	1
1.3. The Design Process in Specware .....	2
1.4. Stages of Application Building .....	3
1.4.1. Building a Specification.....	4
1.4.2. Refining your specifications to constructive specifications .....	5
1.5. Reasoning About Your Code .....	5
1.5.1. Abstractness in Specware .....	5
1.5.2. Logical Inference in Specware.....	6
<b>2. Metaslang.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1. Preliminaries .....	9
2.1.1. The grammar description formalism.....	9
2.1.2. Models.....	10
2.1.3. Sort-correctness.....	11
2.1.4. Constructive .....	13
2.2. Lexical conventions .....	13
2.2.1. Symbols and Names.....	14
2.2.2. Comments .....	16
2.3. Units.....	17
2.3.1. Unit Identifiers .....	19
2.3.2. Specs .....	20
2.3.2.1. Spec Forms.....	20
2.3.2.2. Qualifications .....	20
2.3.2.3. Translations.....	23
2.3.2.4. Substitutions.....	24
2.3.2.5. Diagram Colimits.....	26
2.3.2.6. Obligators.....	26
2.3.3. Morphisms .....	26
2.3.4. Diagrams .....	27
2.3.5. Generate Terms .....	28
2.3.6. Proof Terms.....	28
2.4. Declarations .....	29
2.4.1. Import-declarations .....	30
2.4.2. Sort-declarations .....	31
2.4.3. Sort-definitions.....	32

2.4.4. Op-declarations .....	33
2.4.5. Op-definitions .....	35
2.4.6. Claim-definitions .....	38
2.5. Sorts .....	39
2.5.1. Sort-sums .....	40
2.5.2. Sort-arrows.....	42
2.5.3. Sort-products.....	43
2.5.4. Sort-instantiations .....	43
2.5.5. Sort-names .....	44
2.5.6. Sort-records.....	44
2.5.7. Sort-restrictions.....	45
2.5.8. Sort-comprehensions.....	46
2.5.9. Sort-quotients.....	47
2.6. Expressions .....	47
2.6.1. Lambda-forms.....	49
2.6.2. Case-expressions.....	50
2.6.3. Let-expressions .....	50
2.6.4. If-expressions .....	51
2.6.5. Quantifications .....	51
2.6.6. Applications .....	52
2.6.7. Annotated-expressions .....	54
2.6.8. Op-names .....	54
2.6.9. Literals .....	55
2.6.9.1. Boolean-literals.....	55
2.6.9.2. Nat-literals.....	56
2.6.9.3. Char-literals.....	56
2.6.9.4. String-literals.....	58
2.6.10. Field-selections .....	59
2.6.11. Tuple-displays .....	59
2.6.12. Record-displays.....	60
2.6.13. Sequential-expressions.....	60
2.6.14. List-displays.....	61
2.6.15. Structors .....	62
2.6.15.1. Projectors .....	62
2.6.15.2. Relaxators .....	63
2.6.15.3. Restrictors .....	64
2.6.15.4. Quotienters.....	65
2.6.15.5. Choosers.....	65
2.6.15.6. Embedders.....	66
2.6.15.7. Embedding-tests.....	67

2.7. Matches and Patterns .....	68
2.7.1. Matches .....	68
2.7.2. Patterns.....	69
<b>A. Metaslang Grammar.....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>B. Libraries.....</b>	<b>91</b>
B.1. General .....	91
B.2. Boolean.....	92
B.3. Integer.....	93
B.4. Nat .....	94
B.5. Char .....	96
B.6. String .....	97
B.7. List.....	99



# Disclaimer

As experience is gained with Specware 4.0, both the operation of the Specware system and the Metaslang language are bound to undergo changes, which may not always be fully “backwards compatible”.

For updates, news and bug reports, visit the Specware web site  
<http://www.specware.org>.

## *Disclaimer*



# Chapter 1. Introduction to Specware

## 1.1. What Is Specware?

Specware is a tool for building and manipulating a collection of related specifications. Specware can be considered:

- a design tool, because it can represent and manipulate designs for complex systems, software or otherwise
- a logic, because it can describe concepts in a formal language with rules of deduction
- a programming language, because it can express programs and their properties
- a database, because it can store and manipulate collections of concepts, facts, and relationships

Specifications are the primary units of information in Specware. A specification, or theory, describes a concept to some degree of detail. To add properties and extend definitions, you create new specifications that import or combine earlier specifications. Within a specification, you can reason about objects and their relationships. You declare sorts (data types) and operations (ops, functions), axioms that state properties of operations, and theorems that follow logically from axioms.

A morphism is a relationship between specifications that describes how the properties of one map to the properties of another. Morphisms describe both part-of and is-a relationships. You can propagate theorems from one specification to another using morphisms; for example, if the QEII is a ship, and ships cannot fly, then the QEII cannot fly.

## 1.2. What Is Specware For?

Specware is a general-purpose tool that you can use to develop specifications for any system or realm of knowledge. You can do this as an abstract process, with no reference to computer programming; or you can produce a computer program that is provably a correct implementation of a specification; or you can use the process to redesign an existing program.

You can use Specware to:

- **Develop domain theories**

You can use Specware to do “ontological engineering” -- that is, to describe a real-world domain of knowledge in explicit or rigorous terms. You might wish to develop a domain theory in abstract terms that are not necessarily intended to become a computer program. You can use the inference engine to test the internal logic of your theory, derive conclusions, and propose theorems.

You can use specifications and morphisms to represent abstract knowledge, with no refinement to any kind of concrete implementation.

More commonly, you would use Specware to model expert knowledge of engineering design. In this case you would refine your theoretical specifications and morphisms to more concrete levels.

- **Develop code from specifications**

You can use Specware to develop computer programs from specifications. One advantage of using Specware for this task is that you can prove that the generated code does implement the specification correctly. Another advantage is that you can develop and compare different implementations of the same specification.

- **Develop specifications from code**

You can use Specware for reverse engineering -- that is, to help you derive a specification from existing code. To do this, you must examine the code to determine what problems are being solved by it, then use Specware’s language Metaslang to express the problems as specifications. In addition to providing a notation tool for this process, Specware allows you to operate on the derived specification. Once you have derived a specification from the original code, you can analyze the specification for correctness and completeness, and also generate different and correct implementations for it.

## **1.3. The Design Process in Specware**

To solve real problems, programs typically combine domain theories about the physical world with problem solving theories about the computational world. Your domain theory is an abstract representation of a real-world problem domain. To implement it,

you must transform the domain theory to a concrete computational model. The built-in specification libraries describe mathematical and computational concepts, which are building blocks for an implementation. Your specifications combine real-world knowledge with this built-in computational knowledge to generate program code that solves real-world problems in a rigorous and provable way.

You interpret designs relative to an initial universe of models. In software design, for example, the models are programs, while in engineering design, they are circuits or pieces of metal. To design an object is to choose it from among the universe of possible models. You make this choice by beginning with an initial description and augmenting it until it uniquely describes the model you desire. In Specware, this process is called refinement.

Composition and refinement are the basic techniques of application building in Specware. You compose simpler specifications into more complex ones, and refine more abstract specifications into more concrete ones. When you refine a specification, you create a more specific case of it; that is, you reduce the number of possible models of it.

The process of refinement is also one of composition. To begin the refinement, you construct primitive interpretations that show how to implement an abstract concept in terms of a concrete concept. You then compose interpretations to deepen and widen the refinement.

Specware provides two types of composition for interpretations; horizontal (or parallel), and vertical (or sequential).

- When you compose interpretations horizontally, you increase the scope of what is refined. In the same way you compose specifications to create a more complex specification from simpler parts, you compose refinements horizontally to create a complex refinement from simpler parts.
- When you compose interpretations vertically, you increase the degree of refinement. You compose interpretations sequentially, in a simple, linear progression, to create a deeper refinement from a shallower one.

For example, suppose you are designing a house. A wide but not deep view of the design specifies several rooms but gives no details. A deep but not wide view of the design specifies one room in complete detail. To complete the refinement, you must create a view that is both wide and deep; however, it makes no difference which view you create first.

The final refinement implements a complex, abstract specification by interpreting it to code.

## 1.4. Stages of Application Building

Conceptually, there are two major stages in producing a Specware application. In the actual process, steps from these two stages may alternate.

1. Building a specification
2. Refining your specifications to constructive specifications

### 1.4.1. Building a Specification

You must build a specification that describes your domain theory in rigorous terms. To do this, you first create small specifications for basic, abstract concepts, then specialize and combine these to make them more concrete and complex.

To relate concepts to each other in Specware, you use specification morphisms. A specification morphism shows how one concept is a specialization or part of another. For example, the concept “fast car” specializes both “car” and “fast thing”. The concept “room” is part of the concept “house”. You can specialize “room” in different ways, one for each room of the house.

You specialize in order to derive a more concrete specification from a more abstract specification. Because the specialization relation is transitive (if A specializes B and B specializes C, then A specializes C as well), you can combine a series of morphisms to achieve a step-wise refinement of abstract specifications into increasingly concrete ones.

You combine specifications in order to construct a more complex concept from a collection of simpler parts. In general, you increase the complexity of a specification by adding more structural detail.

Specware helps you to handle complexity and scale by providing composition operators that take small specifications and combine them in a rigorous way to produce a complex specification that retains the logic of its parts. Specware provides several techniques for combining specifications, that can be used in combination:

- The import operation allows you to include earlier specifications in a later one.
- The translate operation allows you to rename the parts of a specification.
- The colimit operation glues concepts together into a shared union along shared subconcepts.

A shared union specification combines specializations of a concept. For example, if you combine “red car” with “fast car” sharing the concept “car”, you obtain the shared union “fast, red car”. If you combine them sharing nothing, you obtain “red car and fast car”, which is two cars rather than one. Both choices are available.

## **1.4.2. Refining your specifications to constructive specifications**

You combine specifications to extend the refinement iteratively. The goal is to create a refinement between the abstract specification of your problem domain and a concrete implementation of the problem solution in terms of sorts and operations that ultimately are defined in the Specware libraries of mathematical and computational theories.

For example, suppose you want to create a specification for a card game. An abstract specification of a card game would include concepts such as card, suit, and hand. A refinement for this specification might map cards to natural numbers and hands to lists containing natural numbers.

The Specware libraries contains constructive specifications for various sorts, including natural numbers and lists.

To refine your abstract specification, you build a refinement between the abstract Hand specification and the List-based specification. When all sorts and operations are refined to concrete library-defined sorts and operations, the Specware system can generate code from the specification.

## **1.5. Reasoning About Your Code**

Writing software in Metaslang, the specification and programming language used in Specware, brings many advantages. Along with the previously-mentioned possibilities for incremental development, you have the option to perform rigorous verification of the design and implementation of your code, leading to the a high level of assurance in the correctness of the final application.

### **1.5.1. Abstractness in Specware**

Specware allows you to work directly with abstract concepts independently of

implementation decisions. You can put off making implementation decisions by describing the problem domain in general terms, specifying only those properties you need for the task at hand.

In most languages, you can declare either everything about a function or nothing about it. That is, you can declare only its type, or its complete definition. In Specware you must declare the signature of an operation, but after that you have almost complete freedom in stating properties of the operation. You can declare nothing or anything about it. Any properties you have stated can be used for program transformation.

For example, you can describe how squaring distributes over multiplication:

```
axiom square_distributes_over_times is
  fa(a, b) square(a * b) = square(a) * square(b)
```

This property is not a complete definition of the squaring operation, but it is true. The truth of this axiom must be preserved as you refine the operation. However, unless you are going to generate code for `square`, you do not need to supply a complete definition.

The completeness of your definitions determines whether you can create interpretations to code. An interpretation must completely define the operations of the source theory in terms of the target theory. This guarantees that, if the target is implementable, the source is also implementable. However, Specware also allows you to construct interpretation schemes, which need not be definitional extensions. This allows you to make considerable progress in building up and refining an abstract specification in advance of providing complete definitions.

## 1.5.2. Logical Inference in Specware

Specware performs inference using external theorem provers; the distribution includes SRI's SNARK theorem prover. External provers are connected to Specware through logic morphisms, which relate logics to each other.

You can apply external reasoning agents to refinements in different ways (although only verification is fully implemented in the current release of Specware).

- Verification tests the correctness of a refinement. For example, you can prove that quicksort is a correct refinement of the sorting specification.
- Simplification is a complexity-reducing refinement. For example, given appropriate axioms, you can rewrite  $3*a+3*b$  to  $3*(a+b)$ .

- Synthesis derives a refinement for a given specification by combining the domain theory with computational theory. For example, you can derive quicksort semi-automatically from the sorting specification as a solution to a sorting problem, if you describe exactly how the problem is a sorting problem.





# Chapter 2. Metaslang

This chapter introduces the Metaslang specification language.

The following sections give the grammar rules and meaning for each Metaslang language construct.

## 2.1. Preliminaries

### 2.1.1. The grammar description formalism

The grammar rules used to describe the Metaslang language use the conventions of (extended) BNF. For example, a grammar rule like:

$$\text{waffle} ::= \text{waffle} \ [ \ \text{waffle-tail} \ ] \ | \ \text{piffle} \ \{ \ + \ \text{piffle} \ }^*$$

defines a **waffle** to be: either a **waffle** optionally followed by a **waffle-tail**, or a sequence of one or more **piffles** separated by terminal symbols **+**. (Further rules would be needed for **waffle**, **waffle-tail** and **piffle**.) In a grammar rule the left-hand side of  $::=$  shows the kind of construct being defined, and the right-hand side shows how it is defined in terms of other constructs. The sign **|** separates alternatives, the square brackets **[ ... ]** enclose optional parts, and the curly braces plus asterisk **{ ... }\*** enclose a part that may be repeated any number of times, including zero times. All other signs stand for themselves, like the symbol **+** in the example rule above.

In the grammar rules terminal symbols appear in a bold font. Some of the terminal symbols used, like **|** and **{**, are very similar to the grammar signs like **|** and **{** as described above. They can hopefully be distinguished by their bold appearance.

Grammar rules may be *recursive*: a construct may be defined in terms of itself, directly or indirectly. For example, given the rule:

$$\text{piffle} ::= \mathbf{1} \ | \ \mathbf{M} \ \{ \ \text{piffle} \ }^*$$

here are some possible piffles:

$\mathbf{1}$              $\mathbf{M}$              $\mathbf{M1}$              $\mathbf{M111}$              $\mathbf{MMMM}$              $\mathbf{M1M1}$

Note that the last two examples of **piffles** are ambiguous. For example, **M1M1** can be interpreted as: **M** followed by the two **piffles** **1** and **M1**, but also as: **M** followed by the

three piffles 1, M, and another 1. Some of the actual grammar rules allow ambiguities; the accompanying text will indicate how they are to be resolved.

## 2.1.2. Models

`spec ::= spec-form`

`op ::= op-name`

The term `spec` is used as short for `spec-form`. The *semantics* of Metaslang `specs` is given in terms of classes of *models*. A model is an assignment of sorts (sets of values) to all the `sort-names` and of “sorted” values to all the `op-names` declared -- explicitly or implicitly -- in the `spec`. The notion of *value* includes numbers, strings, arrays, functions, etcetera. A sorted value can be thought of as a pair  $(S, V)$ , in which  $S$  is a sort and  $V$  is a value that is an inhabitant of  $S$ . For example, the expressions `0 : Nat` and `0 : Integer` correspond, semantically, to the sorted values  $(N, 0)$  and  $(Z, 0)$ , respectively, in which  $N$  stands for the set of natural numbers  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , and  $Z$  for the set of integers  $\{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . (For historical reasons, the term *sort* is traditionally used in specification languages with essentially the same meaning as the term *type* in programming languages.) In Metaslang, *op* is used -- again for historical reasons -- for declared names representing values. The term “op” is used as an abbreviation for “op-name”. (*Op* for *operator*, a term used, again, for historical reasons, although including things normally not considered operators.) For example, given this `spec`:

```
spec
  sort Even
  op next : Even -> Even
  axiom nextEffect is
    fa(x : Even) ~(next x = x)
endspec
```

one possible model (out of many!) is the assignment of the even integers to `Even`, and of the function that increments an even number by 2 to `next`.

Each model has to *respect sorting*; for example, given the above assignment to `Even`, the function that increments a number by 1 does not map all even numbers to even numbers, and therefore can not -- in the same model -- be assigned to `next`.

Additionally, the axioms of the `spec` have to be satisfied by the model. The axiom labeled `nextEffect` above states that the function assigned to `op-name` `next` maps

any value of the sort assigned to `sort-name` Even to a different value. So the squaring function, although sort-respecting, could not be assigned to `next` since it maps 0 to itself.

If all sort-respecting combinations of assignments of sorts to `sort-names` and `ops` to `op-names` fail the axioms test, the `spec` has no models and is called *inconsistent*. Although usually undesirable, an inconsistent `spec` is not by itself considered erroneous. The Specware system does not attempt to detect inconsistencies, but associated provers can sometimes be used to find them. Not always; in general it is undecidable whether a `spec` is consistent or not.

In general, the meaning of a construct in a model depends on the assignments of that model, and more generally on an *environment*: a model possibly extended with assignments to `local-variables`. For example, the meaning of the claim  $\text{fa}(x : \text{Even}) \sim (\text{next } x = x)$  in the axiom `nextEffect` depends on the meanings of `Even` and `next`, while the sub-expression `next x`, for example, also depends on an assignment (of an “even” value) to `x`. To avoid laborious phrasings, the semantic descriptions use language like “the function `next` applied to `x`” as shorthand for this lengthy phrase: “the function assigned in the environment to `next` applied to the value assigned in the environment to `x`”.

When an environment is extended with an assignment to a `local-variable`, any assignments to synonymous `ops` or other `local-variables` are superseded by the new assignment in the new environment. In terms of Metaslang text, within the scope of the binding of `local-variables`, synonymous `ops` and earlier introduced `local-variables` (that is, having the same `name`) are “hidden”; any use of the `name` in that scope refers to the textually most recently introduced `local-variable`. For example, given:

```
def x = "op-x"
def y = let v = "let-v" in x
def z = let x = "let-x" in x
```

the value of `y` is `"op-x"` (`op x` is not hidden by the `local-variable v` of the `let-binding`), whereas the value of `z` is `"let-x"` (`op x` is hidden by the `local-variable x` of the `let-binding`).

### 2.1.3. Sort-correctness

If no sort-respecting combinations of assignments exist for a given `spec`, it is considered *incorrect*, and is said to have a sort error (or type error). This is determined by Specware while elaborating the `spec`, and signaled as an error. Sort-incorrectness

differs from inconsistency in that the meaning of the axioms does not come into play, and the question whether an incorrect **spec** is consistent is moot.

To be precise, there are subtle and less subtle differences between sort-incorrectness of a **spec** and its having no sort-respecting combinations of assignments. For example, the following **spec** is sort-correct but has no models:

```
spec
  sort Empty = | Just Empty
  op IdNotExist : Empty
endspec
```

The explanation is that the **sort-definition** for `Empty` generates an *implicit* axiom that all inhabitants of the sort `Empty` must satisfy, and for this recursive definition the axiom effectively states that such creatures can't exist: the sort `Empty` is uninhabited. That by itself is no problem, but precludes a sort-respecting assignment of an inhabitant of `Empty` to `op IdNotExist`. So the **spec**, while sort-correct, is actually inconsistent. See further under *Sort-definitions*.

Here is a sort-incorrect **spec** that has sort-respecting combinations of assignments:

```
spec
  sort Outcome = | Positive | Negative
  sort Sign = | Positive | Zero | Negative
  def whatAmI = Positive
endspec
```

Here there are two constructors `Positive` of different sorts, the sort `Outcome` and the sort `Sign`. That by itself is fine, but when such “overloaded” constructors are used, the context must give sufficient information which is meant. Here, the use of `Positive` in the definition for `op whatAmI` leaves both possibilities open; as used it is *sort-ambiguous*. Metaslang allows omitting sort information provided that, given a sort assignment to all **local-sort-variables** in scope, unique sorts for all sorted constructs, such as **expressions** and **patterns**, can be inferred from the context. If no complete and unambiguous sort-assignment can be made, the **spec** is not accepted by the Specware system. Sort-ambiguous **expressions** can be disambiguated by using a sort annotation, as described under *Annotated-expressions*. In the example, the definition of `whatAmI` can be disambiguated in either of the following ways:

```
def whatAmI : Sign = Positive
def whatAmI = Positive : Sign
```

Also, if the **spec** elsewhere contains something along the lines of:

```

op signToNat (s : Sign) : Nat
def sw = signToNat whatAmI

```

that is sufficient to establish that `whatAmI` has sort `Sign` and thereby disambiguate the use of `Positive`. See further under *Op-definitions* and *Structors*.

## 2.1.4. Constructive

When code is generated for a `spec`, complete “self-contained” code is only generated for sort-definitions and op-definitions that are fully *constructive*.

Non-constructiveness is “contagious”: a **definition** is only constructive if all components of the definition are. The sort of a **sort-name** without **definition** is not constructive. A sort is only constructive if all component sorts are. An **op** without **definition** is non-constructive, and so is an **op** whose sort is non-constructive. A **quantification** is non-constructive. The built-in polymorphic equality predicate `=` is only constructive for *discrete sorts* (see below).

A sort is called discrete if the equality predicate `=` for that sort is constructive. The built-in sorts `Integer`, `Nat`, `Boolean`, `Char` and `String` are all discrete. Sort `List S` is discrete when `S` is. All function sorts are non-discrete (even when the domain sort is the unit sort). Sum sorts, product sorts and record sorts are discrete whenever all component sorts are. Subsort  $(S \mid P)$  is discrete when supersort `S` is. (Predicate `P` need not be constructive: the equality test is that of the supersort.) Quotient sort  $S / Q$  is discrete when predicate `Q` is constructive. (Sort `S` need not be discrete: the equality test on the quotient sort is just the predicate `Q` applied to pairs of members of the `Q`-equivalence classes.)

## 2.2. Lexical conventions

A Metaslang text consists of a sequence of **symbols**, possibly interspersed with whitespace. The term *whitespace* refers to any non-empty sequence of spaces, tabs, newlines, and **comments** (described below). A **symbol** is presented in the text as a sequence of one or more “marks” (ASCII characters). Within a composite (multi-mark) **symbol**, no whitespace is allowed, but whitespace may be needed between two **symbols** if together they could be taken for one **symbol**; in particular, two **names** that follow each other should be separated by whitespace. More precisely, whitespace is required between two adjacent **symbols** for each of the following combinations, in which “abc” stands for an arbitrary word-symbol, “<\*>” stands for an arbitrary

non-word-symbol, “?:!” stands for an arbitrary non-word-symbol starting with a ?-mark, and “123” stands for an arbitrary literal (see below for the definitions of the various classes of symbols):

```
abc  abc
abc  ? : !
abc  123
< * >  < * >
123  abc
123  123
abc  _
(    *
```

Apart from the last two cases, no whitespace is ever needed adjacent to a special-symbol.

Inside literals (constant-denotations) whitespace is also disallowed, except for “significant-whitespace” as described under *String-literals*.

Other than that, whitespace -- or the lack of it -- has no significance. Whitespace can be used to lay-out the text for readability, but as far as only the meaning is concerned, the two following presentations of the same `spec` are entirely equivalent:

```
spec
  sort Even
  op next : Even -> Even
  axiom nextEffect is
    fa(x : Even) ~(next x = x)
endspec

spec sort    Even op    next : Even -> Even axiom nextEffect
is fa(x : Even)~(next      x                      = x)endspec
```

## 2.2.1. Symbols and Names

symbol ::= name | literal | special-symbol

name ::= word-symbol | non-word-symbol

word-symbol ::= word-start-mark { word-continue-mark }\*

word-start-mark ::= letter

word-continue-mark ::=  
letter | decimal-digit | \_ | ?

letter ::=

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m
n	o	p	q	r	s	t	u	v	w	x	y	z

decimal-digit ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

non-word-symbol ::= non-word-mark { non-word-mark }\*

non-word-mark ::=

`	~	!	@	\$	^	&	*	-
=	+	\		:	<	>	/	?

special-symbol ::= \_ | ( | ) | [ | ] | { | } | ; | , | .

Sample names:

Date	\$\$	?!
yymmdd2date	<*>	::=
well_ordered?	~==	

For convenience, here are the 14 printing ASCII marks that, next to **letters** and **decimal-digits**, can *not* occur in a non-word-symbol:

#	%	'	"	_	(	)
[	]	{	}	;	,	.

**Restriction.** As mentioned before, no whitespace is allowed in **symbols**: while a **node** is a single **name**, both a **node** and an **ode** consist of two **names**. Further, the case (lower or upper) of **letters** in **names** is significant: `grandparent`, `grandParent` and `grandpaRent` are three different **names**.

**Restriction.** In general, **names** can be chosen freely. However, the following *reserved words* have a special meaning and must not be used for **names**:

as	endspec	infixr	relax
axiom	ex	is	restrict
case	fa	let	sort
choose	false	morphism	spec

## Chapter 2. Metaslang

colimit	fn	obligations	then
conjecture	from	of	theorem
def	generate	op	translate
diagram	if	project	true
else	import	prove	where
embed	in	qualifying	
embed?	infixl	quotient	

They each count as a single **symbol**, and no whitespace is allowed inside any reserved word.

Likewise, the following *reserved non-words* must not be used for **names**:

:	::	
<-	->	+->

In addition, several **names** -- for example `=` -- are pre-defined in built-in libraries. While strictly speaking not reserved, they must not be redefined. See further the *Libraries* Appendix.

The **non-word-symbols** can be used to choose convenient **names** for infix operators that, conventionally, are written with non-alphabetic marks.

Some Metaslang users follow the convention of using **names** that start with a capital letter for **unit-identifiers** and **sort-names** and for **constructors**, while **word-symbols** chosen for **op-names** and **field-names** start with a lower-case letter. Both plain **local-variables** and **local-sort-variables** are often chosen to be single lower-case letters: `x`, `y`, `z`, `a`, `b`, `c`, with the start of the alphabet preferred for **local-sort-variables**. **Op-names** of predicates (that is, having some sort `S -> Boolean`) often end with the mark `?`. These are just conventions that users are free to follow or ignore, but in particular some convention distinguishing **constructors** from **op-names** and **local-variables** is recommended.

### 2.2.2. Comments

`comment ::= line-end-comment | block-comment`

`line-end-comment ::= % line-end-comment-body`

`line-end-comment-body ::=`  
`any-text-up-to-end-of-line`



```
block-comment ::= ( * block-comment-body *)
```

```
block-comment-body ::=
    any-text-including-newlines-and-nested-block-comments
```

Sample comments:

```
% keys must be unique
(* op yymdd2Date : String -> Date *)
```

Metaslang allows two styles of **comments**. The `%`-style is light-weight, for adding comment on a line *after* the formal text (or taking a line on its own, but always confined to a single line). The `( *...*)`-style can be used for blocks of text, spanning several lines, or stay within a line. Any text remaining on the line after the closing `*)` is processed as formal text. **Block-comments** may be nested, so the pairs of brackets `( *` and `*)` must be balanced.

A **block-comment** can not contain a **line-end-comment** and vice versa: whichever starts first has “the right of way”. For example, `( * 100 % or more! *)` is a **block-comment** with **block-comment-body** `100 % or more!`. The `%` here is a mark like any other; it does not introduce a **line-end-comment**. Conversely, in the **line-end-comment** `% op <*> stands for (*)` the `( *` is part of the **line-end-comment-body**; it does not introduce a **block-comment**. Note also that `%` and `( *` have no special significance in **literals** (which may not contain whitespace, including comments): `"100 % or more!"` is a well-formed **string-literal**.

## 2.3. Units

A “unit” is an identifiable **unit-term**, where “identifiable” means that the **unit-term** can be referred to by a **unit-identifier**. **Unit-terms** can be “elaborated”, resulting in **specs**, **mrphisms**, **diagrams** or other entities. The effect of elaborating a **unit-definition** is that its **unit-term** is elaborated and becomes associated with its **unit-identifier**.

A Specware project consists of a collection of Metaslang **unit-definitions**. They can be recorded in one or more Specware files. There are basically two styles for recording **unit-definitions** using Specware files. In the single-unit style, the file, when processed by Specware, contributes a single **unit-definition** to the project. In the multiple-unit style, the file may contribute several **unit-definitions**. The two styles may be freely mixed in a project (but not in the same Specware file). This is explained in more detail in what follows.

```

unit-definition ::= unit-identifier = unit-term

unit-term ::=
    spec-term
  | morphism-term
  | diagram-term
  | target-code-term
  | proof-term

specware-file-contents ::=
    unit-term
  | infile-unit-definition { infile-unit-definition } *

infile-unit-definition ::= fragment-identifier = unit-term

```

Unit-definitions may use other unit-definitions, including standard libraries, which in Specware 4.0 are supposed to be part of each project. However, the dependencies between units must not form a cycle; it must always be possible to arrange the unit-definitions in an order in which later unit-definitions only depend on earlier ones. How unit-definitions are processed by Specware is further dealt with in the Specware User Manual.

As mentioned above, unit-definitions are collected in Specware files, which in Specware 4.0 must have an `.sw` extension. The Specware files do not directly contain the unit-definitions that form the project. In fact, a user never writes unit-definition explicitly. These are instead determined from the contents of the Specware files using the following rules. There are two possibilities here. The first is that the `specware-file-contents` consists of a single unit-term. If  $P.sw$  is the path for the Specware file, the unit being defined has as its unit-identifier  $P$ . For example, if file `C:/units/Layout/Fixture.sw` contains a single unit-term  $U$ , the unit-identifier is `/units/Layout/Fixture`, and the unit-definition it contributes to the project is

```
/units/Layout/Fixture = U
```

(Note that this is not allowed as an `infile-unit-definition` in a `specware-file-contents`, since the unit-identifier is not a fragment-identifier.)

The second possibility is that the Specware file contains one or more `infile-unit-definitions`. If  $I$  is the fragment-identifier of such an `infile-unit-definition`, and  $P.sw$  is the path for the Specware file, the unit being defined has as its unit-identifier  $P\#I$ . For example, if file `C:/units/Layout/Cart.sw` contains an

infile-unit-definition `Pos = U`, the unit-identifier is `/units/Layout/Cart#Pos`, and the unit-definition it contributes to the project is

```
/units/Layout/Cart#Pos = U
```

## 2.3.1. Unit Identifiers

```
unit-identifier ::= swpath-based-path | relative-path
```

```
swpath-based-path ::= / relative-path
```

```
relative-path ::= { path-element / } * path-element [ # path-element ]
```

```
path-element ::= word-symbol
```

**Warning.** Note that unit-identifiers are processed by the tokenizer like everything else. This means that whitespace is removed and marks not allowed in **names**, even if otherwise permitted in filenames (such as `.`), cannot appear in unit-identifiers. For this reason, some care must be taken when naming units.

Unit-identifiers are used to identify unit-terms. Typically, only a final part of the full unit-identifier is used. When Specware is started with environment variable `SWPATH` set to a semicolon-separated list of pathnames for directories, the Specware files are searched for relative to these pathnames; for example, if `SWPATH` is set to

```
C:/units/Layout;C:/units/Layout/Cart,
```

```
C:/units/Layout/Fixture.sw
```

may be shortened to `/Fixture`, and

```
C:/units/Layout/Cart.sw
```

to `/Cart`. How unit-definitions are processed by Specware is further dealt with in the Specware User Manual.

Further, unit-identifiers can be relative to the directory containing the Specware file in which they occur. So, for example, both in file `C:/units/Layout/Fixture.sw` and in file `C:/units/Layout/Cart.sw`, unit-identifier `Tools/Pivot` refers to the unit-term contained in file `C:/units/Layout/Tools/Pivot.sw`, while `Props#SDF` refers to the unit-term of infile-unit-definition `SDF = ...` contained in file `C:/units/Layout/Props.sw`.

The unit-identifier must identify a unit-definition as described above; the elaboration of the unit-identifier is then the result of elaborating the corresponding unit-term,

yielding a `spec`, morphism, diagram, or other entity.

## 2.3.2. Specs

```
spec-term ::=
  unit-identifier
  | spec-form
  | spec-qualification
  | spec-translation
  | spec-substitution
  | diagram-colimit
  | obligator
```

Restriction. When used as a `spec-term`, the elaboration of a `unit-identifier` must yield a `spec`.

The elaboration of a `spec-term`, if defined, yields a “closed” `spec-form` as defined in the next subsection.

### 2.3.2.1. Spec Forms

```
spec-form ::= spec { declaration }* endspec
```

Restriction. Spec-forms must be sort-correct.

Sample `spec-forms`:

```
spec import Measures import Valuta endspec
```

A *closed* `spec-form` is a `spec-form` containing no `import-declarations`.

The elaboration of a `spec-form` yields the Metaslang text which is that `spec` itself, after expanding any `import-declarations`. The *meaning* of that text is the class of models of the `spec`, as described throughout this Chapter.

### 2.3.2.2. Qualifications

Names of sorts and ops may be *unqualified* or *qualified*. The difference is that `unqualified-names` do not contain a dot sign “.”, while `qualified-names` are prefixed

with a “qualifier” followed by a dot. Examples of unqualified names are `Date`, `today` and `<*>`. Examples of **qualified-names** are `Calendar.Date`, `Calendar.today` and `Monoid.<*>`.

**Qualifiers** can be used to disambiguate. For example, there may be reason to use two different **ops** called `union` in the same context: one for set union, and one for bag (multiset) union. They could then more fully be called `Set.union` and `Bag.union`, respectively. Unlike in earlier versions of Specware, there is no rigid relationship between **qualifiers** and the **unit-identifiers** identifying **specs**. The author of a collection of **specs** may use the **qualifier** deemed most appropriate for any **sort-name** or **op-name**. For example, there could be a single **spec** dubbed `SetsAndBags` that introduces two new **ops**, one called `Set.union` and one called `Bag.union`. Generally, **sorts** and **ops** that “belong together” should receive the same **qualifier**. It is up to the author of the **specs** to determine what belongs together.

**Sort-names** and **op-names** are *introduced* in a **declaration** or **definition**, and may then be *employed* elsewhere in the same **spec**. Thus, all occurrences of a **sort-name** or **op-name** can be divided into “introductions” and “employs”. The name as introduced in an introduction is the *full name* of the sort or **op**. If that name is unqualified, the full name is unqualified. If the name as introduced is qualified, then so is the full name.

For employs the rules are slightly different. First, if the name employed occurs just like that in an introduction, then it is the full name. Also, if the name employed is qualified, it is the full name. Otherwise, the name as employed may be unqualified shorthand for a qualified full name. For example, given an employ of the unqualified **sort-name** `Date`, possible qualified full names for it are `Calendar.Date`, `DateAndTime.Date`, `Diary.Date`, and so on. But, of course, the full name must be one that is introduced in the **spec**. If there is precisely one **qualified-name** introduced whose last part is the same as the **unqualified-name** employed, then that name is the full name. Otherwise, sort information may be employed to disambiguate (“resolve overloading”).

Here is an illustration of the various possibilities:

```
spec
  sort Apple
  sort Fruit.Apple
  sort Fruit.Pear
  sort Fruit.Date
  sort Calendar.Date
  sort Fruit.Basket = Apple * Pear * Date
endspec
```

In the definition of `sort Fruit.Basket` we have three unqualified employs of **sort-names**, viz. `Apple`, `Pear` and `Date`. The name `Apple` is introduced like that, so

the employ `Apple` already uses the full name; it does not refer to `Fruit.Apple`. The name `Pear` is nowhere introduced just like that, so the employ must be shorthand for some qualified full name. There is only one applicable introduction, namely `Fruit.Pear`. Finally, for `Date` there are two candidates: `Fruit.Date` and `Calendar.Date`. This is ambiguous, and in fact an error. To correct the error, the employ of `Date` should be changed into either `Fruit.Date` or `Calendar.Date`, depending on the intention.

It is possible to give a qualification in one go to all **unqualified-names** introduced in a **spec**. If  $Q$  is a **qualifier**, and  $S$  is a term denoting a **spec**, then the term  $Q$  **qualifying**  $S$  denotes the same **spec** as  $S$ , except that each introduction of an **unqualified-name**  $N$  is replaced by an introduction of the **qualified-name**  $Q.N$ . Employs that before referred to the unqualified introduction are also accordingly qualified, so that they now refer to the qualified introduction. For example, the value of

```
Company qualifying spec
  sort Apple
  sort Fruit.Apple
  sort Fruit.Pear
  sort Fruit.Basket = Apple * Pear
endspec
```

is the same as that of

```
spec
  sort Company.Apple
  sort Fruit.Apple
  sort Fruit.Pear
  sort Fruit.Basket = Company.Apple * Fruit.Pear
endspec
```

**spec-qualification** ::= **qualifier** **qualifying** **spec-term**

**qualifier** ::= **word-symbol**

**qualifiable-name** ::= **unqualified-name** | **qualified-name**

**unqualified-name** ::= **name**

**qualified-name** ::= **qualifier** . **name**

Sample **spec-qualification**:

```
Weight qualifying /Units#Weights
```

Sample qualifiable-names:

```
Key
$
Calendar.Date
Monoid.<*>
```

Let  $R$  be the result of elaborating spec-term  $S$ . Then the elaboration of qualification  $Q$  qualifying  $S$ , where  $Q$  is a **qualifier**, is  $R$  with each unqualified **sort-name** or **op-name**  $N$  introduced there replaced by the **qualified-name**  $Q.N$ . The same replacement applies to all uses of  $N$  identifying that introduced name.

For example, the elaboration of

```
Buffer qualifying spec
  op size : Nat
  axiom LargeSize is size >= 1024
endspec
```

results in:

```
spec
  op Buffer.size : Nat
  axiom LargeSize is Buffer.size >= 1024
endspec
```

Note that the **claim-name** `LargeSize` is unchanged. In later versions of Specware this may change, so that also unqualified **claim-names** get qualified.

### 2.3.2.3. Translations

```
spec-translation ::= translate spec-term by name-map
```

```
name-map ::= { [ name-map-item { , name-map-item }* ] }
```

```
name-map-item ::= sort-name-map-item | op-name-map-item
```

```
sort-name-map-item ::= [ sort ] qualifiable-name +-> qualifiable-name
```

```
op-name-map-item ::=
  [ op ] annotable-qualifiable-name +-> annotable-qualifiable-name
```

`annotable-qualifiable-name ::= qualifiable-name [ : sort ]`

Sample spec-translation:

```
translate A by {Counter +-> Nat}
```

Let  $R$  be the result of elaborating **spec-term**  $S$ . Then the elaboration of `translate`  $S$  by  $\{ M_1 +\rightarrow N_1, \dots M_n +\rightarrow N_n \}$  is  $R$  with each occurrence of a **qualifiable-name**  $M_i$  replaced by  $N_i$ .

For example, the elaboration of

```
translate spec
  sort E
  op i : E
endspec by {
  E +-> Counter,
  i +-> zero
}
```

results in:

```
spec
  sort Counter
  op zero : Counter
endspec
```

### 2.3.2.4. Substitutions

`spec-substitution ::= spec-term [ morphism-term ]`

Sample spec-substitution:

```
Routing#Basis[morphism /Coll/Lattice ->
               /Coll/LatticeWithTop {} ]
```

The elaboration of **spec-substitution**  $S[M]$  yields the **spec**  $T$  obtained as follows. Let **spec**  $R$  be the result of elaborating  $S$ , and morphism  $N$  that of  $M$ . Let **specs**  $D$  and  $C$  be the domain and codomain of  $N$ . First, remove from  $R$  all **declarations** of  $D$ , and



subject the result to the effect of  $N$ , meaning that all name translations of  $N$  and all extensions with **declarations** are performed. Then add the **declarations** of  $C$ , but without duplications, i.e., as if  $C$  is imported. The result obtained is  $T$ .

Restriction. **Spec**  $C$  must be a “sub-spec” of **spec**  $R$ , meaning that each **declaration** of  $C$  is also a **declaration** of  $R$ .

Informally,  $T$  is to  $R$  as  $C$  is to  $D$ .

Except when  $R$  introduces, next to the **sort-names** and **op-names** it has in common with  $D$ , new **sort-names** or **op-names** that also occur in  $C$ , the result **spec**  $T$  is a categorical colimit of this pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 D & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & R \\
 | & & | \\
 | & & | \\
 | & & | \\
 \vee & & \vee \\
 C & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & T
 \end{array}$$

Although isomorphic to the result that would be obtained by using a **diagram-colimit**,  $T$  is more “user-oriented” in two ways: the names in  $T$  are names from  $C$ , and axioms of  $D$  not repeated in  $C$  are not repeated here either.

For example, assume we have:

```

A = spec
  sort Counter
  op reset: Counter
  op tick : Counter -> Counter
  axiom Effect is
    fa (c : Counter) ~(tick c = c)
endspec

B = spec
  def reset = 0
  def tick c = c+1
endspec

M = morphism A -> B {Counter +-> Nat}

AA = spec
  import A
  sort Interval = {start: Counter, stop: Counter}
  op isEmptyInterval? : Interval -> Boolean
  def isEmptyInterval? {start = x, stop = y} = (x = y)

```

```
endspec
```

Then the result of `AA[M]` is the same as that of this `spec`:

```
spec
  import B
  sort Interval = {start: Nat, stop: Nat}
  op isEmptyInterval? : Interval -> Boolean
  def isEmptyInterval? {start = x, stop = y} = (x = y)
endspec
```

### 2.3.2.5. Diagram Colimits

`diagram-colimit ::= colimit diagram-term`

The result of elaborating a `diagram-colimit` is the `spec` which is the apex of the cocone forming the colimit in the category of `specs` and `spec-morphisms`. See further the Specware Tutorial.

### 2.3.2.6. Obligators

`obligator ::= obligations unit-term`

Restriction. The `unit-term` of an `obligator` must either be a `spec-term` or a `morphism-term`.

The result of elaborating an `obligator` is a `spec` containing the proof obligations engendered by the `spec` or `morphism` resulting from elaborating its `unit-term`. These proof obligations are expressed as `conjectures`; they can be discharged by proving them, using `proof-terms`. See further the Specware User Manual.

## 2.3.3. Morphisms

```
morphism-term ::=
  unit-identifier
  | spec-morphism
```

`spec-morphism ::= morphism spec-term -> spec-term name-map`

A morphism is a formal mapping between two closed specs that describes exactly how one is translated or extended into the other.

Restriction. When used as a morphism-term, the elaboration of a unit-identifier must yield a spec morphism.

Restriction (“proof obligations”). Given `spec-morphism morphism  $S \rightarrow T \{ M \}$` , let  $S'$  be the result of elaborating `translate  $S$  by  $\{ M \}$` , and let  $T'$  be the result of elaborating  $T$ . Then, first, each sort-name or op-name introduced in  $S'$  must also be introduced in  $T'$ . Further, no sort-name or op-name originating from a library spec may have been subject to translation. Finally, each axiom in  $S'$  must be a theorem that follows from the axioms of  $T'$ . Collectively, the axioms in  $S'$  are known as the *proof obligations* engendered by the morphism. They are the formal expression of the requirement that the step from  $S'$  to  $T'$  is a proper refinement.

## 2.3.4. Diagrams

`diagram-term ::=`  
     unit-identifier  
     | diagram-form

`diagram-form ::= diagram { diagram-element { , diagram-element }* }`

`diagram-element ::=`  
     diagram-node  
     | diagram-edge

`diagram-node ::= name +-> spec-term`

`diagram-edge ::= name : name -> name +-> morphism-term`

Restriction. When used as a diagram-term, the elaboration of a unit-identifier must yield a diagram.

Restriction. In a diagram, the first name of each diagram-node and diagram-edge must be unique (i.e., not be used more than once in that diagram). Further, for each diagram-edge  $E : ND \rightarrow NC \rightarrow M$ , there must be diagram-nodes  $ND \rightarrow D$

and  $NC \multimap C$  of the diagram such that, after elaboration,  $M$  is a morphism from  $D$  to  $C$ .

Sample diagram:

```
diagram {
  A          +-> /Coll/Lattice,
  B          +-> /Coll/LatticeWithTop,
  m : A -> B +-> /Coll/AddTop,
  C          +-> Routing#Basis,
  i : A -> C +-> morphism /Coll/Lattice ->
                                Routing#Basis {}
}
```

The result of elaborating a diagram-form is the categorical diagram whose nodes are labeled with the specs and whose edges are labeled with the morphisms that result from elaborating the corresponding spec-terms and morphism-terms.

## 2.3.5. Generate Terms

```
target-code-term ::=
  generate target-language-name spec-term [ in string-literal ]
```

```
target-language-name ::= lisp
```

Sample target-code-term:

```
generate lisp /Vessel#Contour
           in "C:/Projects/Vessel/Contour.lisp"
```

The elaboration of a target-code-term for a correct spec-term generates code in the language suggested by the target-language-name (currently only Common Lisp); see further the Specware User Manual.

## 2.3.6. Proof Terms

```
proof-term ::=
  prove claim-name in spec-term
```

```
[ with prover-name ]
[ using { claim-list } ]
[ options prover-options ]
```

```
prover-name ::= snark
```

```
claim-list ::= claim-name { , claim-name }*
```

```
prover-options ::= string-literal
```

Restriction. The claim-names must occur as claim-names in the spec that results from elaborating the spec-term.

Sample proof-term:

```
prove Effect in translate A by {Counter +-> Nat}
    options "(use-paramodulation t)"
```

The elaboration of a proof-term invokes the prover suggested by the prover-name (currently only SNARK). The property to be proved is the claim of the first claim-name; the claim-list lists the hypotheses (assumptions) that may be used in the proof. The prover-options are prover-specific and are not further described here. For details, see the Specware User Manual.

## 2.4. Declarations

```
declaration ::=
    import-declaration
  | sort-declaration
  | op-declaration
  | definition
```

```
definition ::=
    sort-definition
  | op-definition
  | claim-definition
```

```
equals ::= is | =
```

Sample declarations:

```
import Lookup
sort Key
op present : Database * Key -> Boolean
sort Key = String
def present(db, k) = embed? Some (lookup (db, k))
axiom norm_idempotent is fa(x) norm (norm x) = norm x
```

## 2.4.1. Import-declarations

A **spec** may contain one or more import-declarations. On elaboration, these are “expanded”. The effect is as if the bodies of these imported **specs** (themselves in elaborated form, which means that all import-declarations have been expanded, all translations performed and all shorthand employs of names have been resolved to full names, after which only declarations or definitions of sorts, ops and axioms are left) is inserted in place in the receiving **spec**.

For example, the result of

```
spec
  import spec
    sort A.Z
    op b : Nat -> Z
  end
  sort A.Z = String
  def b = toString
endspec
```

is this “expanded” **spec**:

```
spec
  sort A.Z
  op b : Nat -> A.Z
  sort A.Z = String
  def b = toString
endspec
```

For this to be correct, the imported **specs** must be correct by themselves; in addition, the result of expanding them in place must result in a correct **spec**.

There are a few restrictions, which are meant to catch unintentional naming mistakes. First, if two different imported **specs** each introduce a sort or **op** with the same (full) name, the introductions must be identical declarations or definitions, or one may be a declaration and the other a “compatible” definition. For example, given

```
S1 = spec op e : Int end
S2 = spec op e : Char end
S3 = spec def e = 0 end
```

the **specs** *S1* and *S3* can be imported together, but all other combinations of two or more co-imported **specs** are incorrect. This restriction is in fact a special case of the general requirement that import expansion must result in a correct **spec**. Secondly, a **sort-name** introduced in any of the imported **specs** cannot be re-introduced in the receiving **spec** except for the case of an “imported” declaration together with a definition in the receiving **spec**. Similarly for **op-names**, with the addition that an **op-definition** in the receiving **spec** must be compatible with an **op-declaration** for the same name in an imported **spec**. The latter is again a special case of the general requirement that import expansion must result in a correct **spec**.

What is specifically excluded by the above, is giving a definition of a sort or **op** in some **spec**, import it, and then redefining or declaring that sort or **op** with the same full name in the receiving **spec**.

import-declaration ::= **import** spec-term

Sample import-declarations

```
import Lookup
```

An import-declaration is contained in some **spec-form**, and to elaborate that **spec-form** the **spec-term** of the import-declaration is elaborated first, giving some **spec** *S*. The import-declaration has then the effect as if the **declarations** of the imported **spec** *S* are expanded in place. This cascades: if **spec** *A* imports *B*, and **spec** *B* imports *C*, then effectively **spec** *A* also imports *C*. An important difference with earlier versions of Specware than version 4 is that multiple imports of the same **spec** have the same effect as a single import.

If **spec** *A* is imported by *B*, each model of *B* is necessarily a model of *A* (after “forgetting” any **names** newly introduced by *B*). So *A* is then refined by *B*, and the morphism from *A* to *B* is known as the “import morphism”. As it does not involve translation of **sort-names** or **op-names**, it can be denoted by morphism  $A \rightarrow B \{ \}$ .

## 2.4.2. Sort-declarations

`sort-declaration ::= sort sort-name [ formal-sort-parameters ]`

`formal-sort-parameters ::= local-sort-variable | ( local-sort-variable-list )`

`local-sort-variable ::= name`

`local-sort-variable-list ::= local-sort-variable { , local-sort-variable }*`

Restriction. Each `local-sort-variable` of the `formal-sort-parameters` must be a different name.

Sample sort-declarations:

```
sort Date
sort Array a
sort Map(a, b)
```

Every `sort-name` used in a `spec` must be declared (in the same `spec` or in an imported `spec`, included the “built-in” `specs` that are always implicitly imported). A `sort-name` may have *sort parameters*. Given the example `sort-declarations` above, some valid `sorts` that can be used in this context are `Array Date`, `Array (Array Date)` and `Map (Nat, Boolean)`.

In a model of the `spec`, a sort is assigned to each unparameterized `sort-name`, while an infinite *family* of sorts is assigned to parameterized `sort-names` “indexed” by tuples of sorts, that is, there is one family member, a sort, for each possible assignment of sorts to the `local-sort-variables`. So for the above example `sort-declaration` of `Array` one sort must be assigned to `Array Nat`, one to `Array Boolean`, one to `Array (Array Date)`, and so on. These assigned sorts could all be the same sort, or perhaps all different, as long as the model respects sorting.

## 2.4.3. Sort-definitions

`sort-definition ::= sort sort-name [ formal-sort-parameters ] equals sort`

Sample sort-definitions:

```
sort Date = {year : Nat, month : Nat, day : Nat}
```



```
sort Array a = List a
sort Map(a, b) = (Array (a * b) | key_uniq?)
```

In each model, the sort assigned to the **sort-name** must be the same as the right-hand-side **sort**. For parameterized sorts, this extends to all possible assignments of sorts to the **local-sort-variables**, taking the right-hand **sorts** as interpreted under each of these assignments. So, for the example, `Map(Nat, Char)` is the same sort as `(Array (Nat * Char) | key_uniq?)`, and so on.

With *recursive sort-definitions*, there are additional requirements. For example, consider

```
sort Stack a =
  | Empty
  | Push {top : a, pop : Stack a}
```

This means that for each sort `a` there is a value `Empty` of sort `Stack a`, and further a function `Push` that maps values of sort `{top : a, pop : Stack a}` to `Stack a`. Furthermore, the sort assigned to `Stack a` must be such that all its inhabitants can be constructed *exclusively* and *uniquely* in this way: there is one inhabitant `Empty`, and all others are the result of a `Push`. Finally -- this is the point -- the sort in the model must be such that its inhabitants can be constructed this way in *a finite number of steps*. So there can be no “bottom-less” stacks: deconstructing a stack using

```
def fa(a) hasBottom? (s : Stack a) : Boolean =
  case s of
    | Empty -> true
    | Push {top, pop = rest} -> hasBottom? rest
```

is a procedure that is guaranteed to terminate, always resulting in `true`.

In general, **sort-definitions** generate implicit axioms, which for recursive definitions imply that the sort is not “larger” than necessary. In technical terms, in each model the sort is the least fixpoint of a recursive domain equation.

## 2.4.4. Op-declarations

```
op-declaration ::= op op-name [ fixity ] : sort-scheme
```

```
fixity ::= associativity priority
```

```
associativity ::= infixl | infixr
```

priority ::= nat-literal

sort-scheme ::= [ sort-variable-binder ] sort

sort-variable-binder ::= **fa** local-sort-variable-list

Sample op-declarations:

op usage : String

op o infixl 24 : fa(a,b,c) (b -> c) \* (a -> b) -> a -> c

An op-declaration introduces an op-name with an associated sort. The sort can be “monomorphic”, like `String`, or “polymorphic” (indicated by a `sort-variable-binder`). In the latter case, an indexed family of values is assigned to parameterized sort-names “indexed” by tuples of sorts, that is, there is one family member, a sorted value, for each possible assignment of sorts to the `local-sort-variables` of the `sort-variable-binder`, and the sort of that value is the result of the corresponding substitution of sorts for `local-sort-variables` on the polymorphic sort of the op. In the example above, the declaration of polymorphic `o` can be thought of as introducing a family of (fictitious) ops, one for each possible assignment to the `local-sort-variables` `a`, `b` and `c`:

$\circ_{\text{Nat}, \text{String}, \text{Char}} : (\text{String} \rightarrow \text{Char}) * (\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{String}) \rightarrow \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Char}$

$\circ_{\text{Nat}, \text{Nat}, \text{Boolean}} : (\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Boolean}) * (\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}) \rightarrow \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$

$\circ_{\text{Char}, \text{Boolean}, \text{Nat}} : (\text{Boolean} \rightarrow \text{Nat}) * (\text{Char} \rightarrow \text{Boolean}) \rightarrow \text{Char} \rightarrow \text{Nat}$

and so on. Any op-definition for `o` must be likewise accommodating.

Only binary ops (those having some sort  $S * T \rightarrow U$ ) may be declared with a fixity. When declared with a fixity, the op-name may be used in infix notation, and then it is called an *infix operator*. For `o` above, this means that `o(f, g)` and `f o g` may be used, interchangeably, with no difference in meaning. If the **associativity** is `infixl`, the infix operator is called *left-associative*; otherwise, if the **associativity** is `infixr`, it is called *right-associative*. If the **priority** is `priority N`, the operator is said to have *priority N*. The `nat-literal N` stands for a natural number; if infix operator `O1` has priority `N1`, and `O2` has priority `N2`, with  $N1 < N2$ , we say that `O1` has *lower priority* than `O2`, and that `O2` has *higher priority* than (or *takes priority over*) `O1`. For the role of the **associativity** and **priority**, see further at *Infix-applications*.

## 2.4.5. Op-definitions

```
op-definition ::=
  def [ sort-variable-binder ] formal-expression [ : sort ] equals
    expression
```

```
formal-expression ::= op-name | formal-application
```

```
formal-application ::= formal-application-head formal-parameter
```

```
formal-application-head ::= op-name | formal-application
```

```
formal-parameter ::= closed-pattern
```

Sample op-definitions:

```
def usage = "Usage: Lookup key [database]"

def fa(a,b,c) o(f : b -> c, g: a -> b) : a -> c =
  fn (x : a) -> f(g x)

def o(f, g) x = f(g x)
```

Restriction. See the restriction under *Op-declarations* on redeclaring/redefining ops.

Note that a **formal-expression** always contains precisely one **op-name**, which is the *op being defined* by the **op-definition**. Note further that the **formal-application** of an **op-definition** always uses prefix notation, also for infix operators.

An **op** can be defined without having been declared. In that case the **op-definition** generates an implicit **op-declaration** for the **op**, as well as implicit **sort-declarations** for “place-holder” sorts needed for the **op-declaration**. For example, an undeclared **op** defined by

```
def f x y = (x, y x)
```

generates implicit declarations like:

```
sort s4771
sort s4772
op f : s4771 -> (s4771 -> s4772) -> (s4771 * s4772)
```

in which `s4771` and `s4772` are fresh names. Note that this is not polymorphic, but monomorphic with *unspecified* sorts. However, the further uses of `f` must uniquely

determine sorts for the place-holders. In general, sorting information on **ops** may be omitted, but sufficient information must be supplied when used, so that all **expressions** can be assigned a sort in the context in which they occur while uniquely associating the **ops** with **op-declarations** or **op-definitions**. If two different associations both give sort-correct **specs**, the **spec** is ambiguous and incorrect.

As for **op-definitions**, the presence of a **sort-variable-binder** signals that the **op** being defined is polymorphic. Note that the optional sort annotation in an **op-definition** may not be a polymorphic **sort-scheme**, unlike for **op-declarations**. For example, the following is ungrammatical:

```
def o : fa(a,b,c) (b -> c) * (a -> b) -> a -> c =
  fn (f, g) -> fn (x) -> f(g x)
```

The presumably intended effect is achieved by

```
def fa(a,b,c) o : (b -> c) * (a -> b) -> a -> c =
  fn (f, g) -> fn (x) -> f(g x)
```

In a model of the **spec**, an indexed family of sorted values is assigned to a polymorphic **op**, with one family member for each possible assignment of sorts to the **local-sort-variables** of the **sort-variable-binder**, and the sort of that value is the result of the corresponding **sort-instantiation** for the polymorphic sort of the **op**. Thus, we can reduce the meaning of a polymorphic **op-definition** to a family of (fictitious) monomorphic **op-definitions**.

An **op-definition** with formal-prefix-application

```
def H P = E
```

in which  $H$  is a **formal-application-head**,  $P$  is a **formal-parameter** and  $E$  an **expression**, is equivalent to the **op-definition**

```
def H = fn P -> E
```

For example,

```
def o (f, g) x = f(g x)
```

is equivalent to

```
def o (f, g) = fn x -> f(g x)
```

which in turn is equivalent to

```
def o = fn (f, g) -> fn x -> f(g x)
```

By this deparameterizing transformation for each **formal-parameter**, an equivalent unparameterized **op-definition** is reached. The semantics is described in terms of such **op-definitions**.

In each model, the sorted value assigned to the **op** being defined must be the same as the value of the right-hand-side **expression**. For polymorphic **op-definitions**, this extends to all possible assignments of sorts to the **local-sort-variables**.

An **op-definition** can be thought of as a special notation for an axiom. For example,

```
def fa(a) double (x : a) = (x, x)
```

can be thought of as standing for:

```
op double : fa(a) a -> a * a

axiom double_def is
  sort fa(a) fa(x : a) double x = (x, x)
```

In fact, Specware generates such axioms for use by provers. But in the case of recursive definitions, this form of axiomatization does not adequately capture the meaning. For example,

```
def f (n : Nat) : Nat = 0 * f n
```

is an improper **definition**, while

```
axiom f_def is
  fa(n : Nat) f n = 0 * f n
```

characterizes the function that maps every natural number to 0. The issue is the following. Values in models can not be *undefined* and functions assigned to **ops** must be *total*. But in assigning a meaning to a recursive **op-definition**, we -- temporarily -- allow *undefined* and partial functions (functions that are not everywhere defined on their domain sort) to be assigned to recursively defined **ops**. In the thus extended class of models, the recursive **ops** must be the least-defined solution to the “axiomatic” equation (the least fixpoint as in domain theory), given the assignment to the other **ops**. For the example of *f* above this results in the everywhere undefined function, since 0 times *undefined* is *undefined*. If the solution results in an undefined value or a function that is not total (or for higher-order functions, functions that may return non-total functions, and so on), the **op-definition** is improper.

Specware 4.0 does not attempt to detect this condition or generate proof obligations for showing its absence.

Functions that are determined to be the value of an **expression**, but that are not assigned to **ops**, need not be total, but the context must enforce that the function can not be applied to values for which it is undefined. Otherwise, the **spec** is incorrect.

## 2.4.6. Claim-definitions

`claim-definition ::= claim-kind claim-name equals claim`

`claim-kind ::= axiom | theorem | conjecture`

`claim-name ::= name`

`claim ::= [ sort-quantification ] expression`

`sort-quantification ::= sort sort-variable-binder`

Sample claim-definitions:

```
axiom norm_idempotent is
  norm o norm = norm

theorem o_assoc is
  sort fa(a,b,c,d) fa(f : c -> d, g : b -> c, h : a -> b)
  f o (g o h) = (f o g) o h

conjecture pivot_hold is
  let p = pivot hold in
  fa (n : {n : Nat | n < p}) ~(hold n = hold p)
```

Restriction. The sort of the **claim** must be **Boolean**.

When a **sort-quantification** is present, the **claim** is polymorphic. The **claim** may be thought of as standing for an infinite family of monomorphic **claims**, one for each possible assignment of sorts to the **local-sort-variables**.

The **claim-kind** `theorem` should only be used for **claims** that have actually been proved to follow from the (explicit or implicit) axioms. In other words, giving them axiom status should not change the class of models. Theorems can be used by provers.

Conjectures are meant to represent proof obligations that should eventually attain theoremhood. Like theorems, they can be used by provers.

The Specware system passes on the **claim-name** of the **claim-definition** with the **claim** for purposes of identification. Both may be transformed to fit the requirements of the prover, and appear differently there. Not all **claims** can be faithfully represented in all provers, and even when they can, the logic of the prover may not be up to dealing with them.

Remark. It is a common mistake to omit the part “**claim-name equals**” from a **claim-definition**. A defensive style against this mistake is to have the **claim** always start on a new text line. This is additionally recommended because it may become required in future revisions of Metaslang.

## 2.5. Sorts

```

sort ::=
    sort-sum
  | sort-arrow
  | slack-sort

slack-sort ::=
    sort-product
  | tight-sort

tight-sort ::=
    sort-instantiation
  | closed-sort

closed-sort ::=
    sort-name
  | local-sort-variable
  | sort-record
  | sort-restriction
  | sort-comprehension
  | sort-quotient
  | ( sort )

```

(The distinctions “slack-”, “tight-” and “closed-” before “sort” have no semantic significance. The distinction merely serves the purpose of diminishing the need for parenthesizing in order to avoid grammatical ambiguities.)

Sample sorts:

```
| Point XYpos | Line XYpos * XYpos
List String * Nat -> Option String
a * Order a * a
PartialFunction (Key, Value)
Key
a
{center : XYpos, radius : Length}
(Nat | even)
{k : Key | present (db, k)}
Nat / (fn (m, n) -> m rem 3 = n rem 3)
(Nat * Nat)
```

The meaning of a parenthesized sort ( $S$ ) is the same as that of the enclosed sort  $S$ .

The various other kinds of sorts not defined here are described each in their following respective sections, with the exception of *local-sort-variable*, whose (lack of) meaning as a sort is described below.

**Restriction.** A *local-sort-variable* may only be used as a sort if it occurs in the scope of a *formal-sort-parameters* or *sort-variable-binder* in which it is introduced.

**Disambiguation.** A single name used as a sort is a *local-sort-variable* when it occurs in the scope of a *formal-sort-parameters* or *sort-variable-binder* in which it is introduced, and then it identifies the textually most recent introduction. Otherwise, the name is a *sort-name*.

A *local-sort-variable* used as a sort has no meaning by itself, and where relevant to the semantics is either “indexed away” (for parameterized sorts) or “instantiated away” (when introduced in a *formal-sort-parameters* or *sort-variable-binder*) before a meaning is ascribed to the construct in which it occurs. Textually, it has a scope just like a plain *local-variable*.

## 2.5.1. Sort-sums

$\text{sort-sum} ::= \text{sort-summand} \{ \text{sort-summand} \}^*$

$\text{sort-summand} ::= | \text{constructor} [ \text{slack-sort} ]$



constructor ::= name

Sample sort-sum:

| Point XYpos | Line XYpos \* XYpos

Restriction. The constructors of a sort-sum must all be different names.

The ordering of the sort-summands has no significance: | Zero | Succ Peano denotes the same “sum sort” as | Succ Peano | Zero.

A sort-sum denotes a *sum sort*, which is a sort that is inhabited by “tagged values”. A tagged value is a pair  $(C, v)$ , in which  $C$  is a constructor and  $v$  is a sorted value.

A sort-sum introduces a number of **embedders**, one for each sort-summand. In the discussion, we omit the optional `embed` keyword of the **embedders**. The **embedders** are similar to **ops**, and are explained as if they were **ops**, but note the Restriction specified under *Structors*.

For a sort-sum  $SS$  with sort-summand  $C\ S$ , in which  $C$  is a constructor and  $S$  a sort, the corresponding pseudo-op introduced is sorted as follows:

op  $C : S \rightarrow SS$

It maps a value  $v$  of sort  $S$  to the tagged value  $(C, v)$ . If the sort-summand is a single *parameter-less* constructor (the *slack-sort* is missing), the pseudo-op introduced is sorted as follows:

op  $C : SS$

It denotes the tagged value  $(C, ())$ , in which  $()$  is the inhabitant of the unit sort (see under *Sort-records*).

The sum sort denoted by the sort-sum then consists of the union of the ranges (for parameter-less constructors the values) of the pseudo-ops for all constructors.

The **embedders** are individually, jointly and severally *injective*, and jointly *surjective*.

This means, first, that for any pair of constructors  $C1$  and  $C2$  of *any* sort-sum, and for any pair of values  $v1$  and  $v2$  of the appropriate sort (to be omitted for parameter-less constructors), the value of  $C1\ v1$  is only equal to  $C2\ v2$  when  $C1$  and  $C2$  are the same constructor of the *same* sum sort, and  $v1$  and  $v2$  (which then are either both absent, or else must have the same sort) are both absent or are the same value. In other words, whenever the constructors are different, or are from different sort-sums, or the values are different, the results are different. (The fact that

synonymous **constructors** of different sorts yield different values already follows from the fact that values in the models are sorted.)

Secondly, for any value  $u$  of any sum sort, there is a **constructor**  $C$  of that sum sort and a value  $v$  of the appropriate sort (to be omitted for parameter-less **constructors**), such that the value of  $C\ v$  is  $u$ . In other words, all values of a sum sort can be constructed with an **embedder**.

For example, consider

```
sort Peano =
  | Zero
  | Succ Peano

sort Unique =
  | Zero
```

This means that there is a value `Zero` of sort `Peano`, and further a function `Succ` that maps values of sort `Peano` to sort `Peano`. Then `Zero` and `Succ n` are guaranteed to be different, and each value of sort `Peano` is either `Zero : Peano`, or expressible in the form `Succ (n : Peano)` for a suitable expression  $n$ . The expressions `Zero : Peano` and `Zero : Unique` denote different, entirely unrelated, values. (Note that `Unique` is *not* a subsort of `Peano`. Subsorts of a sort can only be made with a **sort-restriction**, for instance as in `(Peano | embed? Zero)`.) For recursively defined **sort-sums**, see also the discussion under *Sort-definitions*.

Note. Although the sum sorts `| Mono` and `| Mono ( )` have exactly the same set of inhabitants when considered as unsorted values, these two sorts are different, and the pseudo-ops they introduce have different sorts, only the second of which is a function sort:

```
Mono : | Mono

Mono : ( ) -> | Mono ( )
```

## 2.5.2. Sort-arrows

```
sort-arrow ::= arrow-source -> sort
```

```
arrow-source ::= sort-sum | slack-sort
```

Sample sort-arrow:

```
(a -> b) * b -> List a -> List b
```

In this example, the **arrow-source** is  $(a \rightarrow b) * b$ , and the (target) **sort** `List a -> List b`.

The *function*  $\text{sort } S \rightarrow T$  is inhabited by precisely all *partial or total* functions from  $S$  to  $T$ . That is, function  $f$  has sort  $S \rightarrow T$  if, and only if, for each value  $x$  of sort  $S$  such that the value of  $f\ x$  is defined, that value has sort  $T$ . Functions can be constructed with **lambda-forms**, and be used in **applications**.

In considering whether two functions (of the same sort) are equal, only the meaning on the domain sort is relevant. Whether a function is undefined outside its domain sort, or might return some value of some sort, is immaterial to the semantics of Metaslang. (For a sort-correct **spec**, the difference is unobservable.)

### 2.5.3. Sort-products

```
sort-product ::= tight-sort * tight-sort { * tight-sort }*
```

Sample sort-product:

```
(a -> b) * b * List a
```

Note that a **sort-product** contains at least two constituent **tight-sorts**.

A **sort-product** denotes a *product sort* that has at least two “component sorts”, represented by its **tight-sorts**. The ordering of the component sorts is significant: unless  $S$  and  $T$  are the same sort, the product sort  $S * T$  is different from the sort  $T * S$ . Further, the three sorts  $(S * T) * U$ ,  $S * (T * U)$  and  $S * T * U$  are all different; the first two have two component sorts, while the last one has three. The inhabitants of the product sort  $S_1 * S_2 * \dots * S_n$  are precisely all  $n$ -tuples  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ , where each  $v_i$  has sort  $S_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Values of a product sort can be constructed with **tuple-displays**, and component values can be extracted with **tuple-patterns** as well as with **projectors**.

### 2.5.4. Sort-instantiations

```
sort-instantiation ::= sort-name actual-sort-parameters
```

`actual-sort-parameters ::= closed-sort | ( proper-sort-list )`

`proper-sort-list ::= sort , sort { , sort }*`

Sample sort-instantiation:

`Map (Nat, Boolean)`

Restriction. The **sort-name** must have been declared or defined as a parameterized sort (see *Sort-declarations*), and the number of **sorts** in the **actual-sort-parameters** must match the number of **local-sort-variables** in the **formal-sort-parameters** of the **sort-declaration** and/or **sort-definition**.

The **sort** represented by a **sort-instantiation** is the sort assigned for the combination of sorts of the **actual-sort-parameters** in the indexed family of sorts for the **sort-name** of the **sort-instantiation**.

## 2.5.5. Sort-names

`sort-name ::= qualifiable-name`

Sample sort-names:

`Key`  
`Calendar.Date`

Restriction. At the **spec** level, a **sort-name** may only be used if there is a **sort-declaration** and/or **sort-definition** for it in the current **spec** or in some **spec** that is imported (directly or indirectly) in the current **spec**. If there is a unique **qualified-name** for a given unqualified ending, the qualification may be omitted for a **sort-name** used as a **sort**.

The sort of a **sort-name** is the sort assigned to it in the model. (In this case, the context can not have superseded the original assignment.)

## 2.5.6. Sort-records

`sort-record ::= { [ field-sorter-list ] } | ( )`

`field-sorter-list ::= field-sorter { , field-sorter }*`

`field-sorter ::= field-name : sort`

`field-name ::= name`

Sample sort-record:

```
{center : XYpos, radius : Length}
```

Restriction. The field-names of a sort-record must all be different.

Note that a sort-record contains either no constituent field-sorters, or else at least two.

A sort-record is like a sort-product, except that the components, called “fields”, are identified by name instead of by position. The ordering of the field-sorters has no significance: `{center : XYpos, radius : Length}` denotes the same *record sort* as `{radius : Length, center : XYpos}`. Therefore we assume in the following, without loss of generality, that the fields are ordered lexicographically according to their field-names (as in a dictionary: a comes before ab comes before b) using some fixed collating order for all marks that may comprise a name. Then each field of a record sort with  $n$  fields has a *position* in the range 1 to  $n$ . The inhabitants of the record sort  $\{F_1 : S_1, F_2 : S_2, \dots, F_n : S_n\}$  are precisely all  $n$ -tuples  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ , where each  $v_i$  has sort  $S_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . The field-names of that record sort are the field-names  $F_1, \dots, F_n$ , and, given the lexicographic ordering, field-name  $F_i$  *selects* position  $i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Values of a record sort can be constructed with record-displays, and field values can be extracted with record-patterns and (as for product sorts) with projectors.

For the sort-record `{ }`, which may be equivalently written as `( )`, the record sort it denotes has zero components, and therefore no field-names. This zero-component sort has precisely one inhabitant, and is called the *unit sort*. The unit sort may equally well be considered a product sort, and is the only sort that is both a product and a record sort.

## 2.5.7. Sort-restrictions

`sort-restriction ::= ( slack-sort | expression )`

Sample sort-restriction:

```
(Nat | even)
```

**Restriction.** In a **sort-restriction**  $(S \mid P)$ , the **expression**  $P$  must be a predicate on the sort  $S$ , that is,  $P$  must be a function of sort  $S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ .

Note that the parentheses in  $(S \mid P)$  are mandatory.

The inhabitants of **sort-restriction**  $(S \mid P)$  are precisely the inhabitants of sort  $S$  that satisfy the predicate  $P$ , that is, they are those values  $v$  for which the value of  $P \ v$  is `true`.

If  $P1$  and  $P2$  are the same function, then  $(S \mid P1)$  and  $(S \mid P2)$  are equivalent, that is, they denote the same sort.

The sort  $(S \mid P)$  is called a *subsort* of *supersort*  $S$ . Values can be shuttled between a subsort and its supersort and vice versa with **relaxators** and **restrictors**; see also *Relax-patterns*.

Metaslang does not require the explicit use of a **relaxator** to relax an **expression** from a subsort to its supersort if the context requires the latter. Implicit relaxation will take place when needed. For example, in the **expression** `~1` the **nat-literal** `1` of sort `Nat` is implicitly relaxed to sort `Integer` to accommodate the unary negation operator `~`, which has sort `Integer → Integer`.

Likewise, Metaslang does not require the explicit use of a **restrictor** to restrict an **expression** from a sort to a subsort if the context requires the latter. Implicit restriction will take place when needed. For example, in the **expression** `7 div 2` the **nat-literal** `2` of sort `Nat` is implicitly restricted to sort `PosNat`, a subsort of `Nat`, to accommodate the division operator `div`, whose second argument has sort `PosNat`. But note that implicit restriction engenders the same proof obligation as results when using an explicit **restrictor**.

## 2.5.8. Sort-comprehensions

**sort-comprehension** ::= { annotated-pattern | expression }

Sample sort-comprehension:

`{n : Nat | even n}`

**Restriction.** In a **sort-comprehension**  $\{P : S \mid E\}$ , the **expression**  $E$  must have sort `Boolean`.

**Sort-comprehensions** provide an alternative notation for **sort-restrictions** that is akin to the common mathematical notation for set comprehensions. The meaning of

sort-comprehension  $\{P : S \mid E\}$  is the same as that of the sort-restriction  $(S \mid \text{fn } P \rightarrow E)$ . So the meaning of the example sort-comprehension above is  $(\text{Nat} \mid \text{fn } n \rightarrow \text{even } n)$ .

## 2.5.9. Sort-quotients

sort-quotient ::= closed-sort / expression

Sample sort-quotient:

```
Nat / (fn (m, n) -> m rem 3 = n rem 3)
```

Restriction. In a sort-quotient  $S / Q$ , the expression  $Q$  must be a (binary) predicate on the sort  $S * S$  that is an equivalence relation, as explained below.

Equivalence relation. Call two values  $x$  and  $y$  of sort  $S$  “ $Q$ -related” if  $(x, y)$  satisfies  $Q$ . Then  $Q$  is an *equivalence relation* if, for all values  $x, y$  and  $z$  of sort  $S$ ,  $x$  is  $Q$ -related to itself,  $y$  is  $Q$ -related to  $x$  whenever  $x$  is  $Q$ -related to  $y$ , and  $x$  is  $Q$ -related to  $z$  whenever  $x$  is  $Q$ -related to  $y$  and  $y$  is  $Q$ -related to  $z$ . The equivalence relation  $Q$  then partitions the inhabitants of  $S$  into *equivalence classes*, being the maximal subsets of  $S$  containing mutually  $Q$ -related members. These equivalence classes will be called “ $Q$ -equivalence classes”.

The inhabitants of the *quotient sort*  $S / Q$  are precisely the  $Q$ -equivalence classes into which the inhabitants of  $S$  are partitioned by  $Q$ . For the example above, there are three equivalence classes of natural numbers leaving the same remainder on division by 3: the sets  $\{0, 3, 6, \dots\}$ ,  $\{1, 4, 7, \dots\}$  and  $\{2, 5, 8, \dots\}$ , and so the quotient sort has three inhabitants.

## 2.6. Expressions

```
expression ::=
    lambda-form
  | case-expression
  | let-expression
  | if-expression
  | quantification
```

```
| tight-expression

tight-expression ::=
  application
| annotated-expression
| closed-expression

closed-expression ::=
  op-name
| local-variable
| literal
| field-selection
| tuple-display
| record-display
| sequential-expression
| list-display
| structor
| ( expression )
```

(The distinctions `tight-` and `closed-` for expressions lack semantic significance, and merely serve the purpose of avoiding grammatical ambiguities.)

Sample expressions:

```
fn (s : String) -> s ^ "."
case z of {re = x, im = y} -> {re = x, im = ~y}
let x = x + 1 in f(x, x)
if x <= y then x else y
fa(x,y) (x <= y)  <=>  ((x < y) or (x = y))
f(x, x)
[] : List Arg
<=>
x
3260
z.re
("George", Poodle : Dog, 10)
{name = "George", kind = Poodle : Dog, age = 10}
(writeLine "key not found"; embed Missing)
["Sun", "Mon", "Tue", "Wed", "Thu", "Fri", "Sat"]
project 2
(n + 1)
```

Restriction. Like all polymorphic or sort-ambiguous constructs, an expression can only be used in a context if its sort can be inferred uniquely, given the expression and



the context. This restriction will not be repeated for the various kinds of **expressions** defined in the following subsections.

The meaning of a parenthesized **expression** ( $E$ ) is the same as that of the enclosed **expression**  $E$ .

The various other kinds of **expressions** not defined here are described each in their following respective sections, with the exception of **local-variable**, whose meaning as an **expression** is described below.

**Restriction.** A **local-variable** may only be used as an **expression** if it occurs in the scope of the **local-variable-list** of a **quantification** or of a **variable-pattern** in which it is introduced.

**Disambiguation.** A single name used as an **expression** is a **local-variable** when it occurs in the scope of a **local-variable-list** or **variable-pattern** in which a synonymous **local-variable** is introduced, and then it identifies the textually most recent introduction. Otherwise, the name is an **op-name** or an **embedder**; for the disambiguation between the latter two, see *Embedders*.

A **local-variable** used as an **expression** has the sorted value assigned to it in the environment.

## 2.6.1. Lambda-forms

**lambda-form** ::= **fn** match

Sample **lambda-form**:

```
fn (s : String) -> s ^ "."
```

The value of a **lambda-form** is a partial or total function. If the value determined for a **lambda-form** as described below is not a total function, the context must enforce that the function can not be applied to values for which it is undefined. Otherwise, the **spec** is incorrect. Specware 4.0 does not attempt to generate proof obligations for establishing this.

The sort of a **lambda-form** is that of its **match**. The meaning of a given **lambda-form** of sort  $S \rightarrow T$  is the function  $f$  mapping each inhabitant  $x$  of  $S$  to a value  $y$  of sort  $T$ , where  $y$  is the return value of  $x$  for the **match** of the **lambda-form**. If the **match** accepts each  $x$  of sort  $S$  (for acceptance and return value, see the section on *Matches*) function  $f$  is total; otherwise it is partial, and undefined for those values  $x$  rejected.

In case of a recursive definition, the above procedure may fail to determine a value for  $y$ , in which case function  $f$  is not total, but undefined for  $x$ .

## 2.6.2. Case-expressions

case-expression ::= **case** expression **of** match

Sample case-expressions:

```
case z of {re = x, im = y} -> {re = x, im = ~y}

case s of
| Empty -> true
| Push {top = _, pop = rest} -> hasBottom? rest
```

The value of a case-expression `case  $E$  of  $M$`  is the same as that of the application `(fn  $M$ ) ( $E$ )`.

## 2.6.3. Let-expressions

let-expression ::= **let** let-bindings **in** expression

let-bindings ::= recless-let-binding | rec-let-binding-sequence

recless-let-binding ::= pattern equals expression

rec-let-binding-sequence ::= rec-let-binding { rec-let-binding }\*

rec-let-binding ::=

**def** name formal-parameter-sequence [ : sort ] equals expression

formal-parameter-sequence ::= formal-parameter { formal-parameter }\*

Sample let-expressions:

```
let x = x + e in f(x, x)
let def f x = x + e in f (f x)
```

In the case of a recless-let-binding (recless = recursion-less), the value of the let-expression `let  $P$  =  $A$  in  $E$`  is the same as that of the application `(fn  $P$  ->`

$E) (A)$ . For the first example above, this amounts to  $f(x + e, x + e)$ . Note that  $x = x + e$  is not interpreted as a recursive definition.

In case of a **rec-let-binding-sequence** (rec = recursive), the **rec-let-bindings** have the role of “local” **op-definitions**; that is, they are treated exactly like **op-definitions** except that they are interpreted in the local environment instead of the global model. For the second example above, this amounts to  $(x + e) + e$ . (If  $e$  is a **local-variable** in this scope, the definition of  $f$  can not be “promoted” to an **op-definition**, which would be outside the scope binding  $e$ .) A **spec** with **rec-let-bindings** can be transformed into one without such by creating **op-definitions** for each **rec-let-binding** that take additional arguments, one for each of the **local-variables** referenced. For the example, in which  $f$  references **local-variable**  $e$ , the **op-definition** for the “extended” **op**  $f^+$  would be  $\text{def } f^+ e x = x + e$ , and the **let-expression** would become  $f^+ e (f^+ e x)$ . The only difference in meaning is that the models of the transformed **spec** assign a value to the newly introduced **op-name**  $f^+$ .

Note that the first occurrence of  $x$  in the above example of a **rec-let-binding** is a **variable-pattern** and the second-occurrence is in its scope; the third and last occurrence of  $x$ , however, is outside the scope of the first  $x$  and identifies an **op** or **local-variable**  $x$  introduced elsewhere. So, without change in meaning, the **rec-let-binding** can be changed to:

```
let def f xena = xena + e in f (f x)
```

## 2.6.4. If-expressions

**if-expression** ::= **if** expression **then** expression **else** expression

Sample if-expression:

```
if x <= y then x else y
```

The value of an **if-expression** **if**  $B$  **then**  $T$  **else**  $F$  is the same as that of the **case-expression** **case**  $B$  **of** **true**  $\rightarrow (T)$  **|** **false**  $\rightarrow (F)$ .

## 2.6.5. Quantifications

quantification ::= quantifier ( local-variable-list ) expression

quantifier ::= **fa** | **ex**

local-variable-list ::= annotable-variable { , annotable-variable }\*

annotable-variable ::= local-variable [ : sort ]

local-variable ::= name

Sample quantifications:

```
fa(x) norm (norm x) = norm x
ex(e : M) fa(x : M) x <*> e = x & e <*> x = x
```

Restriction. Each local-variable of the local-variable-list must be a different name.

Quantifications are non-constructive, even when the domain sort is finitely enumerable. The main use is in claims. The sort of a quantification is `Boolean`. There are two kinds of quantifications: **fa**-quantifications (or “universal quantifications”; **fa** = for all), and **ex**-quantifications (or “existential quantifications”; **ex** = there exists).

The value of a **fa**-quantification **fa** *V* *E*, in which *V* is a local-variable-list and *E* is an expression, is determined as follows. Let *M* be the match *V* → *E*. If *M* has return value `true` for each value *x* in its domain (note that rejection cannot happen here), the value of the quantification is `true`; otherwise it is `false`.

The value of an **ex**-quantification **ex** *V* *E* is the same as that of the **fa**-quantification  $\sim(\text{fa } V \sim(E))$ .

Note that **fa** and **ex** must be followed by an opening parenthesis ( . So **fa** *x* (*x* = *x*), for example, is ungrammatical.

## 2.6.6. Applications

application ::= prefix-application | infix-application

prefix-application ::= application-head actual-parameter

application-head ::= closed-expression | prefix-application

`actual-parameter ::= closed-expression`

`infix-application ::= actual-parameter op-name actual-parameter`

Sample applications:

```
f (x, x)
f x (g y)
x + 1
```

Disambiguation. The grammar for application is ambiguous for cases like  $P \ N \ Q$ , in which  $P$  and  $Q$  are closed-expressions, and  $N$  is the name of an infix operator. The ambiguity is resolved in favor of the reading as an infix-application, and then the infix-application  $P \ N \ Q$  is equivalent to the prefix-application  $N \ (P, \ Q)$ . For example, in the second example application  $f \ x \ (g \ y)$  given above, if  $x$  is an infix operator, the application is an infix-application equivalent to prefix-application  $x \ (f, \ g \ y)$ . If  $x$  is not defined as an infix operator, or is a local-variable in scope, the application is the same as the unconditionally unambiguous version  $(f \ x) \ (g \ y)$ . Note that the resolution of the ambiguity does not rely on information about the sorts. Even if  $(f \ x) \ (g \ y)$  is sort-correct and  $x \ (f, \ g \ y)$  is not, the latter interpretation is chosen for disambiguating  $f \ x \ (g \ y)$  whenever  $x$  is an infix operator in the context, and consequently  $f \ x \ (g \ y)$  is then also sort-incorrect.

Disambiguation. An infix-application  $P \ M \ Q \ N \ R$ , in which  $P, Q$  and  $R$  are actual-parameters and  $M$  and  $N$  are infix operators, is interpreted as either  $(P \ M \ Q) \ N \ R$  or  $P \ M \ (Q \ N \ R)$ . The choice is made as follows. If  $M$  has higher priority than  $N$ , or the priorities are the same but  $M$  is left-associative, the interpretation is  $(P \ M \ Q) \ N \ R$ . In all other cases the interpretation is  $P \ M \ (Q \ N \ R)$ . For example, given

```
op @ infixl 10: Nat * Nat -> Nat
op $ infixr 20: Nat * Nat -> Nat
```

the following interpretations hold:

```
1 $ 2 @ 3 = (1 $ 2) @ 3
1 @ 2 @ 3 = (1 @ 2) @ 3
1 @ 2 $ 3 = 1 @ (2 $ 3)
1 $ 2 $ 3 = 1 $ (2 $ 3)
```

Note that no sort information is used in the disambiguation. If  $(1 \ @ \ 2) \ \$ \ 3$  is sort-correct but  $1 \ @ \ (2 \ \$ \ 3)$  is not, the formula  $1 \ @ \ 2 \ \$ \ 3$  is sort-incorrect, since its interpretation is.

Restriction. In an application  $H\ P$ , in which  $H$  is an application-head and  $P$  an actual-parameter, the sort of  $P$  must be some function sort  $S \rightarrow T$ , and then  $H$  must have the domain sort  $S$ . The sort of the whole application is then  $T$ .

The value of application  $H\ P$  is the value returned by function  $H$  for the argument value  $P$ . (Since infix-applications may always be rewritten equivalently as prefix-applications, only the semantics for prefix-applications is given explicitly.)

## 2.6.7. Annotated-expressions

annotated-expression ::= tight-expression : sort

Restriction. In an annotated-expression  $E : S$ , the expression  $E$  must have sort  $S$ .

Sample annotated-expression:

```
[] : List Arg
Positive : Sign
```

The value of an annotated-expression  $E : S$  is the value of  $E$ .

The sort of some expressions is polymorphic. For example, for any sort  $T$ , `[]` denotes the empty list of sort `List T`. Likewise, constructors of parameterized sum sorts can be polymorphic, as the constructor `None` of

```
sort Option a = | Some a | None
```

Further, overloaded constructors have an ambiguous sort. By annotating such polymorphic or sort-ambiguous expressions with a sort, their sort can be disambiguated, which is required unless an unambiguous sort can already be inferred from the context. Annotation, even when redundant, can further help to increase clarity.

## 2.6.8. Op-names

op-name ::= qualifiable-name

Sample op-names:

```
length
>=
DB_LOOKUP.Lookup
```

Restriction. An **op-name** may only be used if there is an **op-declaration** and/or **op-definition** for it in the current **spec** or in some **spec** that is imported (directly or indirectly) in the current **spec**. If there is a unique **qualified-name** for a given unqualified ending that is sort-correct in the context, the qualification may be omitted for an **op-name** used as an **expression**. So overloaded **ops** may only be used as such when their sort can be disambiguated in the context.

The value of an **op-name** is the value assigned to it in the model. (In this case, the context can not have superseded the original assignment.)

## 2.6.9. Literals

```
literal ::=
    boolean-literal
  | nat-literal
  | char-literal
  | string-literal
```

Sample literals:

```
true
3260
#z
"On/Off switch"
```

Restriction: No whitespace is allowed anywhere inside any kind of **literal**, except for “significant” whitespace in **string-literals**, as explained there.

**Literals** provide denotations for the inhabitants of the “built-in” sorts **Boolean**, **Nat**, **Char** and **String**. The value of a **literal** is independent of the environment.

(There are no **literals** for the built-in sort **Integer**. For nonnegative integers, a **nat-literal** can be used. For negative integers, apply the built-in **op** `~`, which negates an integer, or use the built-in infix operator `-`: both `~1` and `0 - 1` denote the negative integer `-1`.)

### 2.6.9.1. Boolean-literals

```
boolean-literal ::= true | false
```

Sample boolean-literals:

```
true
false
```

The sort `Boolean` has precisely two inhabitants, the values of `true` and `false`.

Note that `true` and `false` are not **constructors**. So `embed true` is ungrammatical.

### 2.6.9.2. Nat-literals

```
nat-literal ::= decimal-digit { decimal-digit }*
```

Sample nat-literals:

```
3260
007
```

The sort `Nat` is, by definition, the subsort of `Integer` restricted to the nonnegative integers 0, 1, 2, ... , which we identify with the natural numbers. The value of a `nat-literal` is the natural number of which it is a decimal representation; for example, the `nat-literal` `3260` denotes the natural number 3260. Leading `decimal-digits` 0 have no significance: both `007` and `7` denote the number 7.

### 2.6.9.3. Char-literals

```
char-literal ::= #char-literal-glyph
```

```
char-literal-glyph ::= char-glyph | "
```

```
char-glyph ::=
    letter
  | decimal-digit
  | other-char-glyph
```

```
other-char-glyph ::=
    ! | : | @ | # | $ | % | ^ | & | * | ( | ) | _ | - | + | =
  | | | ~ | ` | . | , | < | > | ? | / | ; | ' | [ | ] | { | }
  | \ \ | \"
  | \a | \b | \t | \n | \v | \f | \r | \s
  | \x hexadecimal-digit hexadecimal-digit
```

```
hexadecimal-digit ::=
```



decimal-digit					
a	b	c	d	e	f
A	B	C	D	E	F

Sample char-literals:

```
#z
#\x7a
```

The sort `Char` is inhabited by the 256 8-bit *characters* occupying decimal positions 0 through 255 (hexadecimal positions 00 through FF) in the ISO 8859-1 code table. The first 128 characters of that code table are the traditional ASCII characters (ISO 646). (Depending on the operating environment, in particular the second set of 128 characters -- those with “the high bit set” -- may print or otherwise be visually presented differently than intended by the ISO 8859-1 code.) The value of a **char-literal** is a character of sort `Char`.

The value of a **char-literal** `#G`, where *G* is a **char-glyph**, is the character denoted by *G*. For example, `#z` is the character that prints as `z`. The two-mark **char-literal** `#"` provides a variant notation of the three-mark **char-literal** `#\"` and yields the character `"` (decimal position 34).

Each one-mark **char-glyph** *C* denotes the character that “prints” as *C*. The two-mark **char-glyph** `\\` denotes the character `\` (decimal position 92), and the two-mark **char-glyph** `\"` denotes the character `"` (decimal position 34).

Notations are provided for denoting eight “non-printing” characters, which, with the exception of the first, are meant to regulate lay-out in printing; the actual effect may depend on the operating environment:

glyph	decimal	name
<code>\a</code>	7	bell
<code>\b</code>	8	backspace
<code>\t</code>	9	horizontal tab
<code>\n</code>	10	newline
<code>\v</code>	11	vertical tab
<code>\f</code>	12	form feed
<code>\r</code>	13	return
<code>\s</code>	32	space

Finally, every character can be obtained using the hexadecimal representation of its position. The four-mark **char-glyph**  $\backslash x H_1 H_0$  denotes the character with hexadecimal position  $H_1 H_0$ , which is decimal position 16 times the decimal value of **hexadecimal-digit**  $H_1$  plus the decimal value of **hexadecimal-digit**  $H_0$ , where the decimal value of the digits 0 through 9 is conventional, while the six extra digits A through F correspond to 10 through 15. The case (lower or upper) of the six extra digits is not significant. For example,  $\backslash x7A$  or equivalently  $\backslash x7a$  has decimal position 16 times 7 plus 10 = 122, and either version denotes the character z. The “null” character can be obtained by using  $\backslash x00$ .

#### 2.6.9.4. String-literals

**string-literal** ::= " string-body "

**string-body** ::= { **string-literal-glyph** }\*

**string-literal-glyph** ::= **char-glyph** | **significant-whitespace**

**significant-whitespace** ::= **space** | **tab** | **newline**

The presentation of a **significant-whitespace** is the whitespace suggested by the name (**space**, **tab** or **newline**).

Sample **string-literals**:

```
" "
"see page"
"see\spage"
"the symbol ' is a single quote"
"the symbol \" is a double quote"
```

The sort **String** is inhabited by the *strings*, which are (possibly empty) sequences of characters. The sort **String** is primitive; it is a different sort than the isomorphic sort **List Char**, and the list operations can not be directly applied to strings.

The value of a **string-literal** is the sequence of characters denoted by the **string-literal-glyphs** comprising its **string-body**, where the value of a **significant-whitespace** is the whitespace character suggested by the name (**space**, **horizontal tab** or **newline**). For example, the **string-literal** "seepage" is different from "see page"; the latter denotes an eight-character string of which the fourth character is a space. The space can be made explicit by using the **char-glyph**  $\backslash s$ .

When a double-quote character " is needed in a string, it must be escaped, as in "[ 6 ' 2 \" ] ", which would print like this: [ 6 ' 2 " ].

## 2.6.10. Field-selections

field-selection ::= closed-expression . field-selector

field-selector ::= nat-literal | field-name

Disambiguation. A closed-expression of the form  $M.N$ , in which  $M$  is a word-symbol and  $N$  is a name, is interpreted as an op-name if  $M.N$  occurs as the op-name of an op-declaration or op-definition in the spec in which it occurs or in the set of names imported from another spec through an import-declaration. Otherwise,  $M.N$  is interpreted as a field-selection. (The effect of a field-selection can always be obtained with a projector.)

Sample field-selections:

```
triple.2
z.re
```

A field-selection  $E.F$  is a convenient notation for the equivalent expression  $(\text{project } F E)$ . (See under *Projectors*.)

## 2.6.11. Tuple-displays

tuple-display ::= ( tuple-display-body )

tuple-display-body ::= [ expression , expression { , expression }\* ]

Sample tuple-display:

```
("George", Poodle : Dog, 10)
```

Note that a tuple-display-body contains either no expressions, or else at least two.

The value of a tuple-display whose tuple-display-body is not empty, is the tuple whose components are the respective values of the expressions of the tuple-display-body, taken in textual order. The sort of that tuple is the “product” of the

corresponding sorts of the components. The value of `()` is the empty tuple, which is the sole inhabitant of the unit sort `()`. (The fact that the notation `()` does double duty, for a sort and as an expression, creates no ambiguity. Note also that -- unlike the empty list-display `[]` -- the expression `()` is monomorphic, so there is no need to ever annotate it with a sort.)

## 2.6.12. Record-displays

`record-display ::= { record-display-body }`

`record-display-body ::= [ field-filler { , field-filler }* ]`

`field-filler ::= field-name equals expression`

Sample record-display:

```
{name = "George", kind = Poodle : Dog, age = 10}
```

The value of a `record-display` is the record whose components are the respective values of the expressions of the `record-display-body`, taken in the lexicographic order of the `field-names`, as discussed under *Sort-records*. The sort of that record is the record sort with the same set of `field-names`, where the sort for each `field-name`  $F$  is the sort of the corresponding sort of the component selected by  $F$  in the record. The value of `{ }` is the empty tuple, which is the sole inhabitant of the unit sort `()`. (For expressions as well as for sorts, the notations `{ }` and `()` are fully interchangeable.)

## 2.6.13. Sequential-expressions

`sequential-expression ::= ( open-sequential-expression )`

`open-sequential-expression ::= void-expression ; sequential-tail`

`void-expression ::= expression`

`sequential-tail ::= expression | open-sequential-expression`

Sample sequential-expression:

```
(writeLine "key not found"; embed Missing)
```

A sequential-expression  $(V ; T)$  is equivalent to the let-expression `let _ =  $V$  in  $(T)$` . So the value of a sequential-expression  $(V_1 ; \dots ; V_n ; E)$  is the value of its last constituent expression  $E$ .

Sequential-expressions can be used to achieve non-functional “side effects”, effectuated by the elaboration of the void-expressions, in particular the output of a message. This is useful for tracing the execution of generated code. The equivalent effect of the example above can be achieved by a let-binding:

```
let _ = writeLine "key not found" in
embed Missing
```

(If the intent is to temporarily add, and later remove or disable the tracing output, this is probably a more convenient style, as the modifications needed concern a single full text line.) Any values resulting from elaborating the void-expressions are discarded.

## 2.6.14. List-displays

`list-display ::= [ list-display-body ]`

`list-display-body ::= [ expression { , expression }* ]`

Sample list-display:

```
[ "Sun", "Mon", "Tue", "Wed", "Thu", "Fri", "Sat" ]
```

Restriction. All expressions of the list-display-body must have the same sort.

Note that a `list-display [ ]` with empty list-display-body is polymorphic, and may need to be sort-disambiguated, for example with a sort annotation. In a case like `[ [ ] , [ 1 ] ]`, there is no need to disambiguate `[ ]`, since the above restriction already implies that `[ ]` here has the same sort as `[ 1 ]`, which has sort `List Nat`.

The parameterized sort `List`, although built-in, is actually not primitive, but defined by:

```
sort List a =
  | Nil
  | Cons a * List a
```

The empty list-display `[ ]` denotes the same list as the expression `Nil`, a singleton list-display `[  $E$  ]` denotes the same list as the expression `Cons ( $E$ , Nil)`, and a

multi-element list-display  $[E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n]$  denotes the same list as the expression `Cons (E1, [E2, ... , En])`.

## 2.6.15. Structors

```
structor ::=
  projector
  | relaxator
  | restrictor
  | quotienter
  | chooser
  | embedder
  | embedding-test
```

The **structors** are a medley of constructs, all having polymorphic or sort-ambiguous function sorts and denoting special functions that go between structurally related sorts, such as the constructors of sum sorts and the destructors of product sorts.

Restriction. Like all polymorphic or sort-ambiguous constructs, a **structor** can only be used in a context where its sort can be inferred uniquely. This restriction will not be repeated for the various kinds of **structors** described in the following subsections.

For example, the following correct **spec** becomes incorrect when any of the sort annotations is omitted:

```
spec
  def fa(a) p2 = project 2 : String * a -> a
  def          q2 = project 2 : String * Nat -> Nat
endspec
```

### 2.6.15.1. Projectors

`projector ::= project` field-selector

Sample projectors:

```
project 2
project re
```

When the **field-selector** is some **nat-literal** with value  $i$ , it is required that  $i$  be at least 1. The sort of the **projector** is a function sort (whose domain sort is a product sort) of the form  $S_1 * S_2 * \dots * S_n \rightarrow S_i$ , where  $n$  is at least  $i$ , and the value of the **projector** is the function that maps each  $n$ -tuple  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$  inhabiting the domain sort to its  $i$ th component  $v_i$ .

When the **field-selector** is some **field-name**  $F$ , the sort of the **projector** is a function sort (whose domain sort is a record sort) of the form  $\{F_1 : S_1, F_2 : S_2, \dots, F_n : S_n\} \rightarrow S_i$ , where  $F$  is the same **field-name** as  $F_i$  for some natural number  $i$  in the range 1 through  $n$ . Assuming that the fields are lexicographically ordered by **field-name** (see under *Sort-records*), the value of the **projector** is the function that maps each  $n$ -tuple  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$  inhabiting the domain sort to its  $i$ th component  $v_i$ .

### 2.6.15.2. Relaxators

**relaxator** ::= **relax** closed-expression

Sample relaxator:

```
relax even
```

Restriction. The closed-expression of a **relaxator** must have some function sort  $S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ .

The sort of **relaxator** **relax**  $P$ , where  $P$  has sort  $S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ , is the function sort (whose domain is a subsort)  $(S \mid P) \rightarrow S$ . The value of the **relaxator** is the function that maps each inhabitant of subsort  $(S \mid P)$  to the same value -- apart from the sort information -- inhabiting supersort  $S$ .

For example, given

```
sort Even = (Nat | even)
```

we have the sorting

```
relax even : Even -> Nat
```

for the function that injects the even natural numbers back into the supersort of **Even**.

Metaslang does not require the explicit use of a **relaxator** to relax an **expression** from a subsort to its supersort if the context requires the latter. Implicit relaxation will take place when needed. For example, in the **expression** `~1` the **nat-literal** `1` of sort **Nat** is

implicitly relaxed to sort `Integer` to accommodate the unary negation operator `~`, which has sort `Integer -> Integer`.

Note the remarks about equivalence of **sort-restrictions** in the corresponding section.

### 2.6.15.3. Restrictors

`restrictor ::= restrict` closed-expression

Sample restrictor:

```
restrict even
```

**Restriction.** The closed-expression of a restrictor must have some function sort  $S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ .

A **restrictor** `restrict P` is a convenient notation for the **lambda-form** `fn X -> let relax P V = X in V`, where  $V$  is some unique fresh **name**, that is, it is any **name** that does not already occur in the **spec**, directly or indirectly through an **import**.

The sort of a **restrictor** is of the form  $S \rightarrow (S \mid P)$ , that is, it goes from a supersort to a subsort. In general its value is a partial function, defined only on the range of the function `relax P`. The use of this partial function engenders a proof obligation that the arguments to which it is applied satisfy predicate  $P$ .

For example, the **restrictor** `restrict (fn (n : Integer) -> n >= 0)` has sort `Integer -> Nat`; its domain of definedness are the nonnegative integers (of sort `Integer`). Used in the following expression, which has sort `Nat` assuming that `i` has sort `Integer`,

```
if i < 0
then 0
else restrict (fn (n : Integer) -> n >= 0) i
```

the context guarantees that integer `i`, where it is subjected to the **restrictor**, satisfies the nonnegativity restriction on natural numbers, and will be accepted and achieve `Nat`-hood. Formally, the proof obligation here is  $\sim(i < 0) \Rightarrow (i \geq 0)$ . This is a theorem from the Theory of Integers.

Metaslang does not require the explicit use of a **restrictor** to restrict an **expression** from a sort to a subsort if the context requires the latter. Implicit restriction will take place when needed. For example, in the expression `7 div 2` the **nat-literal** `2` of sort `Nat` is implicitly restricted to sort `PosNat`, a subsort of `Nat`, to accommodate the



division operator `div`, whose second argument has sort `PosNat`. But note that implicit restriction engenders the same proof obligation as results when using an explicit restrictor.

### 2.6.15.4. Quotienters

`quotienter ::= quotient closed-expression`

Sample quotienter:

```
quotient (fn (m, n) -> m rem 3 = n rem 3)
```

Restriction. The closed-expression of a `quotienter` must have some sort  $S * S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ ; in addition, it must be an equivalence relation, as explained under *Sort-quotients*.

The sort of `quotienter quotient Q`, where  $Q$  has sort  $S * S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ , is the function sort  $S \rightarrow S / Q$ , that is, it goes from some sort to one of its quotient sorts. The value of the `quotienter` is the function that maps each inhabitant of sort  $S$  to the  $Q$ -equivalence class inhabiting  $S / Q$  of which it is a member.

For example, given

```
def congMod3 : Nat * Nat -> Boolean =
  (fn (m, n) -> m rem 3 = n rem 3)
```

```
sort Z3 = Nat / congMod3
```

we have the sorting

```
quotient congMod3 : Nat -> Z3
```

and the function maps, for example, the number 5 to the equivalence class  $\{2, 5, 8, \dots\}$ , which is one of the three inhabitants of  $Z3$ .

### 2.6.15.5. Choosers

`chooser ::= choose closed-expression`

Sample chooser:

```
choose congMod3
```

Restriction. The closed-expression of a **chooser** must have some sort  $S * S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ , and must be an equivalence relation (see under *Sort-quotients*).

The sort of a **chooser** `choose Q`, where  $Q$  has sort  $S * S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ , is a function sort of the form  $(S \rightarrow T) \rightarrow (S / Q \rightarrow T)$ . The value of the **chooser** is the (in general partial) function mapping each  $Q$ -constant (explained below) function  $f$  inhabiting sort  $S \rightarrow T$  to the function that maps each inhabitant  $C$  of  $S / Q$  to  $f\ x$ , where  $x$  is any member of  $C$ . Expressed symbolically, using a pseudo-function `any` that arbitrarily picks any member from a nonempty set, this is the function

```
fn f -> fn C -> f (any C)
```

The requirement of  $Q$ -constancy is precisely what is needed to make this function insensitive to the choice made by `any`.

Function  $f$  is  $Q$ -constant if, for each  $Q$ -equivalence class  $C$  inhabiting  $S / Q$ ,  $f\ x$  equals  $f\ y$  for any two values  $x$  and  $y$  that are members of  $C$ , or  $f$  is undefined on all members of  $C$ . (Since the result of  $f$  is constant across each equivalence class, it does not matter which of its elements is selected by `any`.) For example -- continuing the example of the previous section -- function `fn n -> n*n rem 3` is `congMod3`-constant; for the equivalence class  $\{2, 5, 8, \dots\}$ , for example, it maps each member to the same value 1. So `choose congMod3 (fn n -> n*n rem 3)` maps the inhabitant  $\{2, 5, 8, \dots\}$  of sort `z3` to the natural number 1.

The most discriminating  $Q$ -constant function is `quotient Q`, and `choose Q quotient Q` is the identity function on the quotient sort for  $Q$ .

The meaning of `choose Q (fn x -> E) A` is the same as that of the **let-expression** `let quotient Q x = A in E`. Indeed, often a **quotient-pattern** offers a more convenient way of expressing the intention of a **chooser**. Note, however, the remarks on the proof obligations for **quotient-patterns**.

### 2.6.15.6. Embedders

```
embedder ::= [ embed ] constructor
```

Sample embedders:

```
Nil
embed Nil
Cons
```

```
embed Cons
```

Disambiguation. If an **expression** consists of a single **name**, which, in the context, is both the name of a **constructor** and the name of an **op** or a **local-variable** in scope, then it is interpreted as the latter of the various possibilities. For example, in the context of

```
sort Answer = | yes | no

def yes = no : Answer

def which (a : Answer) = case a of
  | yes -> "Yes!"
  | no  -> "Oh, no!"
```

the value of `which yes` is "Oh, no!", since `yes` here is disambiguated as identifying the **op** `yes`, which has value `no`. The interpretation as **embedder** is forced by using the `embed` keyword: the value of `which embed yes` is "Yes!". By using **names** that begin with a capital letter for **constructors**, and **names** that do not begin with a capital letter for **ops** and **local-variables**, the risk of an accidental wrong interpretation can be avoided.

The semantics of **embedders** is described in the section on *Sort-sums*. The presence or absence of the keyword `embed` is not significant for the meaning of the construct (although it may be required for grammatical disambiguation, as described above).

### 2.6.15.7. Embedding-tests

`embedding-test ::= embed? constructor`

Sample embedding-test:

```
embed? Cons
```

**Restriction.** The sort of an **embedding-test** `embed? C` must be of the form  $SS \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ , where  $SS$  is a sum sort that has a **constructor**  $C$ .

The value of **embedding-test** `embed? C` is the predicate that returns `true` if the argument value -- which, as inhabitant of a sum sort, is tagged -- has tag  $C$ , and otherwise `false`. The **embedding-test** can be equivalently rewritten as

```
fn
```

```

| C _ -> true
| _    -> false

```

where the wildcard `_` in the first branch is omitted when `C` is parameter-less.

In plain words, `embed? C` tests whether its sum-sorted argument has been constructed with the constructor `C`. It is an error when `C` is not a constructor of the sum sort.

## 2.7. Matches and Patterns

### 2.7.1. Matches

```
match ::= [ | ] branch { | branch }*
```

```
branch ::= pattern -> expression
```

Sample matches:

```
{re = x, im = y} -> {re = x, im = ~y}
```

```
Empty -> true
| Push {top = _, pop = rest} -> hasBottom? rest
```

```
| Empty -> true
| Push {top = _, pop = rest} -> hasBottom? rest
```

**Restriction.** In a match, given the environment, there must be a unique sort  $S$  to which the pattern of each branch conforms, and a unique sort  $T$  to which the expression of each branch conforms, and then the match has sort  $S \rightarrow T$ . The pattern of each branch then has sort  $S$ .

**Disambiguation.** If a branch could belong to several open matches, it is interpreted as being a branch of the textually most recently introduced match. For example,

```

case x of
| A -> a
| B -> case y of
| C -> c
| D -> d

```

is not interpreted as suggested by the indentation, but as

```
case x of
  | A -> a
  | B -> (case y of
           | C -> c
           | D -> d)
```

If the other interpretation is intended, the expression introducing the inner match needs to be parenthesized:

```
case x of
  | A -> a
  | B -> (case y of
           | C -> c)
  | D -> d
```

Acceptance and return value  $y$ , if any, of a value  $x$  for a given **match** are determined as follows. If each **branch** of the **match** rejects  $x$  (see below), the whole **match** rejects  $x$ , and does not return a value. Otherwise, let  $B$  stand for the textually first **branch** accepting  $x$ . Then  $y$  is the return value of  $x$  for  $B$ .

Acceptance and return value  $y$ , if any, of a value  $x$  for a **branch**  $P \rightarrow E$  in an environment  $C$  are determined as follows. If **pattern**  $P$  rejects  $x$ , the **branch** rejects  $x$ , and does not return a value. (For acceptance by a **pattern**, see under *Patterns*.) Otherwise,  $y$  is the value of **expression**  $E$  in the environment  $C$  extended with the acceptance binding of **pattern**  $P$  for  $x$ .

For example, in

```
case z of
  | (x, true)  -> Some x
  | (_, false) -> None
```

if  $z$  has value  $(3, \text{true})$ , the first branch accepts this value with acceptance binding  $x = 3$ . The value of `Some x` in the extended environment is then `Some 3`. If  $z$  has value  $(3, \text{false})$ , the second branch accepts this value with empty acceptance binding (empty since there are no “accepting” local-variables in **pattern** `(_, false)`), and the return value is `None` (interpreted in the original environment).

## 2.7.2. Patterns

```
pattern ::=
    annotated-pattern
  | tight-pattern
```

```
tight-pattern ::=
    aliased-pattern
  | cons-pattern
  | embed-pattern
  | quotient-pattern
  | relax-pattern
  | closed-pattern
```

```
closed-pattern ::=
    variable-pattern
  | wildcard-pattern
  | literal-pattern
  | list-pattern
  | tuple-pattern
  | record-pattern
  | ( pattern )
```

(As for **expressions**, the distinctions **tight-** and **closed-** for **patterns** have no semantic significance, but merely serve to avoid grammatical ambiguities.)

```
annotated-pattern ::= pattern : sort
```

```
aliased-pattern ::= variable-pattern as tight-pattern
```

```
cons-pattern ::= closed-pattern :: tight-pattern
```

```
embed-pattern ::= constructor closed-pattern
```

```
quotient-pattern ::= quotient closed-expression tight-pattern
```

```
relax-pattern ::= relax closed-expression tight-pattern
```

```
variable-pattern ::= local-variable
```

```
wildcard-pattern ::= _
```

```
literal-pattern ::= literal
```

```

list-pattern ::= [ list-pattern-body ]

list-pattern-body ::= [ pattern { , pattern }* ]

tuple-pattern ::= ( tuple-pattern-body )

tuple-pattern-body ::= [ pattern , pattern { , pattern }* ]

record-pattern ::= { record-pattern-body }

record-pattern-body ::= [ field-patterner { , field-patterner }* ]

field-patterner ::= field-name [ equals pattern ]

```

Sample patterns:

```

(i, p) : Integer * Boolean
z as {re = x, im = y}
hd :: tail
Push {top, pop = rest}
embed Empty
quotient congMod3 n
relax even e
x
-
#z
[0, x]
(cl as (0, _), x)
{top, pop = rest}

```

**Restriction.** Like all polymorphic or sort-ambiguous constructs, a **pattern** may only be used in a context where its sort can be uniquely inferred.

**Restriction.** Each **local-variable** in a **pattern** must be a different **name**, disregarding any **local-variables** introduced in **expressions** or **sorts** contained in the **pattern**. (For example, `Line (z, z)` is not a lawful **pattern**, since `z` is repeated; but `n : {n : Nat | n < p}` is lawful: the second `n` is “shielded” by the **sort-comprehension** in which it occurs.)

**Restriction.** The **closed-expression** of a **quotient-pattern** must have some sort  $S * S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ ; in addition, it must be an equivalence relation, as explained under *Sort-quotients*.

Restriction. Quotient-patterns may only be used in a definition or claim if the result is insensitive to the choice of representative from the equivalence class. Specware 4.0 does not attempt to generate proof obligations for establishing this.

Restriction. The closed-expression of a relax-pattern must have some function sort  $S \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$ .

To define acceptance and acceptance binding (if any) for a value and a pattern, we introduce a number of auxiliary definitions.

The *accepting local-variables* of a pattern  $P$  are the collection of local-variables occurring in  $P$ , disregarding any local-variables introduced in expressions or sorts contained in the  $P$ . For example, in pattern  $u : \{v : S \mid p\ v\}$ ,  $u$  is an accepting local-variable, but  $v$  is not. (The latter is an accepting local-variable of pattern  $v : S$ , but not of the larger pattern.)

The *expressive descendants* of a pattern are a finite set of expressions having the syntactic form of patterns, as determined in the following three steps (of which the order of steps 1 and 2 is actually immaterial).

Step 1. From pattern  $P$ , form some *tame variant*  $P_t$  by replacing each field-patterner consisting of a single field-name  $F$  by the field-patterner  $F = F$  and replacing each wildcard-pattern  $\_$  in  $P$  by a unique fresh name, that is, any name that does not already occur in the spec, directly or indirectly through an import. For example, assuming that the name  $v7944$  is fresh, a tame variant of

```
s0 as _ :: s1 as (Push {top, pop = rest}) :: ss
```

is

```
s0 as v7944 :: s1 as (Push {top = top, pop = rest}) :: ss
```

Step 2. Next, from  $P_t$ , form a (tamed) *construed version*  $P_{tc}$  by replacing each constituent cons-pattern  $H :: T$  by the embed-pattern  $\text{Cons } (H, T)$ , where  $\text{Cons}$  denotes the constructor of the parameterized sort  $\text{List}$ . For the example, the construed version is:

```
s0 as Cons (v7944,
             s1 as Cons (Push {top = top, pop = rest}, ss))
```

Step 3. Finally, from  $P_{tc}$ , form the set  $ED_P$  of *expressive descendants* of  $P$ , where expression  $E$  is an expressive descendant if  $E$  can be obtained by repeatedly replacing



some constituent **aliased-pattern**  $L$  as  $R$  of  $P_{tc}$  by one of the two patterns  $L$  and  $R$  until no **aliased-patterns** remain, and then interpreting the result as an **expression**. For the example, the expressive descendants are the three **expressions**:

```
s0
Cons (v7944, s1)
Cons (v7944, Cons (Push {top = top, pop = rest}, ss))
```

An *accepting binding* of a **pattern**  $P$  for a value  $x$  in an environment  $C$  is some binding  $B$  of sorted values to the accepting **local-variables** of the *tame* variant  $P_t$ , such that the value of each expressive descendant  $E$  in  $ED_P$  in the environment  $C$  extended with binding  $B$ , is the same sorted value as  $x$ .

Acceptance and acceptance binding, if any, for a value  $x$  and a **pattern**  $P$  are then determined as follows. If there is no accepting binding of  $P$  for  $x$ ,  $x$  is rejected. If an accepting binding exists, the value  $x$  is accepted by **pattern**  $P$ . There is a unique binding  $B$  among the accepting bindings in which the sort of each assigned value is as “restricted” as possible in the subsort-supersort hierarchy without violating well-sortedness constraints (in other words, there are no avoidable implicit relaxations). The acceptance binding is then the binding  $B$  *projected on* the accepting **local-variables** of  $P$ .

For the example, the accepting **local-variables** of  $P_t$  are the six **local-variables**  $s0$ ,  $s1$ ,  $ss$ ,  $rest$  and  $v7944$ . In general, they are the accepting **local-variables** of the original **pattern** together with any fresh **names** used for taming. Let the value  $x$  being matched against the pattern be

```
Cons (Empty, Cons (Push {top = 200, pop = Empty}, Nil))
```

Under the accepting binding

```
s0 = Cons (Empty, Cons (Push {top = 200, pop = Empty}, Nil))
s1 = Cons (Push {top = 200, pop = Empty}, Nil)
ss = Nil
top = 200
rest = Empty
v7944 = Empty
```

the value of each  $E$  in  $ED_P$  amounts to the value  $x$ . Therefore,  $x$  is accepted by the original **pattern**, with acceptance binding

```
s0 = Cons (Empty, Cons (Push {top = 200, pop = Empty}, Nil))
s1 = Cons (Push {top = 200, pop = Empty}, Nil)
```

## *Chapter 2. Metaslang*

```
ss = Nil  
top = 200  
rest = Empty
```

obtained by “forgetting” the fresh name `v7944`.

# Appendix A. Metaslang Grammar

This appendix lists the grammar rules of the Metaslang specification language. These rules are identical to those of the Chapter on *Metaslang*. They are brought together here, without additional text, for easy reference.

## The grammar description formalism.

wiffle ::= waffle [ waffle-tail ] | piffle { + piffle }\*

piffle ::= 1 | m { piffle }\*

## Models.

spec ::= spec-form

op ::= op-name

## Symbols and Names.

symbol ::= name | literal | special-symbol

name ::= word-symbol | non-word-symbol

word-symbol ::= word-start-mark { word-continue-mark }\*

word-start-mark ::= letter

word-continue-mark ::=  
letter | decimal-digit | \_ | ?

letter ::=

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m
n	o	p	q	r	s	t	u	v	w	x	y	z

decimal-digit ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

non-word-symbol ::= non-word-mark { non-word-mark }\*

non-word-mark ::=

`	~	!	@	\$	^	&	*	-
---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---

## Appendix A. Metaslang Grammar

| = | + | \ | | | : | < | > | / | ?

special-symbol ::= `_` | `(` | `)` | `[` | `]` | `{` | `}` | `;` | `,` | `.`

### Comments.

comment ::= line-end-comment | block-comment

line-end-comment ::= % line-end-comment-body

line-end-comment-body ::=  
any-text-up-to-end-of-line

block-comment ::= (\* block-comment-body \*)

block-comment-body ::=  
any-text-including-newlines-and-nested-block-comments

### Units.

unit-definition ::= unit-identifier = unit-term

unit-term ::=  
spec-term  
| morphism-term  
| diagram-term  
| target-code-term  
| proof-term

specware-file-contents ::=  
unit-term  
| infile-unit-definition { infile-unit-definition }\*

infile-unit-definition ::= fragment-identifier = unit-term

### Unit Identifiers.

unit-identifier ::= swpath-based-path | relative-path

swpath-based-path ::= / relative-path

relative-path ::= { path-element / }\* path-element [ # path-element ]

path-element ::= word-symbol

### Specs.

```
spec-term ::=
  unit-identifier
  | spec-form
  | spec-qualification
  | spec-translation
  | spec-substitution
  | diagram-colimit
  | obligator
```

### Spec Forms.

spec-form ::= **spec** { declaration }\* **endspec**

### Qualifications.

spec-qualification ::= qualifier **qualifying** spec-term

qualifier ::= word-symbol

qualifiable-name ::= unqualified-name | qualified-name

unqualified-name ::= name

qualified-name ::= qualifier . name

### Translations.

spec-translation ::= **translate** spec-term **by** name-map

name-map ::= { [ name-map-item { , name-map-item }\* ] }

name-map-item ::= sort-name-map-item | op-name-map-item

sort-name-map-item ::= [ **sort** ] qualifiable-name +-> qualifiable-name

op-name-map-item ::=  
[ **op** ] annotable-qualifiable-name +-> annotable-qualifiable-name

## Appendix A. Metaslang Grammar

annotable-qualifiable-name ::= qualifiable-name [ : sort ]

### Substitutions.

spec-substitution ::= spec-term [ morphism-term ]

### Diagram Colimits.

diagram-colimit ::= **colimit** diagram-term

### Obligators.

obligator ::= **obligations** unit-term

### Morphisms.

morphism-term ::=  
    unit-identifier  
    | spec-morphism

spec-morphism ::= **morphism** spec-term -> spec-term name-map

### Diagrams.

diagram-term ::=  
    unit-identifier  
    | diagram-form

diagram-form ::= **diagram** { diagram-element { , diagram-element }\* }

diagram-element ::=  
    diagram-node  
    | diagram-edge

diagram-node ::= name +-> spec-term

diagram-edge ::= name : name -> name +-> morphism-term

### Generate Terms.

target-code-term ::=  
    **generate** target-language-name spec-term [ **in** string-literal ]

target-language-name ::= **lisp**

### Proof Terms.

proof-term ::=  
     **prove** claim-name **in** spec-term  
                             [ **with** prover-name ]  
                             [ **using** { claim-list } ]  
                             [ **options** prover-options ]

prover-name ::= **snark**

claim-list ::= claim-name { , claim-name }\*

prover-options ::= string-literal

### Declarations.

declaration ::=  
     import-declaration  
     | sort-declaration  
     | op-declaration  
     | definition

definition ::=  
     sort-definition  
     | op-definition  
     | claim-definition

equals ::= **is** | **=**

### Import-declarations.

import-declaration ::= **import** spec-term

### Sort-declarations.

sort-declaration ::= **sort** sort-name [ formal-sort-parameters ]

formal-sort-parameters ::= local-sort-variable | ( local-sort-variable-list )

local-sort-variable ::= name

local-sort-variable-list ::= local-sort-variable { , local-sort-variable }\*

### Sort-definitions.

sort-definition ::= **sort** sort-name [ formal-sort-parameters ] equals sort

### Op-declarations.

op-declaration ::= **op** op-name [ fixity ] : sort-scheme

fixity ::= associativity priority

associativity ::= **infixl** | **infixr**

priority ::= nat-literal

sort-scheme ::= [ sort-variable-binder ] sort

sort-variable-binder ::= **fa** local-sort-variable-list

### Op-definitions.

op-definition ::=  
    **def** [ sort-variable-binder ] formal-expression [ : sort ] equals  
        expression

formal-expression ::= op-name | formal-application

formal-application ::= formal-application-head formal-parameter

formal-application-head ::= op-name | formal-application

formal-parameter ::= closed-pattern

### Claim-definitions.

claim-definition ::= claim-kind claim-name equals claim

claim-kind ::= **axiom** | **theorem** | **conjecture**



claim-name ::= **name**

claim ::= [ sort-quantification ] expression

sort-quantification ::= **sort** sort-variable-binder

### Sorts.

sort ::=  
     sort-sum  
     | sort-arrow  
     | slack-sort

slack-sort ::=  
     sort-product  
     | tight-sort

tight-sort ::=  
     sort-instantiation  
     | closed-sort

closed-sort ::=  
     sort-name  
     | local-sort-variable  
     | sort-record  
     | sort-restriction  
     | sort-comprehension  
     | sort-quotient  
     | ( sort )

### Sort-sums.

sort-sum ::= sort-summand { sort-summand }\*

sort-summand ::= | constructor [ slack-sort ]

constructor ::= name

### Sort-arrows.

## *Appendix A. Metaslang Grammar*

`sort-arrow ::= arrow-source -> sort`

`arrow-source ::= sort-sum | slack-sort`

### **Sort-products.**

`sort-product ::= tight-sort * tight-sort { * tight-sort }*`

### **Sort-instantiations.**

`sort-instantiation ::= sort-name actual-sort-parameters`

`actual-sort-parameters ::= closed-sort | ( proper-sort-list )`

`proper-sort-list ::= sort , sort { , sort }*`

### **Sort-names.**

`sort-name ::= qualifiable-name`

### **Sort-records.**

`sort-record ::= { [ field-sorter-list ] } | ( )`

`field-sorter-list ::= field-sorter { , field-sorter }*`

`field-sorter ::= field-name : sort`

`field-name ::= name`

### **Sort-restrictions.**

`sort-restriction ::= ( slack-sort | expression )`

### **Sort-comprehensions.**

`sort-comprehension ::= { annotated-pattern | expression }`

### Sort-quotients.

sort-quotient ::= closed-sort / expression

### Expressions.

expression ::=

- lambda-form
- | case-expression
- | let-expression
- | if-expression
- | quantification
- | tight-expression

tight-expression ::=

- application
- | annotated-expression
- | closed-expression

closed-expression ::=

- op-name
- | local-variable
- | literal
- | field-selection
- | tuple-display
- | record-display
- | sequential-expression
- | list-display
- | structor
- | ( expression )

### Lambda-forms.

lambda-form ::= **fn** match

### Case-expressions.

case-expression ::= **case** expression **of** match

### Let-expressions.

## *Appendix A. Metaslang Grammar*

let-expression ::= **let** let-bindings **in** expression

let-bindings ::= recless-let-binding | rec-let-binding-sequence

recless-let-binding ::= pattern equals expression

rec-let-binding-sequence ::= rec-let-binding { rec-let-binding }\*

rec-let-binding ::=

**def** name formal-parameter-sequence [ : sort ] equals expression

formal-parameter-sequence ::= formal-parameter { formal-parameter }\*

### **If-expressions.**

if-expression ::= **if** expression **then** expression **else** expression

### **Quantifications.**

quantification ::= quantifier ( local-variable-list ) expression

quantifier ::= **fa** | **ex**

local-variable-list ::= annotable-variable { , annotable-variable }\*

annotable-variable ::= local-variable [ : sort ]

local-variable ::= name

### **Applications.**

application ::= prefix-application | infix-application

prefix-application ::= application-head actual-parameter

application-head ::= closed-expression | prefix-application

actual-parameter ::= closed-expression

infix-application ::= actual-parameter op-name actual-parameter

### Annotated-expressions.

annotated-expression ::= tight-expression : sort

### Op-names.

op-name ::= qualifiable-name

### Literals.

literal ::=  
     boolean-literal  
   | nat-literal  
   | char-literal  
   | string-literal

### Boolean-literals.

boolean-literal ::= **true** | **false**

### Nat-literals.

nat-literal ::= decimal-digit { decimal-digit } \*

### Char-literals.

char-literal ::= #char-literal-glyph

char-literal-glyph ::= char-glyph | "

char-glyph ::=  
     letter  
   | decimal-digit  
   | other-char-glyph

other-char-glyph ::=  
     ! | : | @ | # | \$ | % | ^ | & | \* | ( | ) | \_ | - | + | =  
   | | ~ | \ | . | , | < | > | ? | / | ; | ' | [ | ] | { | }  
   | \ \ | \"  
   | \a | \b | \t | \n | \v | \f | \r | \s  
   | \x hexadecimal-digit hexadecimal-digit

hexadecimal-digit ::=  
    decimal-digit  
    | **a** | **b** | **c** | **d** | **e** | **f**  
    | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F**

### **String-literals.**

string-literal ::= " string-body "  
  
string-body ::= { string-literal-glyph }\*  
  
string-literal-glyph ::= char-glyph | significant-whitespace  
  
significant-whitespace ::= space | tab | newline

### **Field-selections.**

field-selection ::= closed-expression . field-selector  
  
field-selector ::= nat-literal | field-name

### **Tuple-displays.**

tuple-display ::= ( tuple-display-body )  
  
tuple-display-body ::= [ expression , expression { , expression }\* ]

### **Record-displays.**

record-display ::= { record-display-body }  
  
record-display-body ::= [ field-filler { , field-filler }\* ]  
  
field-filler ::= field-name equals expression

### **Sequential-expressions.**

sequential-expression ::= ( open-sequential-expression )

open-sequential-expression ::= void-expression ; sequential-tail

void-expression ::= expression

sequential-tail ::= expression | open-sequential-expression

### List-displays.

list-display ::= [ list-display-body ]

list-display-body ::= [ expression { , expression }\* ]

### Structors.

structor ::=  
    projector  
    | relaxator  
    | restrictor  
    | quotienter  
    | chooser  
    | embedder  
    | embedding-test

projector ::= **project** field-selector

relaxator ::= **relax** closed-expression

restrictor ::= **restrict** closed-expression

quotienter ::= **quotient** closed-expression

chooser ::= **choose** closed-expression

embedder ::= [ **embed** ] constructor

embedding-test ::= **embed?** constructor

### Matches.

match ::= [ | ] branch { | branch }\*

branch ::= pattern -> expression

**Patterns.**

```
pattern ::=
  annotated-pattern
  | tight-pattern
```

```
tight-pattern ::=
  aliased-pattern
  | cons-pattern
  | embed-pattern
  | quotient-pattern
  | relax-pattern
  | closed-pattern
```

```
closed-pattern ::=
  variable-pattern
  | wildcard-pattern
  | literal-pattern
  | list-pattern
  | tuple-pattern
  | record-pattern
  | ( pattern )
```

```
annotated-pattern ::= pattern : sort
```

```
aliased-pattern ::= variable-pattern as tight-pattern
```

```
cons-pattern ::= closed-pattern :: tight-pattern
```

```
embed-pattern ::= constructor closed-pattern
```

```
quotient-pattern ::= quotient closed-expression tight-pattern
```

```
relax-pattern ::= relax closed-expression tight-pattern
```

```
variable-pattern ::= local-variable
```

```
wildcard-pattern ::= _
```

```
literal-pattern ::= literal
```

```
list-pattern ::= [ list-pattern-body ]
```

```
list-pattern-body ::= [ pattern { , pattern }* ]
```



`tuple-pattern ::= ( tuple-pattern-body )`

`tuple-pattern-body ::= [ pattern , pattern { , pattern }* ]`

`record-pattern ::= { record-pattern-body }`

`record-pattern-body ::= [ field-patterner { , field-patterner }* ]`

`field-patterner ::= field-name [ equals pattern ]`



# Appendix B. Libraries

This appendix contains a brief description of the `sorts` and `ops` pre-defined in the Metaslang libraries.

The `op-declarations` are given as a table where the first column contains the `name` of the `op`, the second one its associativity and priority if declared as an infix operator; otherwise the column is left empty. The third column contains the `sort-scheme` and the fourth column gives a short description of the meaning.

## B.1. General

### Sort-declarations

```
sort Option a = | Some a | None
sort Comparison = | Less | Equal | Greater
```

### Op-declarations

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
=	infixl 20	<code>fa(a) a * a -&gt;</code> Boolean	equality test
<code>mapOption</code>		<code>fa(a,b) (a -&gt; b) -&gt;</code> <code>Option a -&gt; Option b</code>	applies the function given as first argument to the optional value if it is <code>Some x</code> , otherwise <code>None</code> is returned.

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
compare		fa(a) (a * a -> Comparison) -> Option a * Option a -> Comparison	returns the result of the comparison of the two optional values, where None is less than Some x for all x. If both optional values are of the form Some x, then the comparison function given as first argument is used to compute the result.
some?		fa(a) Option a -> Boolean	returns true iff the argument has the form Some x
none?		fa(a) Option a -> Boolean	returns true iff the argument is None

## B.2. Boolean

### Sort-declaration

```
sort Boolean = | true | false
```

### Op-declarations

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
&	infixr 15	Boolean * Boolean -> Boolean	logical and
or	infixr 14	Boolean * Boolean -> Boolean	logical or

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
=>	infixr 13	Boolean * Boolean -> Boolean	implication
<=>	infixr 12	Boolean * Boolean -> Boolean	equivalence
~		Boolean -> Boolean	negation
toString		Boolean -> String	converts Boolean value to a character string
compare		Boolean * Boolean -> Comparison	compares two Boolean values

## B.3. Integer

### Sort-declaration

```
sort Integer
```

### Op-declarations

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
*	infixl 27	Integer * Integer -> Integer	multiplication
+	infixl 25	Integer * Integer -> Integer	addition

## Appendix B. Libraries

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
-	infixl 25	Integer * Integer -> Integer	subtraction
~		Integer -> Integer	unary minus
<	infixl 20	Integer * Integer -> Boolean	less-than
<=	infixl 20	Integer * Integer -> Boolean	less-than-or-equal
>	infixl 20	Integer * Integer -> Boolean	greater-than
>=	infixl 20	Integer * Integer -> Boolean	greater-than-or-equal
compare		Integer * Integer -> Comparison	compares two integers
min		Integer * Integer -> Integer	minimum of two integers
max		Integer * Integer -> Integer	maximum of two integers
toString		Integer -> String	converts integer to a character string
intToString		Integer -> String	same as toString
stringToInt		String -> Integer	converts character string to an integer

## B.4. Nat

### Sort-declaration

```
sort Nat = {n : Integer | n >= 0}
sort PosNat = {n : Nat | n > 0 }
```

### Op-declarations

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
*	infixl 27	Nat * Nat -> Nat	multiplication
+	infixl 25	Nat * Nat -> Nat	addition
-	infixl 25	Nat * Nat -> Nat	subtraction
div	infixl 26	Nat * PosNat -> Nat	division
rem	infixl 26	Nat * PosNat -> Nat	remainder, modulo
<	infixl 20	Nat * Nat -> Boolean	less-than
<=	infixl 20	Nat * Nat -> Boolean	less-than-or-equal

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
>	infixl 20	<code>Nat * Nat -&gt; Boolean</code>	greater-than
>=	infixl 20	<code>Nat * Nat -&gt; Boolean</code>	greater-than-or-equal
compare		<code>Nat * Nat -&gt; Comparison</code>	compares two natural numbers
min		<code>Nat * Nat -&gt; Nat</code>	minimum of two natural numbers
max		<code>Nat * Nat -&gt; Nat</code>	maximum of two natural numbers
posNat?		<code>Nat -&gt; Boolean</code>	false for zero, true otherwise
succ		<code>Nat -&gt; Nat</code>	successor
pred		<code>Nat -&gt; Integer</code>	predecessor
toString		<code>Nat -&gt; String</code>	converts natural number to a character string
natToString		<code>Nat -&gt; String</code>	same as toString
stringToNat		<code>String -&gt; Nat</code>	converts character string to a natural number

## B.5. Char

### Sort-declaration

```
sort Char
```



**Op-declarations**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Fixity</b>	<b>Sort</b>	<b>Description</b>
chr		Nat -> Char	converts natural number to an ASCII character
ord		Char -> Nat	converts ASCII character to a natural number
compare		Char * Char -> Comparison	compares two character values
isAlpha		Char -> Boolean	true for letters
isAlphaNum		Char -> Boolean	true for letters and digits
isNum		Char -> Boolean	true for digits
isAscii		Char -> Boolean	true for ASCII characters
isLowerCase		Char -> Boolean	true for lower-case letters
isUpperCase		Char -> Boolean	true for upper-case letters
toUpperCase		Char -> Char	converts to upper case
toLowerCase		Char -> Char	converts to lower case
toString		Char -> String	converts character to a string

## B.6. String

### Sort-declaration

```
sort String
```

### Op-declarations

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
<code>^</code>	<code>infixl 11</code>	<code>String * String -&gt; String</code>	string concatenation
<code>implode</code>		<code>List(Char) -&gt; String</code>	converts list of characters to a string
<code>explode</code>		<code>String -&gt; List(Char)</code>	converts string to a list of characters
<code>leq</code>	<code>infixl 20</code>	<code>String * String -&gt; Boolean</code>	lexicographic less-than-or-equal
<code>lt</code>	<code>infixl 20</code>	<code>String * String -&gt; Boolean</code>	lexicographic less-than
<code>compare</code>		<code>String * String -&gt; Comparison</code>	compares two strings
<code>length</code>		<code>String -&gt; Nat</code>	length of a string
<code>map</code>		<code>(Char -&gt; Char) * String -&gt; String</code>	returns the concatenation of the results of applying the function given as first argument to each character of the string.
<code>newline</code>		<code>String</code>	the string representing a line break
<code>sub</code>		<code>String * Nat -&gt; Char</code>	returns the nth character in a string

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
substring		<code>String * Nat * Nat -&gt; Char</code>	<code>substring(s,n1,n2)</code> returns the substring of <code>s</code> from position <code>n1</code> through position <code>n2-1</code> (counting from 0)
translate		<code>(Char -&gt; String) * String -&gt; String</code>	returns the concatenation of the results of applying the function given as first argument to each character of the string given as second argument.
all		<code>(Char -&gt; Boolean) * String</code>	returns the conjunction of the results of applying the function given as first argument to all characters in the string given as second argument.
toScreen		<code>String -&gt; ()</code>	prints the string on the terminal
writeLine		<code>String -&gt; ()</code>	prints the string on the terminal

## B.7. List

### Sort-declaration

```
sort List a = | Nil | Cons a * List a
```

### Op-declarations

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
------	--------	------	-------------

## Appendix B. Libraries

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
<code>nil</code>		<code>fa(a) List a</code>	the empty list
<code>null</code>		<code>fa(a) List a -&gt; Boolean</code>	true for empty lists
<code>cons</code>		<code>fa(a) a * List a -&gt; List a</code>	constructs a list consisting of a first element and a rest list
<code>++</code>	<code>infixl 11</code>	<code>fa(a) List a * List a -&gt; List a</code>	list concatenation
<code>diff</code>		<code>fa(a) List a * List a -&gt; List a</code>	<code>diff(l1, l2)</code> returns a list containing those elements that are in <code>l1</code> but not in <code>l2</code> . The order of the elements in <code>l1</code> is preserved.
<code>length</code>		<code>List a -&gt; Nat</code>	length of a list
<code>flatten</code>		<code>fa(a) List(List(a)) -&gt; List a</code>	concatenates the element list
<code>member</code>		<code>fa(a) a * List a -&gt; Boolean</code>	list membership
<code>nth</code>		<code>fa(a) List a * Nat -&gt; a</code>	returns the element at position <code>n</code> of a list (counting from 0)
<code>nthTail</code>		<code>fa(a) List a * Nat -&gt; List a</code>	returns the list's tail starting after position <code>n</code> (counting from 0)
<code>foldl</code>		<code>fa(a,b) (a*b -&gt; b) -&gt; b -&gt; List a -&gt; b</code>	<code>foldl foo initVal l</code> successively applies function <code>foo</code> to the elements of <code>l</code> from left to right. The second argument to <code>foo</code> is initially <code>initVal</code> , and at each step the result of the previous invocation of <code>foo</code> .
<code>foldr</code>		<code>fa(a,b) (a*b -&gt; b) -&gt; b -&gt; List a -&gt; b</code>	like <code>foldl</code> but the elements of the list are processed from right to left

Name	Fixity	Sort	Description
map		$\text{fa}(a,b) \ (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{List } b$	applies function to all elements of a list and returns the list consisting of the results
filter		$\text{fa}(a) \ (a \rightarrow \text{Boolean}) \rightarrow \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{List } a$	returns a filtered list wrt. the given predicate
rev		$\text{fa}(a) \ \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{List } a$	reverse list
all		$\text{fa}(a) \ (a \rightarrow \text{Boolean}) \rightarrow \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$	true if the predicate given as first argument is true for all elements of the list.
exists		$\text{fa}(a) \ (a \rightarrow \text{Boolean}) \rightarrow \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{Boolean}$	applies Boolean function to all elements of a list and returns the disjunction of the results
find		$\text{fa}(a) \ (a \rightarrow \text{Boolean}) \rightarrow \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{Option}(a)$	returns Some x where x is the first element in the list (from left to right) for which the given predicate yields true. If no such element exists, None is returned.
hd		$\text{fa}(a) \ \text{List } a \rightarrow a$	returns the first element of the list
tl		$\text{fa}(a) \ \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{List } a$	returns the rest list without the first element
tabulate		$\text{fa}(a) \ \text{Nat} * (\text{Nat} \rightarrow a) \rightarrow \text{List } a$	$\text{tabulate}(n, \text{foo})$ returns the list $[\text{foo}(0), \text{foo}(1), \dots, \text{foo}(n-1)]$
compare		$\text{fa}(a) \ (a * a \rightarrow \text{Comparison}) \rightarrow \text{List } a * \text{List } a \rightarrow \text{Comparison}$	compares two list using the comparison function given as first argument

