Universal Constructions in Maude

Working Example Module

Throughout we'll use the following module as an example to base our transformations on:

```
fmod MYMOD is
  sorts M N P .
  subsorts N P < M .
  op n : -> N .
  op p : -> P .
  op m : -> M .

  op f_ : M -> M .
  eq f n = p .
  eq f m = m .
  eq f p = p .
endfm
```

Sets in Maude

Using a combination of theories, parameterized modules, and views, we can define sets over the sorts in MYMOD. We start with a TRIV theory, a parameterized SET module (taking a TRIV parameter), and views from TRIV to each sort in MYMOD:

```
fth TRIV is sort Elt . endfth

fmod SET{X :: TRIV} is
   sorts NeSet{X} Set{X} .
   subsort X$Elt < NeSet{X} < Set{X} .

   op mt : -> Set{X} .

   op __ : NeSet{X} Set{X} -> NeSet{X} [ctor assoc comm id: mt prec 99] .
   op __ : Set{X} Set{X} -> Set{X} [ctor ditto] .

   var N : NeSet{X} .
   eq N N = N .
   endfm

view M from TRIV to MYMOD is sort Elt to M . endv
view N from TRIV to MYMOD is sort Elt to N . endv
view P from TRIV to MYMOD is sort Elt to P . endv
```

Finally we create a module which extends the parameterized modules with the appropriate views:

```
fmod MYMOD-SET is
  extending SET{M} + SET{N} + SET{P} .
However, this is problematic because we don't have the (often-wanted) mirrored subsort structure. To fix this,
the user manually specifies the desired subsorts:
fmod MYMOD-SET-SUBSORT is
  extending MYMOD-SET .
  subsort Set{N} < Set{M} .</pre>
  subsort Set{P} < Set{M} .</pre>
endfm
reduce n p .
Maude > reduce n p .
Warning: sort declarations for constant mt do not have an unique least sort.
Warning: sort declarations for operator __ failed preregularity check on 10 out of 100 sort tuples. First
Warning: sort declarations for associative operator _ are non-associative on 60 out of 1000 sort triple
reduce in MYMOD-SET-SUBSORT : n p .
rewrites: 0 in 0ms cpu (0ms real) (~ rewrites/second)
result NeSet{M}: n p
Now, if we want to change the sort structure of MYMOD, we have to change it in two places! Obviously this is
not good for maintainability. Additionally, as shown above, we are failing pre-regularity checks. Not shown
here are the many advisories Maude gives about mt and _,_ being imported from multiple places.
So we can make a SUBSORT theory, and a SET-SUBSORT parameterized module which is "subsort aware":
fth SUBSORT is
  sorts A B .
  subsort A < B.
endfth
fmod SET-SUBSORT{X :: SUBSORT} is
  sorts SetA{X} SetB{X} NeSetA{X} NeSetB{X} .
  subsort X$A < NeSetA{X} < SetA{X} .
  subsort X$B < NeSetB{X} < SetB{X} .</pre>
  subsort SetA{X} < SetB{X} .
  op mt : -> SetA{X} .
  op mt : -> SetB{X} .
  op __ : NeSetA\{X\} SetA\{X\} -> NeSetA\{X\} [ctor assoc comm id: mt prec 99] .
  op __ : NeSetB{X} SetB{X} -> NeSetB{X} [ctor assoc comm id: mt prec 99] .
  op __ : SetA{X} SetA{X} -> SetA{X} [ctor ditto] .
  op __ : SetB{X} SetB{X} -> SetB{X} [ctor ditto] .
  var NA : NeSetA{X} .
  eq NA NA = NA.
  var NB : NeSetB{X} .
  eq NB NB = NB .
endfm
```

This fails pre-regularity checks as well, and has a slightly more convoluted sort as output. Additionally, if we had a module with *no* subsorts (eg. a many-sorted module), we would *not* be able to use this approach to construct sets, because there would be no view to SUBSORT possible.

What do we Actually Want?

Think of this as a universal construction. For every part of a specified theory, we want to guarantee the existence of another part. For example, for every sort X in a theory, we want to guarantee that $Set\{X\}$ and $NeSet\{X\}$ exist. Additionally, for every subsort A < B, we want to make sure that $Set\{A\} < Set\{B\}$ and $NeSet\{A\} < NeSet\{B\}$.

This universal module has a "commutative diagram" flavor, where certain parts of the theory are called out as already existing (the forall), and as a result we ensure that other parts exist (the exists).

```
univ SET is
```

```
--- Maude's normal notion of `SET{A}`, for `A` a view to `TRIV`
forall:
  sort A .
exists:
  sorts NeSet{$A} Set{$A} .
  subsort $A < NeSet{$A} < Set{$A} .</pre>
  op mt : \rightarrow Set{$A} .
  op _{-}: Set\{\$A\} Set\{\$A\} -> Set\{\$A\} [ctor assoc comm id: mt prec 99] .
  op __ : NeSet{$A} Set{$A} -> NeSet{$A} [ctor ditto] .
  var NA : NeSet{$A} .
  eq NA NA = NA.
--- automatic subsort generation over new sorts
  sorts A B NeSet{$A} NeSet{$B} Set{$A} Set{$B} .
  subsort $A < $B .
exists:
  subsort NeSet{$A} < NeSet{$B} .</pre>
  subsorts Set{$A} < Set{$B} .</pre>
```

```
--- automatically lift each operator on sort `A` to work on sort `Set{A}`
--- denote that C D are strings of sorts (possibly \eps) with `sorts*`
--- only works with SET because order doesn't matter
forall:
    sorts A B Set{$A} Set{$B} NeSet{$A} .
    sorts* C D .
    op f : $C $A $D -> $B .

exists:
    op $f : $C Set{$A} $C' -> Set{$B} .

var a : $A . vars NA NA' : NeSet{$A} .
    var cs : $C . var ds : $D .
    eq $f(cs, mt, ds) = mt .
    eq $f(cs, (NA NA'), ds) = $f(cs, NA, ds) $f(cs, NA', ds) .
```

enduniv

Semantics

Here we'll give "semantics by example", as actual semantics aren't fleshed out. Two options are provided: (i) desugaring into Maude's theories, parameterized-modules, and views; (ii) syntactic transformation on the original definition.

As Theories/Parameterized-Modules/Views

First we apply the transformation described by the first part of the universal construction. Notice that the universal part (forall: ...) corresponds to a functional theory, and the existential part (exists: ...) corresponds to a parameterized-module (as you would expect given the initial/free semantics respectively).

```
fth SET-THEORY-1 is
  sort A .
endfth
fmod SET-MODULE-1{X :: SET-THEORY-1} is
  sorts Set{X} NeSet{X} .
  subsort X$A < NeSet{X} < Set{X} .</pre>
  op mt : \rightarrow Set{X} .
  op __ : Set\{X\} Set\{X\} -> Set\{X\} [ctor assoc comm id: mt prec 99] .
  op __ : Set{X} NeSet{X} -> NeSet{X} [ctor ditto] .
  var a : NeSet{X} .
  eq a a = a.
endfm
Intermediate views and a module are generated:
view SET-1-M from SET-THEORY-1 to MYMOD is sort A to M . endv
view SET-1-N from SET-THEORY-1 to MYMOD is sort A to N . endv
view SET-1-P from SET-THEORY-1 to MYMOD is sort A to P . endv
fmod MYMOD-EXTENDED-1 is
  protecting MYMOD .
  protecting SET-MODULE-1{SET-1-M}
             + SET-MODULE-1{SET-1-N}
```

```
+ SET-MODULE-1{SET-1-P} .
endfm
Then the next theory is generated:
fth SET-THEORY-2 is
  sorts A B Set{A} Set{B} NeSet{A} NeSet{B} .
  subsort A < B .
endfth
fmod SET-MODULE-2{X :: SET-THEORY-2} is
  subsort X$Set{A} < X$Set{B} .</pre>
  subsort X$NeSet{A} < X$NeSet{B} .</pre>
endfm
And finally we generate the appropriate views (from the second theory into the intermediate generated
module), along with the final module:
view MYMOD-N-M from SET-THEORY-2 to MYMOD-EXTENDED-1 is
  sort A to N . sort Set{A} to Set{SET-1-N} . sort NeSet{A} to NeSet{SET-1-N} .
  sort B to M . sort Set{B} to Set{SET-1-M} . sort NeSet{B} to NeSet{SET-1-M} .
endv
view MYMOD-P-M from SET-THEORY-2 to MYMOD-EXTENDED-1 is
  sort A to P . sort Set{A} to Set{SET-1-P} . sort NeSet{A} to NeSet{SET-1-P} .
  sort B to M . sort Set{B} to Set{SET-1-M} . sort NeSet{B} to NeSet{SET-1-M} .
endv
fmod MYMOD-EXTENDED is
  protecting MYMOD-EXTENDED-1 .
  protecting SET-MODULE-2{MYMOD-N-M}
             + SET-MODULE-2{MYMOD-P-M} .
endfm
```

So we see that the universal clause forall represents the *loose* semantics of a functional theory, and the exists clause represents the *free* semantics over the variables declared in the preceding theory.

Unfortunately, the resulting module MYMOD-EXTENDED has strange names for everything that has been generated, for example:

```
Maude> reduce mt p n m p .
reduce in MYMOD-EXTENDED : p,n,p,m .
rewrites: 1 in Oms cpu (Oms real) (~ rewrites/second)
result Set{SET-1-M}: n p m
```

Syntactic Transformation

reduce mt p n m p .

Here we see that n , p , m has sort Set{SET-1-M}, where we would actually like it to have sort Set{M} for readability and ease-of-use. It's not clear that simpler names could easily be generated, especially when intermediate modules/views/theories are needed. If instead the semantics are given in terms of a definition transformation, the whole issue of cluttering name-spaces is avoided. Intuitively, the module MYMOD is extended to:

```
fmod MYMOD-EXTENDED-CLEAN is sorts M N P .
```

```
subsorts N P < M.
op n : \rightarrow N.
op p : -> P .
op m : \rightarrow M.
op f_{-}: M \rightarrow M.
eq f n = p.
eq f m = m.
eq f p = p.
--- first construction with { A |-> M }
sorts NeSet{M} Set{M} .
subsort M < NeSet{M} < Set{M} .</pre>
op mt : -> Set{M} .
op \_: Set{M} Set{M} -> Set{M} [ctor assoc comm id: mt prec 99] .
op __ : NeSet{M} Set{M} -> NeSet{M} [ctor ditto] .
var NA1 : NeSet{M} .
eq NA1 NA1 = NA1 .
--- first construction with { A \mid-> N }
sorts NeSet{N} Set{N} .
subsort N < NeSet{N} < Set{N} .</pre>
op mt : \rightarrow Set{N} .
op __ : Set{N} -> Set{N} -> Set{N} [ctor assoc comm id: mt prec 99] .
op __ : NeSet{N} Set{N} -> NeSet{N} [ctor ditto] .
var NA2 : NeSet{N} .
eq NA2 NA2 = NA2.
--- first construction with { A |-> P }
sorts NeSet{P} Set{P} .
subsort P < NeSet{P} < Set{P} .
op mt : \rightarrow Set{P} .
op __ : Set{P} -> Set{P} - [ctor assoc comm id: mt prec 99] .
op __ : NeSet{P} Set{P} -> NeSet{P} [ctor ditto] .
var NA3 : NeSet{P} .
eq NA3 NA3 = NA3 .
--- second construction with { A \mid-> N , B \mid-> M }
subsort Set{N} < Set{M} .</pre>
subsort NeSet{N} < NeSet{M} .</pre>
--- second construction with { A \mid-> P , B \mid-> M }
subsort Set{P} < Set{M} .</pre>
subsort NeSet{P} < NeSet{M} .</pre>
--- third construction with { A \mid-> M , B \mid-> M , f \mid-> f_ }
op f_{-} : Set{M} -> Set{M} .
```

This eliminates many of the advisories Maude gives about operators being imported from many places, and has nicer names for all the associated sorts:

```
reduce in MYMOD-EXTENDED-CLEAN : p n p m .
rewrites: 1 in Oms cpu (Oms real) (~ rewrites/second)
result NeSet{M}: n p m

reduce in MYMOD-EXTENDED-CLEAN : f (p n p m) .
rewrites: 7 in Oms cpu (Oms real) (~ rewrites/second)
result NeSet{M}: p m
```

Where it Breaks Down

Some views are more involved (eg. sending theory operators to derived terms), or may have complicated proof obligations (which are not syntactically checkable or automatically dischageable). An anonymous view is not suitable in this case. Take a POSET for example:

It may be difficult for Maude to automatically find every possible view of POSET in a given module, especially since the view can send the theory operators to derived terms. But, we can still gain in *extensibility* even using these theories:

```
univ LEX-PAIR is
```

```
forall:
    view X from POSET .
    view Y from POSET .
exists:
    sort Pair{$X,$Y} .
    op <_;_>: $(X.Elt) $(Y.Elt) -> Pair{$X,$Y} .
    op _<_ : Pair{$X,$Y} Pair{$X,$Y} -> Bool .
    op 1st : Pair{$X,$Y} -> $(X.Elt) .
    op 2nd : Pair{$X,$Y} -> $(Y.Elt) .
    vars A A' : $(X.Elt) .
```

```
vars B B' : $(Y.Elt) . eq 1st(< A ; B >) = A . eq 2nd(< A ; B >) = B . eq < A ; B > < < A' ; B' > = (A < A') or (A == A' and B < B') .
```

enduniv

While the hard work of demonstrating a view to POSET is left to the user, at least the instantiation of two POSETs into a single LEX-PAIR is automatic.

If Then Else

Instead of having if_then_else_fi be "magic" using poly in Maude, we can explicity construct an if_then_else_if for each kind.

```
univ CONDITIONAL is
  protecting BOOL .

forall:
    sort A .
  exists:
    op if_then_else_fi : Bool $[A] $[A] -> $[A] .
    vars a1 a2 : $[A] .
    eq if true then a1 else a2 fi = a1 .
    eq if false then a1 else a2 fi = a2 .
```

enduniv

enduniv

Symbolic Terms

We want to be able to put variables anywhere into our terms, so for each sort A we declare a subsort Var{A}. We also complete the Var heirarchy with a bottom element, so that if you don't care what sort of variable you're using you can use that sort.

```
univ VAR is

forall:
    sort A .
exists:
    sorts Var{$A} Var{$[A]} .
    subsorts Var{$[A]} < Var{$A} < $A .

forall:
    sorts A B Var{$A} Var{$B} .
    subsort $A < $B .
exists:
    subsort Var{$A} < Var{$B} .</pre>
```

Now you might want to be able to distinguish at the sort level that a term is ground (does not contain variables). To do so, we make a subsort Ground{A} of each sort A, with all the operators copied down to

operate over <code>Ground{A}</code> as well. This allows equational simplification to happen over terms and terms with variables, but allows sort-level distinction of terms without variables.

```
forall:
    sort A .
  exists:
    sort Ground{$A} .
    subsort Ground{$A} < $A .</pre>
  forall:
    sorts A B Ground{$A} Ground{$B} .
    subsort A < B .
  exists:
    subsort Ground{$A} < Ground{$B} .</pre>
  forall:
    sort* A .
    sort B .
    op f : $A -> $B.
  exists:
    op f : Ground{$A} -> Ground{$B} .
enduniv
```

univ GROUND is

Finally, you may want to be able to perform substitutions of variables for terms. To do so, we define the substitution homomorphism over all terms of sort A which may have variables in them. This requires that VAR and CONDITIONAL are defined over the sort-heirarchy of interest.

```
univ SUBSTITUTION is
  using VAR + CONDITIONAL .
  forall:
    sorts A Var{$A} .
  exists:
    sort Subst{$A} .
    op _:=_ : Var{$A} $A -> Subst{$A} .
    op _[_] : $A Subst{$A} -> $A .
    vars va1 va2 : Var{$A} . var a : $A .
    eq va1 [va2 := a] = if va1 == va2 then a else va1 fi .
    sorts A B Subst{$A} Subst{$B} .
    subsort A < B .
  exists:
    subsort Subst{$A} < Subst{$B} .</pre>
  forall:
    sort* A .
    sorts B C Subst{$C} .
    op f : $A -> $B.
  exists:
    op _[_] : $B Subst{$C} -> $B .
    var as : $A . var sc : Subst{$C} .
    eq $f(as)[sc] = $f(as[sc]).
```

enduniv

Functions

Here we define functions between one sort heirarchy any another, including appropriate sub-sorting relations (contravariant on domain, covariant on range).

```
univ FUNCTION is
  using SUBSTITUTION .
  --- function sorts
  forall:
    sorts A B .
  exists:
    sort $A=>$B.
    op __ : $A=>$B $A -> [$B] .
  forall:
    sorts A B C .
    subsort $A < $B .</pre>
  exists:
    subsort C=>A < C=>B.
    subsort B=>C < A=>C.
  forall:
    sort A .
  exists:
    op id : \rightarrow $A=>$A .
    var a : $A .
    eq id a = a.
  forall:
    sorts A B C .
  exists:
    op _._ : $B=>$C $A=>$B -> $A=>$C .
    var f : $B=>$C . var g : $A=>$B . var A : $A .
    eq id g = g.
    eqf.id=f.
    eq (f \cdot g) A = f(g(A)).
  --- lambda abstraction
  --- using Ground{$A} to avoid variable capture
  --- eventually would like to lift this restriction
  forall:
    sorts A B .
    sorts Var{$A} Subst{$A} Ground{$A} $A=>$B .
  exists:
    op \_._ : Var{$A} $B -> $A=>$B .
    var ga : Ground{\$A} . var va : Var{\$A} . var b : \$B .
    eq (\ va . b) ga = b [va := ga] .
```

Here we define an explicit map function for sets instead of generating an implicit operator over sets for ever operator over the base sorts.