

Chapter 14

Encoding recursion

14.1 Fixpoint combinators

We have seen that we do not have recursion in ASL. However, it is possible to encode recursion by defining a *fixpoint combinator*. A fixpoint combinator is a function F such that:

$F M$ is equivalent to $M (F M)$ modulo the evaluation rules.

for any expression M . A consequence of the equivalence given above is that fixpoint combinators can encode recursion. Let us note $M \equiv N$ if expressions M and N are equivalent modulo the evaluation rules. Then, consider `ffact` to be the functional obtained from the body of the factorial function by abstracting (i.e. using as a parameter) the `fact` identifier, and `fix` an arbitrary fixpoint combinator. We have:

```
ffact is \fact.(\n. if = n 0 then 1 else * n (fact (- n 1)) fi)
```

Now, let us consider the expression $E = (\text{fix } \text{ffact}) 3$. Using our intuition about the evaluation rules, and the definition of a fixpoint combinator, we obtain:

```
 $E \equiv \text{ffact } (\text{fix } \text{ffact}) 3$ 
```

Replacing `ffact` by its definition, we obtain:

```
 $E \equiv (\backslash\text{fact}.\backslash\text{n. if } = \text{n } 0 \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } * \text{n } (\text{fact } (- \text{n } 1)) \text{ fi})) (\text{fix } \text{ffact}) 3$ 
```

We can now pass the two arguments to the first abstraction, instantiating `fact` and `n` respectively to `fix ffact` and 3:

```
 $E \equiv \text{if } = 3 0 \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } * 3 (\text{fix } \text{ffact } (- 3 1)) \text{ fi}$ 
```

We can now reduce the conditional into its `else` branch:

```
 $E \equiv * 3 (\text{fix } \text{ffact } (- 3 1))$ 
```

Continuing this way, we eventually compute:

```
 $E \equiv * 3 (* 2 (* 1 1)) \equiv 6$ 
```

This is the expected behavior of the factorial function. Given an appropriate fixpoint combinator `fix`, we could define the factorial function as `fix ffact`, where `ffact` is the expression above.

Unfortunately, when using call-by-value, any application of a fixpoint combinator F such that:

$F M$ evaluates to $M (F M)$

leads to non-termination of the evaluation (because evaluation of $(F M)$ leads to evaluating $(M (F M))$, and thus $(F M)$ again).

We will use the Z fixpoint combinator defined by:

$$Z = \lambda f.((\lambda x. f (\lambda y. (x x) y))(\lambda x. f (\lambda y. (x x) y)))$$

The fixpoint combinator Z has the particularity of being usable under call-by-value evaluation regime (in order to check that fact, it is necessary to know the evaluation rules of λ -calculus). Since the name z looks more like an ordinary parameter name, we will call `fix` the ASL expression corresponding to the Z fixpoint combinator.

```
#semantics (parse_top
#       "let fix be \f.((\x.f(\y.(x x) y))(\x.f(\y.(x x) y)));";
ASL Value of fix is <fun>
- : unit = ()
```

We are now able to define the ASL factorial function:

```
#semantics (parse_top
#       "let fact be fix (\f.(\n. if = n 0 then 1
#                               else * n (f (- n 1)) fi));";
ASL Value of fact is <fun>
- : unit = ()

#semantics (parse_top "fact 8;");;
ASL Value of it is 40320
- : unit = ()
```

and the ASL Fibonacci function:

```
#semantics (parse_top
#       "let fib be fix (\f.(\n. if = n 1 then 1
#                               else if = n 2 then 1
#                               else + (f (- n 1)) (f (- n 2)) fi fi));";
ASL Value of fib is <fun>
- : unit = ()

#semantics (parse_top "fib 9;");;
ASL Value of it is 34
- : unit = ()
```

14.2 Recursion as a primitive construct

Of course, in a more realistic prototype, we would extend the concrete and abstract syntaxes of ASL in order to support recursion as a primitive construct. We do not do it here because we want to keep ASL simple. This is an interesting non trivial exercise!