

IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTING

# Exception Handling in Haskell

*by*

**William S. Fisher**

*supervised by*

**Steffen van Bakel**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the MSc  
degree in Computing Science of Imperial College London

September 2016

## Acknowledgements

Thanks me



## Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Background	3
Formal Systems	3
$\lambda$ -Calculus	3
Logic, Types, and their Computation Interpretation	3
Haskell	3
$\lambda\mu$ -Calculus	3
$\lambda^{\text{try}}$ -Calculus	4
Delimited-Continuation Calculus	4
Chapter 3. DCC Interpreter	7
Interpreter	7
Implementation	7
Chapter 4. Translations	9
$\lambda^{\text{try}}$ -to- $\lambda\mu$	9
$\lambda\mu$ -to-DCC	9
$\lambda^{\text{try}}$ -to-DCC	9
Chapter 5. Conclusion	11
Evaluation	11
Conclusion	11
Future Work	11
Bibliography	13

## CHAPTER 1

# Introduction

Hel



## CHAPTER 2

# Background

This chapter explores what *formal systems* are and what they are useful for. It looks at a number of related formal systems and their relation to computation. It outlines context on top of which the rest of this project is built.

## Formal Systems

### $\lambda$ -Calculus

**Definition 0.1** (GRAMMAR FOR UNTYPED  $\lambda$ -CALCULUS)

$\lambda$ -variables are denoted by  $x, y, \dots$

$$M, N ::= x \mid \lambda x.M \mid M N$$

**Definition 0.2** (REDUCTION RULES FOR  $\lambda$ -CALCULUS)

$$\begin{aligned} x &\rightarrow x \\ \lambda x.M &\rightarrow \lambda x.M \\ (\lambda x.M)N &\rightarrow M[N/x] \end{aligned}$$

## Logic, Types, and their Computation Interpretation

Continuations.

Delimited-Continuations.

Haskell

Monads.

### $\lambda\mu$ -Calculus

**Definition 0.3** (GRAMMAR FOR  $\lambda\mu$ -CALCULUS)

$\lambda$ -variables are denoted by  $x, y, \dots$  and  $\mu$ -variables are denoted by  $\alpha, \beta, \dots$

$$M, N ::= x \mid \lambda x.M \mid M N \mid \mu\alpha.[\beta]M$$

**Definition 0.4** (REDUCTION RULES FOR  $\lambda\mu$ -CALCULUS)

$$\begin{array}{ll}
x & \rightarrow x \\
\lambda x.M & \rightarrow \lambda x.M \\
\mu\alpha.[\beta]M & \rightarrow \mu\alpha.[\beta]M \\
(\lambda x.M)N & \rightarrow M[N/x] \\
(\mu\alpha.[\beta]M)N & \rightarrow (\mu\alpha.[\beta]M[[\gamma]M'N/[\alpha]M'])
\end{array}$$

The terse reduction rule at the end simple states that the application of a  $\lambda\mu$ -abstraction  $\mu\alpha.M$  to a term  $N$  applies all the sub-terms of  $M$  labelled  $[\alpha]$  to  $N$  and relabels them with a fresh  $\mu$  variable.

 $\lambda^{\text{try}}$ -Calculus**Delimited-Continuation Calculus**

Simon Peyton-Jones *et al.* extended the  $\lambda$ -calculus with additional operators in order create a framework for implementing delimited continuations [1]. This calculus will be referred to as the delimited-continuation calculus or DCC. Many calculi have been devised with control mechanisms. Like the  $\lambda\mu$ -calculus, these control mechanisms are all specific instances of delimited and undelimited continuations. DCC provides a set of operations that are capable of expressing many of these other common control mechanisms.

The grammar of DCC is an extension of the standard  $\lambda$ -calculus:

**Definition 0.5** (GRAMMAR FOR DCC)

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(Variables)} & x, y, \dots \\
\text{(Expressions)} & e ::= x \mid \lambda x.e \mid e e' \\
& \quad \mid \text{newPrompt} \mid \text{pushPrompt } e e \\
& \quad \mid \text{withSubCont } e e \mid \text{pushSubCont } e e
\end{array}$$

The operational semantics can be understood through an abstract machine that transforms tuple of the form  $\langle e, D, E q \rangle$ :

The additional terms behave as follows:

- *newPrompt* returns a new and distinct prompt.
- *pushPrompt*'s first argument is a prompt which is pushed onto the continuation stack before evaluating its second argument.
- *withSubCont* captures the subcontinuation from the most recent occurrence of the first argument (a prompt) on the execution stack to the current point of execution. Aborts this continuation and applies the second argument (a  $\lambda$ -abstraction) to the captured continuation.
- *pushSubCont* pushes the current continuation and then its first argument (a subcontinuation) onto the continuation stack before evaluating its second argument.



**Definition 0.6** (OPERATIONAL SEMANTICS FOR DCC)

$\langle e \ e', D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle e, D[\Box \ e'], E, q \rangle$	e non-value
$\langle v \ e, D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle e, D[v \ \Box], E, q \rangle$	e non-value
$\langle \text{pushPrompt } e \ e', D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle e, D[\text{pushPrompt } \Box \ e'], E, q \rangle$	e non-value
$\langle \text{withSubCont } e \ e', D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle e, D[\text{withSubCont } \Box \ e'], E, q \rangle$	e non-value
$\langle \text{withSubCont } p \ e, D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle e, D[\text{withSubCont } p \ \Box], E, q \rangle$	e non-value
$\langle \text{pushSubCont } e \ e', D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle e, D[\text{pushSubCont } \Box \ e'], E, q \rangle$	e non-value
$\langle (\lambda x. e) \ v, D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle e[v/x], D, E, q \rangle$	
$\langle \text{newPrompt}, D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle q, D, E, q + 1 \rangle$	
$\langle \text{pushPrompt } p \ e, D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle e, \Box, p : D : E, q \rangle$	
$\langle \text{withSubCont } p \ v, D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle v(D : E \overset{p}{\uparrow}, \Box, E \overset{p}{\downarrow}), q \rangle$	
$\langle \text{pushSubCont } E' \ e, D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle e, \Box, E' + +(D : E), q \rangle$	
$\langle v, D, E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle D[v], \Box, E, q \rangle$	
$\langle v, \Box, p : E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle v, \Box, E, q \rangle$	
$\langle v, \Box, D : E, q \rangle$	$\Rightarrow$	$\langle v, D, E, q \rangle$	



## CHAPTER 3

### DCC Interpreter

This chapter explores the implementation of an interpreter for DCC. Portions of source code are examined in detail although the full source can be found in the appendix.

#### Interpreter

Although Peyton-Jones *et al.* implement a language-level module for DCC, we are interested in the intermediate term transformations. Examining transformation steps in full allows us to derive proofs of soundness and completeness for the translations from the  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda\mu$  calculi into DCC. For this reason, the interpreter was implemented as a term-rewriting program.

Whereas the original grammar for the DCC abstract machine presents sequences as values, the original exposition leaves the semantics for transforming sequences into useable expressions implicit. These semantics are unpacked in the implementation details. To capture the correct behaviour in this interpreter, we must formalize these semantics as a syntax-transformation. Sequences are therefore presented as expressions with the following explicit reduction rule:

**Definition 0.7** (SEMANTICS OF A SEQUENCE OF CONTINUATIONS)

Let  $D_i$  denote some term with a hole and  $D_i[v]$  denote the term  $D_i$  with the hole filled by  $v$ :

$$\langle (D_1 : D_2 : \dots : D_n), D', E, q \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \lambda x. D_n[D_{n-1}[\dots D_1[x] \dots]], D', E, q \rangle$$

A sequence of contexts evaluates to an abstraction that, when applied to a value  $v$ , returns  $v$  to the first context which returns its value to the second context and so on through the whole sequence.

#### Implementation

There are two data types for representing DCC terms, `Value` and `Expr`:

```
data Value = Var Char
           | Abs Char Expr
           | Prompt Int

data Expr = Val Value
          | App Expr Expr
          | Hole
          | PushPrompt Expr Expr
          | PushSubCont Expr Expr
```

```

| WithSubCont Expr Expr
| NewPrompt
| Seq [Expr]
| Sub Expr Expr Char

```

The core of the abstract machine is a function from one state to the next. A state is its own data type:

```
data State = State Expr Expr [Expr] Value
```

Some utility functions are defined to help readability:

- A function `prettify` with the type signature `Expr -> String` is defined inductively for pretty-printing terms.
- `ret :: Expr -> Expr -> Expr` returns the first expression with any holes filled in by the second expression.

```

ret d e = case d of
  Hole -> e
  App m n -> App (ret m e) (ret n e)
  Val (Abs x m) -> Val $ Abs x (ret m e)
  PushPrompt m n -> PushPrompt (ret m e) (ret n e)
  WithSubCont m n -> WithSubCont (ret m e) (ret n e)
  PushSubCont m n -> PushSubCont (ret m e) (ret n e)
  otherwise -> d

```

- `contextToAbs :: Expr -> Expr` takes a term with a hole and returns an abstraction that fills the hole with an expression when applied to it.

```

contextToAbs e = (Val (Abs fresh body))
  where fresh = 'x' -- TODO: generate truly fresh var
        body = ret e (Val (Var fresh))

```

- `seqToAbs :: [Expr] -> Expr` takes a sequence of expressions and, starting from the end, fills the hole of each expression with the previous expression. This in effect joins the output of each context with the input of the next context. It then turns this large context into an abstraction using `contextToAbs`.

```
seqToAbs es = contextToAbs $ foldr ret Hole $ reverse es
```

The heavy lifting is done by the function `eval` with the type `State -> State`. `eval` is defined inductively on the structure of the current expression.

## CHAPTER 4

### Translations

$\lambda^{\text{try}}\text{-to-}\lambda\mu$

$\lambda\mu\text{-to-DCC}$

$\lambda^{\text{try}}\text{-to-DCC}$



## CHAPTER 5

### **Conclusion**

**Evaluation**

**Conclusion**

**Future Work**





## Bibliography

- [1] R. Kent Dybvig, Simon L. Peyton Jones, and Amr Sabry. A monadic framework for delimited continuations. *J. Funct. Program.*, 17(6):687–730, 2007.