

# Collapsing Heterogeneous Towers of Interpreters

Anonymous Author(s)

## Abstract

A tower of interpreters is a program architecture consisting of a sequence of interpreters each interpreting the one above it. The overhead of multiple layers of interpretation can be optimized away using partial evaluation, a process referred to as *collapsing towers of interpreters*. Previous work has focused on homogeneous towers and their reflective and meta-circular aspects. We explore collapsing *heterogeneous* towers of interpreters, particularly addressing the issues caused by their varying data representations.

**CCS Concepts** • Software and its engineering → Interpreters; Source code generation; Semantics; Translator writing systems and compiler generators.

**Keywords** interpreters, partial evaluation, metaprogramming

## ACM Reference Format:

Anonymous Author(s). 2019. Collapsing Heterogeneous Towers of Interpreters. In *GPCE '19: 18th International Conference on Generative Programming: Concepts & Experiences*, October 21–22, 2019, Athens, Greece. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 Introduction

Towers of interpreters are a program architecture which consists of sequences of interpreters where each interpreter is interpreted by an interpreter above it (depicted as a tombstone diagram in figure 1). Each additional *level* (i.e., interpreter) in the tower adds a constant factor of interpretative overhead to the run-time of the system. One of the earliest mentions of such architectures in literature is a language extension to Lisp called 3-LISP [10] introduced by Smith. Smith describes the notion of a reflective system, for “a system that is able to reason about itself”, as a tower of meta-circular interpreters, also referred to as a *reflective tower*<sup>1</sup>. Using this architecture 3-LISP enables an interpreter within the tower to access and modify internal state of its neighbouring interpreters.


<sup>1</sup> Reflective towers are often theorised as infinite, but any finite computation only uses a bounded number of layers.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

GPCE '19, October 21–22, 2019, Athens, Greece

© 2019 Association for Computing Machinery.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>



**Figure 1.** A tower of interpreters where each interpreter  $I_n$  is written in language  $L_{n-1}$  and interprets a language  $L_n$ , for some  $n \geq 0$ . In literature the tower often grows downwards, however, in our study we refer to  $I_0$  as the base interpreter and grow the tower upwards for convenience.  $U$  is the underlying machine (e.g. CPU) on which the base interpreter is executed.

An interpreter is *meta-circular* when the language the interpreter is written in and the language it is interpreting are the same. Meta-circularity and the common data representation between interpreters are core properties of reflective towers studied in previous work. We refer to towers with such properties as *homogeneous*.

In the original reflective tower models only minimal attention was given to the cost of performing new interpretation at each level of a tower. Then works by Sturdy [11] and Danvy et al.’s language Blond [5] hinted at the possibility of removing some of this overhead by partially evaluating (i.e., specializing) interpreters with respect to the interpreters below in the tower. Asai et al.’s language *Black* [3] is a reflective language implemented through a reflective tower. The authors use a hand-crafted partial evaluator, and in a later study use MetaOCaml [2], to efficiently implement the language. Asai and then, using the language Pink [1], Amin et al. demonstrate the ability to compile a reflective language even though the semantics of individual interpreters in the underlying tower can be modified. Essentially this is achieved by specializing and executing functions of an interpreter at run-time to remove the cost of multiple interpretation; this effectively *collapses* a tower.

Parallel to all the above theoretical research into reflective towers, practical programmers have in effect been working

with towers of interpreters dating back to the idea of language parsers. Writing a parser in an interpreted language already implies two levels of interpretation: one running the parser and another the parser itself. Emulation is a form of interpretation and implies interpreters running on virtual hardware, such as the bytecode interpreter in the Java Virtual Machine (JVM) [9], are towers of interpreters as well.

However, these two branches of research do not overlap and work on towers of interpreters rarely studied their counterparts in production systems. It is natural to ask the question of what it would take to apply previous techniques in partial evaluation to a practical setting. This is the question Amin et al. pose in their conclusion after describing Pink [1] and is the starting point for this work.

We aim to bring previous work of removing interpretative overhead in towers using partial evaluation into practice. Our study achieves this by constructing a proof-of-concept tower of interpreters that more-closely resembles those in real-world systems. Figure 2 depicts two versions of our experimental tower. Traditionally reflective towers are thought of as completely vertical like the one on the left. However, details such as how a tower grows, shrinks and collapses while executing user programs worked rather mysteriously. We decided to implement our tower using occasional layers of compilation (as shown on the right). The two versions of our tower are extensionally equal since they yield the same output for a given program to evaluate. Part of our study is devoted to evaluating the effect of the intensional structure of towers on the act of collapsing them.

We then collapse the experimental tower under different configurations and evaluate the resulting optimized programs. We demonstrate that we can partially evaluate individual interpreters in a heterogeneous tower and effectively generate code specialized for a user program (hopefully eliminating interpretative overhead in the process). Our contributions include:

1. Develop an experimental heterogeneous tower of interpreters, with a SECD machine [7, 8] in between two Lisp-like levels
2. Collapse this heterogeneous tower, removing all interpretation overhead
3. Identify general requirements and strategies for collapsing heterogeneous towers

In section 2, we describe what it means to construct and collapse a tower of interpreters and the methodology Pink uses to do so [1]. In section 3, we discuss heterogeneous towers and in section 4, how to collapse them. In section 5, we conclude, looking back and ahead. Our experiments are available from *\*\*omitted for double-blind review\*\**.

## 2 Collapsing Reflective Towers

*Collapsing* a tower means removing overhead from multiple interpretation. To do so we specialize our tower with respect

to a user program and produce a residual program with as little interpretation left as possible. The three key ingredients for collapsing a tower using Pink's technique [1] are:

1. A multi-level language
2. A *lift* operator
3. A *stage-polymorphic* evaluator

Amin et al.'s multi-level language,  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ , differentiates between static and dynamic expressions by tagging dynamic ("code") values; this allows  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  to express binding-time information. The *lift* operator coerces static to dynamic values, in the style of the reification operator of Type-Directed Partial Evaluation (TDPE) [4]. To stage the evaluator, the usual recipe applies: introductory forms that produce values are lifted, while elimination forms that consume values remain unchanged (the result will be dynamic if the operands are dynamic, and static if the operands are static). An evaluator can be made *stage-polymorphic*, parameterized over whether to be staged (acting as a compiler) or not (acting as an interpreter) by taking as argument a *maybe-lift* function that acts as the *lift* operator or the identity function, respectively.

Figures 3a to 3c depict the process of collapsing a (homogeneous) tower through tombstone diagrams. We start with a meta-circular tower of interpreters all written in the same language,  $L$ , and Pink's  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  at the base. The key benefit of meta-circularity is that the *lift* operator defined in  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  is accessible to each interpreter. We can now stage some interpreter in the tower, in this example the user-most one,  $I_3$ , by lifting; this interpreter is now equivalent to a compiler from  $L$  to  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  ( $C_3$  in figure 3b). When we execute the tower (i.e., invoke  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ 's partial evaluator)  $C_3$  residualizes while all other levels in the tower evaluate (essentially *propagating* binding-time information of program  $P$  from the top to the base of the tower). At  $I_1$  a call to *lift* now invokes  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ 's *lift*. Effectively after residualization the generated program will only include the values staged at the top-most interpreter while the rest of the tower was reduced at specialization time. The result is a collapsed tower in figure 3c where all intermediate interpreters,  $I_1$  through  $I_3$ , have been removed from the tower (assuming the absence of side-effects at individual levels).


## 3 Heterogeneous Towers

A central part of our study revolves around the notion of heterogeneous towers. We continue from where Amin et al.'s study of collapsing towers of interpreters [1] left off, namely the question of how one might achieve the effect of compiling multiple interpreters in heterogeneous settings. We view heterogeneous towers as a generalization of reflective towers and define *heterogeneous* as follows:

**Definition 3.1.** Heterogeneous towers of interpreters are systems of interpreters,  $I_1^L, I_2^L, \dots, I_n^L$  where  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$  and  $I_k^L$  determines an interpreter at level  $k$  written in language  $L_{k-1}$  and interprets programs in  $L_k$ .



**Figure 2.** Tombstone diagrams that represent two versions of our experimental tower of interpreters.  $M_e$  is a toy Lisp language,  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  refers to the multi-level language introduced as part of Pink [1] and  $Lisp^*$  is  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ 's Lisp based front-end.  $JVM$  in our diagram also encompasses any underlying machinery necessary to run it. While the left depicts the intuitive view of a tower, we actually implement it using the architecture on the right. Not only is the tower on the right simpler to construct but it also highlights the power of the *lift* operator and its vital role in collapsing heterogeneous towers.



**(a)** Tower of meta-circular interpreters,  $I_k$ , in language,  $L$ , running a program,  $P$ .

**(b)** Tower whose top interpreter is staged (i.e., converted into a compiler,  $C$ )

**(c)** Final representation of the tower in 3a after collapsing it. All intermediate interpretation (levels  $I_1$  to  $I_3$ ) has been eliminated (by evaluating it during PE time) and  $P$  has been specialized with respect to the top-most staged interpreter,  $C_3$ . The residual program  $P$  consists of  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  terms in ANF-normal form.

**Figure 3.** Tombstone diagrams representing the process of collapsing a tower using  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$

**Observation 3.1.** Heterogeneous towers of interpreters are towers which generalize homogeneous towers by:


1. For any two adjacent interpreters  $I_k$  and  $I_{k-1}$  where  $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ :  $L_k \neq L_{k-1}$  can hold
2. For any two adjacent interpreters used in the tower,  $I_k$  and  $I_{k-1}$ , the operational semantics and the representation of data can be different between the two even if the languages coincide; this gives us a way of addressing the difference in intensional structure between towers

### 3.1 Absence of: Meta-circularity


The first generalization described by observation 3.1 is that of mixed languages between levels of a tower. A practical challenge this poses for partial evaluators is the inability to reuse language facilities across interpreters. This also implies that one cannot in general define reflection and reification procedures as in 3-LISP [10], Brown [13], Blond [5], Black [3] or Pink [1].

### 3.2 Absence of: Reflection


Reflection in an interpreter enables the introspection and modification of its state during execution. It is a tool reflective languages can use to embed, for example, debuggers or run-time instrumentation into programs. Reflection in reflective towers implies the ability to modify an interpreter's interpreter which can be beneficial in the implementation of said tools. However, it also allows potentially destructive operations on a running interpreter's semantics which can become difficult to reason about or debug. Towers that we are interested in rarely provide reflective capabilities in their interpreters. Thus, we do not support or experiment with reflection in our study.



**Figure 4.** A hypothetical tower of interpreters that serves as the model for the tower we built (figure 2). The diagram depicts a x86 virtual machine (VM) written in JavaScript running a Python [12] interpreter that in turn executes some Python program. In this model, Python is first translated to bytecode which is then interpreted by some bytecode interpreter (written in the C language [6]). *Browser* encompasses the JavaScript interpreter within a browser and any underlying technologies required to host the browser.



**Figure 5.** Our heterogeneous tower of interpreters (2) after staging at the SECD level (shaded tombstone). All computation to the left of the staged interpreter is carried into the residual program. The collapse essentially moved the code from above the SECD machine to the base.



**Figure 6.** Our heterogeneous tower of interpreters after staging at the  $M_e$  level (shaded tombstone). At each level, starting from  $M_e$ , the *lift* operator is implemented differently but together they achieve the effect of moving code from the  $M_e$  interpreter to the base.

### 3.3 Semantic Gaps

Danvy et al. mentioned the possibility of non-reflective non-meta-circular towers early on in his denotational description of the reflective tower model [5]. The authors explored the idea of having different denotations for data at every level of the tower. However, since it was not the focus of

their study, the potential consequences were not further investigated but serve as an inspiration for the second point of observation 3.1. We call the difference in operational semantics or data representation between two interpreters a *semantic gap*.

Another motivation of ours stems from the realization that systems consisting of several layers of interpretation can feasibly be constructed. A hypothetical tower of interpreters



that served as a model for the one we built throughout our work was described in Amin et al.'s paper on collapsing towers [1] and is depicted as a tombstone diagram in figure 4. As a comparison our tower is shown in figure 2. We replace the x86 emulator with a SECD abstract machine interpreter and Python with our own functional toy language,  $M_e$ . The label  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  represents the multi-level core language from Pink [1] and Lisp\* is the Lisp-like front-end to  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ . Although here the tower grows upwards and to the left, this need not be. We implement (in Scala) the compilers, or *translators*, from  $M_e$  to SECD and from Lisp\* to  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  purely for simplicity. To realize a completely vertical tower (i.e., consisting of interpreters only), the Lisp\*– $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  translator could be omitted so that the  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  interpreter evaluates S-expressions directly. Similarly, the  $M_e$ –SECD compiler could be implemented in SECD instructions itself. However, we argue that the presence of compilation layers in our experimental tower more closely resembles practice and adds some insightful challenges to our experiments.

## 4 Collapsing Heterogeneous Towers

We describe our observations and further effects of heterogeneity on collapsing towers. First, as an echo to section 2 and as a summary, the key ingredients for collapsing a heterogeneous tower are:

1. A multi-level base language
2. A *lift* operator
3. Unstaged lower evaluators
4. A staged user-most evaluator
5. **New requirement:** The *lift* operator must be exposed in each evaluator, and must translate from that level's values to the lower-level values.

We can stage the SECD machine, even though this won't be optimal because it isn't the user-most interpreter. While a definitional interpreter can be staged using TDPE by simply lifting values it returns, the process of staging an abstract machine requires a more sophisticated binding-time analysis with careful design of its division rules and consideration of which locations to lift to avoid non-termination at PE-time. Figure 5 depicts the effect of staging the SECD interpreter in our tower. After staging the SECD machine (highlighted in grey) it now operates as a compiler from SECD instructions to  $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}$  terms. Collapsing the tower in this configuration essentially means moving code from the SECD level to the base interpreter across the Lisp\* level. Consistent with the composition rules of tombstones, the levels above SECD are residualized and present in the output as well.

To stage the  $M_e$  evaluator, above the SECD machine, requires a *lift* operator. There are two difficulties.

(1) In mixed-language towers a *lift* operation is not available to an interpreter unless explicitly provided at each given level. Hence, one approach to propagating binding-time information is to implement a built-in *lift* at all levels below

the interpreter that is to be staged. The implementation of *lift* may require us to reverse engineer and transform the representation of closures, pairs or other constructs which the *lift* at the base expects.

(2) A more subtle collapse of our tower occurs when we stage the  $M_e$  level (see figure 6). In this case staging has a slightly different effect which is not obvious from the tombstones. Since the  $M_e$  level is actually a translator already, staging the translator will simply yield another translator. Instead, staging  $M_e$  means we generate SECD instructions that *lift* (i.e., signal the PE to residualize) expressions of  $M_e$  using a new **LIFT** instruction. As we can see from the annotated tombstone diagram, we use the *lift* operator as a mechanism to move code through each level to the base where it is residualized.

The **LIFT** instruction in the SECD machine has to create closures understood by the lower level. In order to do so, it must reverse engineer the representation of closures, which, for recursive functions, can be implicit in the wiring of the SECD machine. These changes cross-cut the original design, adding complexity. For example, adding support for a **LIFT** instruction to an otherwise standard SECD machine interpreter requires adapting these other instructions:

- LDF** which loads instructions as a function, now requires tagging, so that closure values can be distinguished from others
- AP** which applies a function, now requires deciding whether to apply or generate code for application (to avoid infinite unrolling)
- RTN** which returns from a function, now requires deciding whether to restore state of registers with the dump (default) or return a value to satisfy calling convention of lower level

This study demonstrates that it is feasible to collapse a particular heterogeneous tower. The SECD machine acts as a bottleneck between two Lisp-like levels, because it forces a different lower stack-based representation. Collapsing the tower removes all interpretive overhead, translating from one Lisp to the other, without suffering any obfuscation due to the SECD machine.

The general lesson for collapsing towers is that each level must be able to lift values by translating them to the lower level. In practice, this presents arbitrary difficulties.

## 5 Conclusions and Future Work

### 5.1 Conclusions

We started by generalizing the concept of reflective towers to ones that consisted of non-meta-circular interpreters. To model a tower that could potentially contain layers of translation between languages, such as the one in figure 4, we also introduced the notion of *semantic gaps*, which dictate the extent to which two adjacent interpreters differ in operational semantics or representation of data. A combination

of these two properties (non-meta-circularity and semantic gaps) form the new class of towers of interpreters that we call *heterogeneous*. The theoretical implications from heterogeneity on a tower's structure and procedure to collapse them was a focal point for our experiments. We envisioned two problems with collapsing heterogeneous towers: (1) we needed to devise a strategy to signal to the PE at the base of the tower which expressions to residualize without a meta-circular *lift* (even through levels of compilation) (2) semantic gaps required us to perform complex transformations on program constructs in one interpreter to adhere to their representation in adjacent interpreters. We constructed and then collapsed a 5-level heterogeneous tower with a SECD machine as one of its levels to provide evidence for these hypotheses and gain more insights into heterogeneity.

Staging an interpreter amounts to reifying literals, lambdas and product types it returns. An abstract machine is not guaranteed to distinguish these types by data structures or a type-system but can instead rely on dedicated instructions to differentiate data of these types. Hence, the points to reify at are dictated by the architecture of the underlying machine. In our experiments we created a conservative division tailored to the SECD stack-registers and reduced static expressions in Pink's reflect operator to achieve optimal residualization. In order to propagate the decision of whether to generate or evaluate an expression through levels in the tower, we implemented a *lift* operation for all languages in the tower. Observationally, *lifting* an expression moves it through the tower to the base and is the key to achieving the effect of collapsing. Whereas in homogeneous towers this role of *lift* was implicit and trivial due to meta-circularity, we found that heterogeneity explicates this process. We hope this furthered the understanding of some of the subtleties of collapsing towers of interpreters.

The type of overhead our study concerned itself with was the dispatch logic in an interpreter that decides which operation to perform based on the current term being evaluated. The interpretative cost we removed in a tower is that between the base evaluator and the top-most staged level. We used our experimental tower to investigate the effect of staging interpreters at various points. As expected, the interpretative overhead of all levels up to the one being staged was completely reduced during specialization time. More notably, the structure of the generated code followed that of the interpreter that was staged. In our case, staging at the SECD machine level generated code that contained traces of the SECD semantics such as stack-based operations and as a result still optimizable to the programmer. In comparison, staging at a level above yielded a residual program without any signs of SECD and more optimal for our example programs.

With our experiments we demonstrated the successful collapse of a heterogeneous tower. We also showed the ability of a TDPE-style *reify* operation to essentially move code

across levels of a tower, which also worked across levels of compilation. However, realizing our methodology on a practical setting such as the Python-x86-JavaScript tower will require additional work. Our approach to propagating the TDPE binding-time information involved the implementation of a reification operator in each interpreter that is missing it. This then required the reverse-engineering and conversion of types in an interpreter to the representation that the interpreter below in the tower expects. In practice these changes would require intimate knowledge of and intrusive changes to an interpreter or compiler. Additionally, in our experimental tower we did not consider the residualization of side-effects which a useful collapse procedure would need for wider applicability. Our methodology could, however, help the optimization of smaller-scale systems in practice where towers consist of embedded DSL interpreters or regular expression matchers (even in the absence of meta-circularity and presence of translation layers).

## 5.2 Future Work

We hope our study provided a platform and the necessary techniques to eventually make collapsing towers in practice a reality. The next step is to extend our definition of heterogeneity to investigate ways of dealing with side-effects at various levels of a tower. The ability to perform side-effects such as destructive data structure changes are essential in real-world programs regardless of their domain but were not considered in our study.

One of the considerations is whether side-effects should be residualized, removed or executed during PE time. More broadly a next step would be to devise a method of dealing with situations where a level does not have a necessary feature that an interpreter in a different level requires. Currently any feature, including side-effects, needs to be implemented at each level from the base up to the interpreter that uses it. Kogge presents various extensions to the SECD machine such as a call/cc operator, lazy evaluation or even concurrency (through MultiLisp) [7]. Implementing such extensions could aid the experimentation with features not being available at adjacent levels. For example, call/cc allows us to emulate side-effects such as exceptions and non-determinism.

Ongoing work involves generalizing and making our technique to collapse towers less intrusive. Instead of reimplementing a *lift* operation at the levels that need it, feasible techniques could, at least for particular domains or languages, pass the TDPE binding-time information in the form of data through each level. Whürthinger's GraalVM [14] allows the communication between languages that target the Graal Virtual Machine and could prove useful in further experimenting with heterogeneous towers where multiple interpreters pass, e.g., binding-times to each other.

## References

- [1] Nada Amin and Tiark Rompf. 2017. Collapsing Towers of Interpreters. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 2, POPL, Article 52 (Dec. 2017), 33 pages.
- [2] Kenichi Asai. 2014. Compiling a Reflective Language Using MetaO-Caml. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Generative Programming: Concepts and Experiences (GPCE)*. ACM, 113–122.
- [3] Kenichi Asai, Satoshi Matsuoka, and Akinori Yonezawa. 1996. Duplication and partial evaluation. *Lisp and Symbolic Computation* 9, 2-3 (1996), 203–241.
- [4] Olivier Danvy. 1999. Type-directed partial evaluation. In *Partial Evaluation: Practice and Theory*. Springer, 367–411.
- [5] Olivier Danvy and Karoline Malmkjaer. 1988. Intensions and extensions in a reflective tower. In *Proceedings of the 1988 ACM conference on LISP and functional programming*. ACM, 327–341.
- [6] Brian W Kernighan, Dennis M Ritchie, Clovis L Tondo, and Scott E Gimpel. 1988. *The C programming language*. Vol. 2. prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- [7] Peter M Kogge. 1990. *The architecture of symbolic computers*. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- [8] Peter J Landin. 1964. The mechanical evaluation of expressions. *The computer journal* 6 (1964), 308–320.
- [9] Tim Lindholm, Frank Yellin, Gilad Bracha, and Alex Buckley. 2014. *The Java virtual machine specification*. Pearson Education.
- [10] Brian Cantwell Smith. 1984. Reflection and semantics in Lisp. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGACT-SIGPLAN symposium on Principles of programming languages (POPL)*. ACM, 23–35.
- [11] John CG Sturdy. 1993. *A LISP through the looking glass*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Bath.
- [12] Guido Van Rossum and Fred L Drake. 2011. *The Python language reference manual*. Network Theory Ltd.
- [13] Mitchell Wand and Daniel P Friedman. 1988. The mystery of the tower revealed: A nonreflective description of the reflective tower. *Lisp and Symbolic Computation* 1 (1988), 11–38.
- [14] Thomas Würthinger, Christian Wimmer, Andreas Wöß, Lukas Stadler, Gilles Duboscq, Christian Humer, Gregor Richards, Doug Simon, and Mario Wolczko. 2013. One VM to rule them all. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM international symposium on New ideas, new paradigms, and reflections on programming & software*. ACM, 187–204.