

# STORE

Alex Kavvos

Reading: PFPL §34.1.1, 34.2

Imperative programs are distinguished from functional programs by the use of a **store** (US English: **memory**). We will present Modernised Algol (MA), an imperative language which extends PCF with a store.

## 1 Stores

Mathematically, a store can be modelled as a finite partial function

$$\mu : \text{Loc} \rightarrow \text{StoreVal}$$

from a set  $\text{Loc}$  of **locations** to the set  $\text{StoreVal}$  of **storable values**.  $\text{Loc}$  is usually required to be infinite, so that we can always allocate more memory; for example we may pick  $\text{Loc} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{N}$ .

The set of storable values determines what can be put in the store. In many languages only first-order data (e.g. integers, booleans, ...) and aggregates thereof (e.g. structs, records, ...) are storable. However, languages like OCaml, Scala and JavaScript have a **higher-order store**, i.e. functions can be stored in memory. In this unit we will focus on a **first-order store**, so we pick  $\text{StoreVal} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{v \mid \vdash v : \text{Nat} \wedge v \text{ val}\}$ .

Finally, the function  $\mu$  is **finite**, i.e. its domain  $\text{dom}(\mu)$  is a finite set; in other words, we are only allowed to use a finite number of locations at any point in time.

We will write  $\mu = \mu' \otimes \{a \mapsto v\}$  to mean that  $\mu$  maps the location  $a \in \text{Loc}$  to the value  $v$  (i.e.  $\mu(a) \simeq v$ ), and that  $\mu'$  is the rest of the store (i.e.  $a \notin \text{dom}(\mu')$ ).

## 2 Commands

In addition to the **terms** of the STLC and PCF, MA will have **commands**. While the purpose of expressions is to evaluate to a value, the purpose of commands will be to **change the store**, before also evaluating to a value.

The syntax chart is that of PCF plus the following extensions.

types	$\tau$	$::=$	$\text{Nat}$ $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$ $\text{Cmd}$	natural numbers (partial) function type unevaluated commands
pre-terms	$e$	$::=$	$\dots$ $\text{cmd}(m)$	unevaluated command
pre-commands	$m$	$::=$	$\text{ret}(e)$ $\text{bnd}(e; x. m)$ $\text{dcl}(e; a. m)$ $\text{get}[a]$ $\text{set}[a](e)$	return value sequence allocate fetch location contents set location contents
			$\text{ret } e$ $\text{bind } x \leftarrow e; m$ $\text{decl } a := e \text{ in } m$ $@ a$ $a := e$	

The statics of the language have two sorts of judgment:

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} e : \tau$$

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} m \text{ ok}$$

Both are parameterised in a finite set  $\Sigma \subseteq \text{Loc}$  of locations in use. The first judgement is the usual term typing. The second confirms that  $m$  is a well-formed command, using values from the context  $\Gamma$ .

The statics of the language are those of PCF (with the additional  $\Sigma$  inserted everywhere) plus the following rules.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{FETCH} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma, a} \text{get}[a] \text{ ok}}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ASSIGN} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma, a} e : \text{Nat}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma, a} \text{set}[a](e) \text{ ok}}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{RET} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} e : \text{Nat}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} \text{ret}(e) \text{ ok}}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CMD} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} m \text{ ok}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} \text{cmd}(m) : \text{Cmd}}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{BIND} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} e : \text{Cmd} \quad \Gamma, x : \text{Nat} \vdash_{\Sigma} m \text{ ok}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} \text{bnd}(e; x. m) \text{ ok}}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DECL} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} e : \text{Nat} \quad \Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma, a} m \text{ ok}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\Sigma} \text{dcl}(e; a. m) \text{ ok}}
\end{array}$$

Commands potentially change the store, and then return a value.

The commands  $\text{get}[a]$  and  $\text{set}[a](e)$  respectively fetch the value at location  $a$ , and assign the value of  $e : \text{Nat}$  at location  $a$ . Notice that the location needs to be allocated, i.e. included in the subscript.

The command  $\text{ret}(e)$  simply returns the value of a natural number expression, without changing the store.

The rule **CMD** says that any command  $m$  can be seen as an expression  $\text{cmd}(m) : \text{Cmd}$ . The command is *not* executed when this term is evaluated, but remains frozen in place. Thus, terms of the form  $\text{cmd}(m)$  are values.

The command  $\text{bnd}(e; x. m)$  is a **sequencing** construct. It evaluates  $e$  until it becomes a value  $\text{cmd}(p)$ , and then runs  $p$ . The value returned by  $p$  is then bound to  $x$ , and the next command  $m$  is run.

$\text{dcl}(e; a. m)$  declares the new location  $a$  by assigning the value of term  $e$  to it. Notice that the typing of  $m$  ensures that  $a$  is a valid location (it is included in the subscript). The **scope** of this declaration is the command  $m$ , which runs after the allocation. When its execution is complete, the location  $a$  gets de-allocated. Thus, this construct creates **block structure**, and hence enforces a **stack discipline** (= a stack suffices to implement it).

### 3 Examples

To relate Modernised Algol to common programming idioms we may define the following shorthands.

$$\{x \leftarrow m_1; m_2\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{bnd}(\text{cmd}(m_1); x. m_2) \quad \{m_1; m_2\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{bnd}(\text{cmd}(m_1); \_ . m_2) \quad \text{do } e \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{bnd}(e; x. \text{ret}(x))$$

We sometimes write  $\{m_1; m_2; \dots; m_n\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{m_1; \{m_2; \{\dots; m_n\}\}\}$ , and similarly if we have bindings.

Armed with these shorthands we can write **conditionals** and **loops** as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{if } m \text{ then } m_1 \text{ else } m_2 &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \leftarrow m; \text{do ifz}(x; \text{cmd}(m_1); \_ . \text{cmd}(m_2))\} \\
\text{while } (m) \{m^*\} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{do fix}(r : \text{Cmd}. \text{cmd}(\text{if } m \text{ then } (\text{ret zero}) \text{ else } \{m^*; \text{do } r\}))
\end{aligned}$$

A **procedure** is a term  $f : \tau \rightarrow \text{Cmd}$ . We define

$$\text{proc } (x : \tau) \{m\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda x : \tau. \text{cmd}(m) \quad \text{call } e_1(e_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{do } e_1(e_2)$$

We can then write programs like the following one, which computes the factorial of  $x$ .

```

proc (x : nat) {
  decl r := 1 in
  decl a := x in
  {
    while (@a) {
      y <- @r; z <- @a;
      r := y * (x - z + 1);           // r := r * (x - a + 1)
      a := z - 1;                    // a := a - 1
    };
    x <- @r;
    ret x
  }
}

```

The invariant for this loop is  $@r = (x - @a)!$ , so at the end  $@r = x!$ .