#### CS450

#### Structure of Higher Level Languages

Lecture 28: Effectful operations

Tiago Cogumbreiro

## Today we will...



- Introduce a functional pattern monads
- Introduce state monads
- Introduce stack machines

## Functional pattern: Mutable state

#### Revisiting our reduction rules



$$ightharpoonup_H v \downarrow_E v 
ightharpoonup_H$$

Effectful computation can be divided into three categories:

- Side-effect free computation in blue
- Computation that directly produces side effect in red
- Computation that indirectly produces some side-effect in black

We are ▶ chaining ▶ effectful ▶ computations ▶, that is the variables declared on the left-hand side of ▶ should be accessible in the right-hand side.

## Refactoring memory-based operations



```
(define v1+mem1 (d:eval-exp mem env e1))
(define mem1 (eff-state v1+mem1))
(define v1 (eff-result v1+mem1))
(define env2+mem2 (environ-push mem1 env y v1)
(define env2 (eff-result env2+mem2))
(define mem2 (eff-state env2+mem2))
(define v2+mem3 (d:eval-exp mem2 env2 e2))
(define mem3 (eff-state v+mem1))
(define v2 (eff-result v+mem1))
```

The memory needs to be passed along from one function call to the next. How can we refactor this code so that some function does that for us?

## Refactoring evaluation of application



```
(define* v1 (d:eval-exp* env e1))
(define* env2 (environ-push* env y v1)
(define* v2 (d:eval-exp* env2 e2))
```

At each step we separate the result from the state. Our goal is to **abstract** the memory threading, that is to refactor away this mechanic unpacking of the side effect structure.

## Abstracting the state



#### Ideal pseudo code

In today's class, we introduce an abstraction that allows us to achieve something similar to the pseudo-code below. We highlight in yellow effectful definitions and operations.

```
(define* v1 (d:eval-exp* env e1))
(define* env2 (environ-push* env y v1)
(define* v2 (d:eval-exp* env2 e2))
```

## Roadmap: abstracting effectful computation



#### Combining:

- Effectful operations: s:eval-exp and environ-push, with
   Effectful variable declaration: v1, env2, and v2

```
(define v1 (d:eval-exp env e1))
(define* env2 (environ-push* env y v1)
(define v2 (d:eval-exp env2 e2))
```

$$e_1 \Downarrow_E v_1 \blacktriangleright E' \leftarrow E + [y := v] \blacktriangleright e_2 \Downarrow_{E'} v_2$$

Arithmetic on the heap

A proxy example

## Example



Consider a heap of integers. We allocate two integers and then a third integer that holds the some of the first two.

```
(define (prog1 h1)
  (define eff-x (heap-alloc h1 1))
  (define x (eff-result eff-x))
  (define h2 (eff-state eff-x))
  (define eff-y (heap-alloc h2 2))
  (define y (eff-result eff-y))
  (define h3 (eff-state eff-y))
  (heap-alloc h3 (+ (heap-get h3 y) (heap-get h3 x))))
(define (run-state h op) (eff-state (op h)))
(define H (heap (hash (handle 0) 1 (handle 1) 2 (handle 2) 3)))
(check-equal? (run-state empty-heap prog1) H)
```

#### Effectful operations



- An effectful operation takes a state and returns an effect eff that pairs some state with some result. An effectful operation is parameterized by the state type and by the result type.
- Below we define two effectful operations where the state is a heap.

Add

Alloc

```
(define (num x)
  (lambda (h)
      (heap-alloc h x)))
```

```
(define (add x y)
  (lambda (h)
     (heap-alloc h (+ (heap-get h y) (heap-get h x)))))
```

#### Did you know?

- The state (heap) is a parameter, so that we can combine effectful operations.
- Functions num and add each returns an effectful operation

## Sequencing effectful operations



#### Example

```
(define (prog2 h1)
  (define eff-x ((num 1) h1))
  (define x (eff-result eff-x))
  (define h2 (eff-state eff-x))
  (define eff-y ((num 2) h2))
  (define y (eff-result eff-y))
  (define h3 (eff-state eff-v))
  ((add x y) h3))
```

#### The bind operator

```
(define (bind o1 o2)
  (lambda (h1)
     (define eff-r (o1 h1))
     (define r (eff-result eff-r))
     (define h2 (eff-state eff-r))
     ((o2 r) h2))
```

We highlight in yellow an example of redundant code. Function **bind** abstracts away the redundant code.

## Abstracting with bind



#### Before

```
(define (prog2 h1)
  (define eff-x ((num 1) h1))
  (define x (eff-result eff-x))
  (define h2 (eff-state eff-x))
  (define eff-y ((num 2) h2))
  (define y (eff-result eff-y))
  (define h3 (eff-state eff-y))
 ((add x y) h3))
```

#### After

Using the **bind** operator we remove redundant code. You can think of **bind** as a variable declaration, akin to an effectful **define**.

## Stack machines

The state does not need to be a heap

#### Stack machines



- Uses a stack of number to represent memory (rather than registers)
- Variable-free code
- Very compact object code
- Examples of (virtual) stack machines: OpenJDK JVM, CPython interpreter

#### A stack-based evaluator



#### Operations

- $push(n) \rightarrow (void)$
- $pop() \rightarrow number$

#### State

#### A stack-based evaluator



#### Operations

- $push(n) \rightarrow (void)$
- $pop() \rightarrow number$

#### State

a list of numbers

## Implementing pop



(define (pop)

## Implementing pop



```
(define (pop)
  (lambda (stack)
    (eff (rest stack) (first stack))))
```

## Implementing push



(define (push n)

## Implementing push



```
(define (push n)
  (lambda (stack)
    (eff (cons n stack) (void))))
```

## Implementing mult



```
():

x = pop

y = pop

push (x * y)
```

#### Implementing mult



```
():

x = pop

y = pop

push (x * y)
```

## Implementing prog



#### Pseudo Code

```
():
push(2)
push(5)
mult()
push(2)
mult()
```

## Implementing prog



#### Pseudo Code

```
():
push(2)
push(5)
mult()
push(2)
mult()
```

#### In Racket

```
(check-equal? (run-state (list) prog4) (list 20))
```

Unfortunately, the code appears very nested if we indent it as we usually do. **Can we do better?** 

## Sequencing effectful operators



#### Sequencing effectful operators



Solution

Revisit prog4

```
(define (seq2 op1 op2)
  (bind op1 (lambda (x) op2)))

(define (seq op . ops)
  (cond [(empty? ops) op]
       [else (seq2 op (apply seq ops))]))
```

## Sequencing effectful operators



#### Solution

```
(define (seq2 op1 op2)
  (bind op1 (lambda (x) op2)))

(define (seq op . ops)
  (cond [(empty? ops) op]
       [else (seq2 op (apply seq ops))]))
```

#### Revisit prog4

#### Limitations

The **seq** operator is a regular function call, which takes *expressions* as its arguments. This complicates a situation where we might need to create a temporary variable (say to cache a result) in the middle of a **seq**.

# Syntactic sugar for stateful operations

## Syntactic sugar: the do notation



Macros can be useful technique to avoid redundant code. In our case, we are using a macro to avoid syntactic verbosity.

```
(define-syntax do
  (syntax-rules (←))

[(_ mexp) mexp]

[(_ var ← mexp rest ...) (bind mexp (lambda (var) (do rest ...)))]

[(_ mexp rest ...) (bind mexp (lambda (_) (do rest ...)))]))
```

You do not need to understand this code today. We will learn about macros in detail in a future lesson.

## Syntactic sugar: the do notation



The do notation allows us to make our code less nested. The cost of using macros is that they obfuscate the program's semantics.

Before

After

```
(define (mult)
  (do
    x ← (pop)
    y ← (pop)
       (push (* x y))))
```

#### Limitations

Similarly to **seq**, because of how the macro was designed, it takes a sequence of expressions. Monadic interfaces usually introduce an operator **pure** to workaround the issue.

## The pure operator



The pure operator simply converts a pure (non-effectful) value into an effectful value, leaving the state unaltered. One useful benefit of this is that it allow us to combine effectful and pure operations in the same interface.

The pure operator

```
(define (pure v)
  (lambda (st)
      (eff st v)))
```

#### Example

```
(define (mult)
  (do
    x ← (pop)
    y ← (pop)
    z ← (pure (* x y))
        (push z))))
```

## Summary: the monad



A monad is a **functional pattern** which can be categorized of two base combinators:

- **Bind:** combines two effectful operations  $o_1$  and  $o_2$ . Operation  $o_1$  produces a value that is consumed by operation  $o_2$ .
- **Pure:** Converts a pure value to a monadic operation, which can then be chained with bind.

In this course, we will learn that the monadic pattern appears in different contexts.

## Summary: the state monad



- Data: the monadic data is a pair (struct eff) that holds the global state and some result.
- **Bind:** combines operation  $o_1$  with operation  $o_2$ ; after executing  $o_1$ , we get a new state and some result that are both fed into operation  $o_2$ .

#### To think...

Monadic function application: can we create a function call where all arguments are monadic values? What about a monadic map? And a monadic fold?

```
(define (mult)
  (do
  z ← (mapply * (pop) (pop))
     (push z)))
```