COSE212: Programming Languages

Lecture 8 — Design and Implementation of PLs

(4) States

Hakjoo Oh 2022 Fall

Review: Our Language So Far

Our language has expressions and procedures.

Syntax

Review: Our Language So Far

Semantics

$$\frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow n_1 \quad \rho \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow n_2}{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow n}$$

$$\frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow n_1 \quad \rho \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow n_2}{\rho \vdash E_1 + E_2 \Rightarrow n_1 + n_2}$$

$$\frac{\rho \vdash E \Rightarrow 0}{\rho \vdash \text{iszero } E \Rightarrow \text{true}} \quad \frac{\rho \vdash E \Rightarrow n}{\rho \vdash \text{iszero } E \Rightarrow \text{false}} \quad n \neq 0 \quad \frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow \text{true}}{\rho \vdash \text{if } E_1 \text{ then } E_2 \Rightarrow v} \quad \frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow \text{false}}{\rho \vdash \text{if } E_1 \text{ then } E_2 \Rightarrow v} \quad \frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow \text{false}}{\rho \vdash \text{if } E_1 \text{ then } E_2 \Rightarrow v} \quad \frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow \text{false}}{\rho \vdash \text{if } E_1 \text{ then } E_2 \Rightarrow v} \quad \frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow \text{false}}{\rho \vdash \text{if } E_1 \text{ then } E_2 \Rightarrow v} \quad \frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow v_1 \quad [x \mapsto v_1]\rho \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow v}{\rho \vdash \text{let } x = E_1 \text{ in } E_2 \Rightarrow v} \quad \frac{[f \mapsto (f, x, E_1, \rho)]\rho \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow v}{\rho \vdash \text{letrec } f(x) = E_1 \text{ in } E_2 \Rightarrow v}$$

$$\frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow (x, E, \rho') \quad \rho \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow v \quad [x \mapsto v]\rho' \vdash E \Rightarrow v'}{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow (f, x, E, \rho') \quad \rho \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow v \quad [x \mapsto v, f \mapsto (f, x, E, \rho')]\rho' \vdash E \Rightarrow v'}$$

$$\frac{\rho \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow (f, x, E, \rho') \quad \rho \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow v \quad [x \mapsto v, f \mapsto (f, x, E, \rho')]\rho' \vdash E \Rightarrow v'}{\rho \vdash E_1 E_2 \Rightarrow v'}$$

This Lecture: Adding States to the Language

- So far, our language only had the values produced by computation.
- But computation also has *effects*: it may change the state of memory.
- We will extend the language to support computational effects:
 - Syntax for creating and using memory locations
 - Semantics for manipulating memory states

Motivating Example

• How can we compute the number of times f has been called?

```
let f = proc (x) (x)
in (f (f 1))
```

Motivating Example

• How can we compute the number of times f has been called?

```
let f = proc(x)(x)
in (f(f 1))
```

• Does the following program work?

Motivating Example

• How can we compute the number of times f has been called?

```
let f = proc(x)(x)
in (f(f 1))
```

• Does the following program work?

- The binding of counter is local. We need global effects.
- Effects are implemented by introducing *memory* (*store*) and *locations* (*reference*).

Two Approaches

Programming languages support references explicitly or implicitly.

- Languages with explicit references provide a clear account of allocation, dereference, and mutation of memory cells.
 - ▶ e.g., OCaml, F#
- In languages with implicit references, references are built-in.
 References are not explicitly manipulated.
 - e.g., C and Java.

A Language with Explicit References

- ref E allocates a new location, store the value of E in it, and returns it.
- ! E returns the contents of the location that E refers to.
- ullet $E_1:=E_2$ changes the contents of the location (E_1) by the value of E_2 .
- E_1 ; E_2 executes E_1 and then E_2 while accumulating effects.

```
• let counter = ref 0
  in let f = proc (x) (counter := !counter + 1; !counter)
  in let a = (f 0)
    in let b = (f 0)
    in (a - b)
```

```
• let counter = ref 0
  in let f = proc (x) (counter := !counter + 1; !counter)
    in let a = (f 0)
        in let b = (f 0)
        in (a - b)

• let f = let counter = ref 0
        in proc (x) (counter := !counter + 1; !counter)
in let a = (f 0)
    in let b = (f 0)
    in (a - b)
```

```
let counter = ref 0
 in let f = proc (x) (counter := !counter + 1; !counter)
     in let a = (f 0)
        in let b = (f \ 0)
           in (a - b)
• let f = let counter = ref 0
          in proc (x) (counter := !counter + 1; !counter)
 in let a = (f 0)
     in let b = (f \ 0)
        in (a - b)
• let f = proc (x) (let counter = ref 0
                    in (counter := !counter + 1; !counter))
 in let a = (f 0)
     in let b = (f \ 0)
        in (a - b)
```

We can make chains of references:

```
let x = ref (ref 0)
in (!x := 11; !(!x))
```

Memory is modeled as a finite map from locations to values:

$$egin{array}{lll} Val &=& \mathbb{Z} + Bool + Procedure + Loc \ Procedure &=& Var imes Env \
ho \in Env &=& Var
ightarrow Val \ \sigma \in Mem &=& Loc
ightarrow Val \ \end{array}$$

Semantics rules additionally describe memory effects:

$$\rho, \sigma \vdash E \Rightarrow v, \sigma'$$

Existing rules are enriched with memory effects:

Rules for new constructs:

$$\begin{split} \frac{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E \Rightarrow v, \sigma_1}{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash \text{ref } E \Rightarrow l, [l \mapsto v] \sigma_1} & l \not\in \text{Dom}(\sigma_1) \\ \frac{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E \Rightarrow l, \sigma_1}{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash ! E \Rightarrow \sigma_1(l), \sigma_1} \\ \frac{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow l, \sigma_1}{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow l, \sigma_1} & \rho, \sigma_1 \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow v, \sigma_2}{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow v_1, \sigma_1} \\ \frac{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow v_1, \sigma_1}{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1; E_2 \Rightarrow v_2, \sigma_2} \end{split}$$

$$\overline{\rho, \sigma_0} \vdash \text{let } x = \text{ref (ref 0) in (!x := 11; !(!x))} \Rightarrow$$

Exercise

Extend the language with recursive procedures:

$$egin{array}{lll} P &
ightarrow & E \ E &
ightarrow & n \mid x \ & \mid & E + E \mid E - E \ & \mid & \mathrm{iszero} \; E \mid \mathrm{if} \; E \; \mathrm{then} \; E \; \mathrm{else} \; E \ & \mid & \mathrm{letrec} \; f(x) = E \; \mathrm{in} \; E \ & \mid & \mathrm{proc} \; x \; E \mid E \; E \ & \mid & \mathrm{ref} \; E \ & \mid & E := E \ & \mid & E ; E \ \end{array}$$

Exercise (Continued)

• Domain:

$$egin{array}{lll} Val &=& \mathbb{Z} + Bool + Procedure + Loc \ Procedure &=& Var imes E imes Env \
ho \in Env &=& Var
ightarrow Val \ \sigma \in Mem &=& Loc
ightarrow Val \end{array}$$

Semantics rules:

$$\overline{\rho,\sigma_0} \vdash \text{letrec } f(x) = E_1 \text{ in } E_2 \Rightarrow$$

$$\overline{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \; E_2 \Rightarrow}$$

A Language with Implicit References

$$P
ightarrow E$$
 $E
ightarrow n \mid x$
 $\mid E+E \mid E-E$
 $\mid \text{ iszero } E \mid \text{ if } E \text{ then } E \text{ else } E$
 $\mid \text{ let } x=E \text{ in } E$
 $\mid \text{ proc } x \mid E \mid E \mid E$
 $\mid x := E$
 $\mid E ; E$
this design, every variable denotes a reference and is a

- In this design, every variable denotes a reference and is mutable.
- $\bullet \ x := E$ changes the contents of x by the value of E.

Computing the number of times f has been called:

```
• let counter = 0
in let f = proc (x) (set counter = counter + 1; counter)
in let a = (f 0)
in let b = (f 0)
in (a-b)
```

Computing the number of times f has been called:

```
• let counter = 0
 in let f = proc (x) (set counter = counter + 1; counter)
     in let a = (f 0)
        in let b = (f \ 0)
           in (a-b)
• let f = let counter = 0
          in proc (x) (set counter = counter + 1; counter)
 in let a = (f 0)
     in let b = (f \ 0)
        in (a-b)
```

Computing the number of times f has been called:

```
• let counter = 0
 in let f = proc (x) (set counter = counter + 1; counter)
     in let a = (f 0)
        in let b = (f \ 0)
           in (a-b)
• let f = let counter = 0
          in proc (x) (set counter = counter + 1; counter)
 in let a = (f 0)
     in let b = (f \ 0)
        in (a-b)
• let f = proc (x) (let counter = 0
                    in (set counter = counter + 1; counter))
 in let a = (f 0)
     in let b = (f \ 0)
        in (a-b)
```

Exercise

What is the result of the program?

References are no longer values and every variable denotes a reference:

$$egin{array}{lcl} Val &=& \mathbb{Z} + Bool + Procedure \ Procedure &=& Var imes E imes Env \
ho \in Env &=& Var
ightarrow Loc \ \sigma \in Mem &=& Loc
ightarrow Val \end{array}$$

```
let f = let count = 0
        in proc (x) (set count = count + 1; count)
in let a = (f 0)
   in let b = (f 0)
   in a - b
```

Exercise

Extend the language with recursive procedures:

Exercise (Continued)

Domain:

$$egin{array}{lcl} Val &=& \mathbb{Z} + Bool + Procedure \ Procedure &=& Var imes Env \
ho \in Env &=& Var
ightarrow Loc \ \sigma \in Mem &=& Loc
ightarrow Val \end{array}$$

Semantics rules:

$$\overline{
ho,\sigma_0} dash ext{letrec } f(x) = E_1 ext{ in } E_2 \Rightarrow$$

$$\overline{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 E_2 \Rightarrow}$$

Parameter-Passing Variations

 Our current strategy of calling a procedure is call-by-value. The formal parameter refers to a new location containing the value of the actual parameter:

$$\frac{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow (x, E, \rho'), \sigma_1 \qquad \rho, \sigma_1 \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow v, \sigma_2}{[x \mapsto l] \rho', [l \mapsto v] \sigma_2 \vdash E \Rightarrow v', \sigma_3} \\ \frac{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \ E_2 \Rightarrow v', \sigma_3}{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \ E_2 \Rightarrow v', \sigma_3} \quad l \not\in \mathsf{Dom}(\sigma_2)$$

• The most commonly used form of parameter-passing.

Parameter-Passing Variations

 Our current strategy of calling a procedure is call-by-value. The formal parameter refers to a new location containing the value of the actual parameter:

$$\begin{split} & \rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow (x, E, \rho'), \sigma_1 \qquad \rho, \sigma_1 \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow v, \sigma_2 \\ & \frac{[x \mapsto l] \rho', [l \mapsto v] \sigma_2 \vdash E \Rightarrow v', \sigma_3}{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \ E_2 \Rightarrow v', \sigma_3} \quad l \not \in \mathsf{Dom}(\sigma_2) \end{split}$$

- The most commonly used form of parameter-passing.
- For example, the assignment to x has no effect on the contents of a:

```
let p = proc (x) (set x = 4)
in let a = 3
  in ((p a); a)
```

Parameter-Passing Variations

 Our current strategy of calling a procedure is call-by-value. The formal parameter refers to a new location containing the value of the actual parameter:

$$\begin{split} & \rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow (x, E, \rho'), \sigma_1 \qquad \rho, \sigma_1 \vdash E_2 \Rightarrow v, \sigma_2 \\ & \frac{[x \mapsto l] \rho', [l \mapsto v] \sigma_2 \vdash E \Rightarrow v', \sigma_3}{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \ E_2 \Rightarrow v', \sigma_3} \quad l \not \in \mathsf{Dom}(\sigma_2) \end{split}$$

- The most commonly used form of parameter-passing.
- For example, the assignment to x has no effect on the contents of a:

• Under *call-by-reference*, the assignment changes the value of a after the call.

Call-By-Reference Parameter-Passing

The location of the caller's variable is passed, rather than the contents of the variable.

• Extend the syntax:

$$egin{array}{cccc} E &
ightarrow & dots \ & \mid & E \ E \ & \mid & E \ \langle y
angle \end{array}$$

• Extend the semantics:

$$\frac{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \Rightarrow (x, E, \rho'), \sigma_1 \quad [x \mapsto \rho(y)] \rho', \sigma_1 \vdash E \Rightarrow v', \sigma_2}{\rho, \sigma_0 \vdash E_1 \ \langle y \rangle \Rightarrow v', \sigma_2}$$

What is the benefit of call-by-reference compared to call-by-value?

```
• let p = proc (x) (set x = 4)
in let a = 3
in ((p <a>); a)
```

```
• let p = proc (x) (set x = 4)
in let a = 3
in ((p <a>); a)
```

```
• let f = proc (x) (set x = 44)
in let g = proc (y) (f <y>)
in let z = 55
in ((g <z>); z)
```

```
• let p = proc(x) (set x = 4)
 in let a = 3
     in ((p < a>); a)
• let f = proc(x) (set x = 44)
 in let g = proc(y) (f < y>)
     in let z = 55
        in ((g < z>); z)
• let swap = proc (x) proc (y)
              let temp = x
              in (set x = y; set y = temp)
 in let a = 33
     in let b = 44
        in (((swap <a>) <b>); (a-b))
```

Variable Aliasing

More than one call-by-reference parameter may refer to the same location:

- A variable aliasing is created: x and y refer to the same location
- With aliasing, reasoning about program behavior is very difficult, because an assignment to one variable may change the value of another.

Lazy Evaluation

- So far all the parameter-passing strategies are eager in that they always evaluate the actual parameter before calling a procedure.
- In eager evaluation, procedure arguments are completely evaluated before passing them to the procedure.
- On the other hand, lazy evaluation delays the evaluation of arguments until it is actually needed. If the procedure body never uses the parameter, it will never be evaluated.
- Lazy evaluation potentially avoids non-termination:

```
letrec infinite(x) = (infinite x)
in let f = proc (x) (1)
  in (f (infinite 0))
```

 Lazy evaluation is popular in functional languages, because lazy evaluation makes it difficult to determine the order of evaluation, which is essential to understanding a program with effects.

Summary

Our language is now (somewhat) realistic:

- expressions, procedures, recursion,
- states with explicit/implicit references
- parameter-passing variations