CS 320: Principles of Programming Languages

Katie Casamento, Portland State University

Winter 2018
Week 8b: Imperative Constructs

Referential transparency

So far we've been working only with **expressions**, which **evaluate** to a **value**.

```
e ::= x | (λx. e) | (e₁ e₂)
      | n | (e₁ + e₂) | (e₁ * e₂)
      | b | if e₁ then e₂ else e₃
```

All closed expressions in this language are *referentially transparent*:

If expression `e` evaluates to value `v`,
then we can replace any occurrence of `e` with `v`
without changing the meaning of the program.

Side effects

A *side effect* is anything that might happen during execution outside of expressions evaluating to values.

- Setting the value of a *mutable* variable (one whose value can change over time)
- Printing to some output stream (console, file, network bridge, …)
- Reading from some external resource (console, file, network bridge, …)
- …

These can all be thought of as depending on some kind of **state**:

- Setting the value of a mutable variable changes the state of the program environment
- Printing to an output stream changes the state of the stream
- Reading from an external resource depends on the state of the resource

Side effects

Side effects **break referential transparency**!

```
int x = 0;
int f() { return x++; }
```

The first time we call `f()`, it returns `0`,

but we **can't** replace every call to `f()` with `0` without changing the meaning of a program!

```
void main() { print(f()); print(f()); } // prints "01"
```

is **not the same program** as

```
void main() { print(0);   print(0);   } // prints "00"
```

Statements

In an imperative language, there are **statements** (or *commands*), which **execute** to cause **side effects**.

Some common kinds of statements:

```
x = 1
```
   set the value of mutable variable `x` to `1`

```
if e then s₁ else s₂
```
   execute statement s_1 if `e` evaluates to `true` or statement s_2 if `e` evaluates to `false`

```
while e s
```
   execute statement `s` as long as expression `e` evaluates to `true`

```
s₁ ; s₂
```
   execute statement s_1, then execute statement s_2

Modeling commands

Modeling commands

How can we add commands to our language?

A couple approaches (not the only ones!):

- Model the whole language using a *state machine*
    - Most commonly a *stack machine* or a *register machine*
    - A program is a sequence of statements
    - Expression evaluation is described as a series of commands (as in assembly)

        `x + y + z`

  =   `mov x %eax; mov y %ebx; add %eax %ebx; mov z %eax; add %eax %ebx`
        (returning the result in `%ebx`)
- Model commands as expressions
    - Add expression forms for commands
    - Modify evaluation semantics to account for side effects
    - Sometimes called *expression-oriented* programming

Commands as expressions

In the expression-oriented approach, we add a new expression form to represent mutable assignments.

$$e \; ::= \; … \; | \; \mathbf{x = e}$$

How do we give semantics to this assignment construct?

Evaluating commands

What **value** should a command evaluate to?

```
1 + 2              ⇒* 3
(λx. x + 1) 2 ⇒* 3
(x = 3)            ⇒* ???
```

One approach: have every command evaluate to some (sort of arbitrary) value that's already in our language.

```
(x = 3) ⇒* 3
```

This is the approach C/C++ take for assignments: an assignment evaluates to the value that was being assigned.

Evaluating statements

What value should a command **evaluate** to?

```
1 + 2              ⇒* 3
(λx. x + 1) 2 ⇒* 3
x := 3             ⇒* ???
```

Another approach: C/C++/Java have a `void` type.

```
(x = 3) : void
```

But what does a **value** of type `void` look like?

The unit type

In formal type theory, we call this the *unit* type: a type with exactly one value.

```
e ::= … | unit
t ::= … | Unit
```

```
(x = 3) : Unit
(x = 3) ⇒* unit
```

$$\text{T-Unit} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{unit} : \text{Unit}}$$

$$\text{T-Assign} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t \qquad \Gamma \vdash e : t}{\Gamma \vdash (x = e) : \text{Unit}}$$

`unit` can be thought of as a zero-element struct.

Since `unit` contains **no information**, it can represent the **absence** of a return value.

This captures the **return value** of a command, but we still need a way to describe the **execution** of commands in terms of side effects.

Mutability semantics

We need a way to represent a change in the **value environment** during reductions.

$$\text{E-Assign} \quad \frac{\text{???}}{<\rho,\ (x\ =\ e)> \Downarrow\ \text{???}}$$

Mutability semantics

We need a way to represent a change in the **value environment** during reductions.

One solution: reduce an expression in an environment to a value and also a **new environment**.

$$\text{E-Assign} \quad \frac{\langle \rho, \ e \rangle \Downarrow v}{\langle \rho, \ (x = e) \rangle \Downarrow \langle \rho[x \mapsto v], \ () \rangle}$$

if e **evaluates to** v **under** ρ

then $x = e$ **updates** ρ **with** $x \mapsto v$ **and returns** $()$

This isn't quite right, though: what if the evaluation of e produces side effects?

```
x = (y = y + 1)
```

This might happen if a function mutates state or prints to output before returning a value.

Mutability semantics

We need a way to represent a change in the **value environment** during reductions.

One solution: reduce an expression in an environment to a value and also a **new environment**.

E-Assign

$$\frac{<\rho,\ e>\ \Downarrow\ <\rho',\ v>}{<\rho,\ (x\ =\ e)>\ \Downarrow\ <\rho'[x\ \mapsto\ v],\ ()>}$$

if `e` evaluates to `v` under ρ
and updates the environment to ρ'

then `x = e` updates ρ' with `x` $\mapsto$ `v`
and returns `()`

In order to account for potential side effects in `e`, we have to update the environment **after** evaluating `e`, not the environment **before** evaluating `e`.

Sequencing

Variable assignments aren't very interesting without a way to *sequence* commands.

```
e ::= … | e₁ ; e₂
```

The **value** of a sequence is the value of the **last** expression of the sequence.

```
(1     ; 2)  ⇒* 2
(true ; 2)  ⇒* 2
```

$$\text{T-Seq} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_2 : t}{\Gamma \vdash (e_1 \; ; \; e_2) : t}$$

Sequencing semantics

When reducing a sequence of expressions, we reduce them left to right, **propagating** the environment changes from earlier expressions to later expressions.

if e_1 evaluates to v_1 under ρ and updates the environment to ρ'

and e_2 evaluates to v_2 under ρ' and updates the environment to ρ''

$$\text{E-Seq} \quad \frac{<\rho,\ e_1> \Downarrow <\rho',\ v_1> \qquad <\rho',\ e_2> \Downarrow <\rho'',\ v_2>}{<\rho,\ (e_1\ ;\ e_2)> \Downarrow <\rho'',\ v_2>}$$

then $(e_1\ ;\ e_2)$ evaluates to v_2 under ρ and updates the environment to ρ''

Imperative programs

Now we have the basic tools to write (very simple) imperative programs.

```
plusOne = λ(x: num). x = x + 1; x

plusOne 1 ⇒* 2
plusOne 2 ⇒* 3
```

Imperative semantics example

$$\text{E-Seq} \quad \frac{\langle\rho,\ e_1\rangle \Downarrow \langle\rho',\ v_1\rangle \qquad \langle\rho',\ e_2\rangle \Downarrow \langle\rho'',\ v_2\rangle}{\langle\rho,\ (e_1\ ;\ e_2)\rangle \Downarrow \langle\rho'',\ v_2\rangle}$$

$$\text{E-Assign} \quad \frac{\langle\rho,\ e\rangle \Downarrow \langle\rho',\ v\rangle}{\langle\rho,\ (x = e)\rangle \Downarrow \langle\rho'[x \mapsto v],\ ()\rangle}$$

$$\text{E-Plus} \quad \frac{\langle(x \mapsto 1),\ x\rangle \Downarrow 1 \quad \langle(x \mapsto 1),\ 1\rangle \Downarrow 1 \quad 1 + 1 = 2}{\langle(x \mapsto 1),\ (x + 1)\rangle \Downarrow \langle(x \mapsto 1),\ 2\rangle}$$

$$\text{E-Assign} \quad \frac{}{\langle(x \mapsto 1),\ (x = x + 1)\rangle \Downarrow \langle(x \mapsto 2),\ ()\rangle}$$

$$\text{E-Var} \quad \frac{(x \mapsto 2)(x) = 2}{\langle(x \mapsto 2),\ x\rangle \Downarrow \langle(x \mapsto 2),\ 2\rangle}$$

$$\text{E-Seq} \quad \frac{}{\langle(x \mapsto 1),\ (x = x + 1\ ;\ x)\rangle \Downarrow \langle(x \mapsto 2),\ 2\rangle}$$

Imperative syntax

We can define a more traditional C-style imperative syntax as syntactic sugar:

```
num plusOne(num x) { x = x + 1; return x }
plusOne = λ(x: num). x = x + 1; x
```

(Note that we haven't implemented early returns or recursion yet, though.)

When a function's return type is `unit`, we can leave out the `return` and insert `return unit` during syntax analysis.

```
unit f(x: num) { x = x + 1 }
unit f(x: num) { x = x + 1; return unit }
f = λ(x: num). x = x + 1; unit
```

Imperative syntax

An `if` statement where the branches have type `unit` can omit an `else` branch.

```
if x > 5 then x = x + 1
if x > 5 then x = x + 1 else unit
```

When a function takes no arguments, we model it as taking a single `unit` argument.

```
unit incX() { x = x + 1; }
incX = λu. x = x + 1
```

Explicit vs. implicit typing

The lambda syntax we've been using is partially *implicitly* typed: we don't have to specify the argument and return types of a function explicitly. (This means the typechecker is doing some amount of type **inference**.)

```
plusOne = λx. x = x + 1; x
```

In contrast, the imperative syntax is *explicitly* typed: every variable's type and function's return type must be annotated in the syntax of the program.

```
num plusOne(num x) { x = x + 1; return x }
```

Since return type inference is decidable in this language, this is just a design decision.

- Implicit typing is less work for the programmer and less distracting syntax
- Explicit typing prevents errors where type inference infers a type the programmer didn't intend

Environment updates

How exactly should we **update** the environment?

```
(x ↦ 1, y ↦ 2)[a ↦ 0] =
```

    `err`? (since there's no binding to update for `a`)
    `(a ↦ 0, x ↦ 1, y ↦ 2)`? (*declare* a new binding for `a`)

```
(x ↦ 1, y ↦ 2)[y ↦ 0] =
```

    `(x ↦ 1, y ↦ 0)`? (update the existing binding for `y`)
    `(y ↦ 0, x ↦ 1, y ↦ 2)`? (*declare* a new binding for `y`, *shadowing* the old binding)

(Remember that `ρ(x)` returns the **leftmost** binding for `x` in `ρ`.)

And when should we **remove** values from the environment?

Python:

```python
if __name__ == "__main__":

    x = 1 # new binding x₁
    y = 2 # new binding y₁
    x = 3 # update x₁

    def f(x): # new binding x₂
        x = 4 # update x₂
        y = 5 # new binding y₂
        y = 6 # update y₂
        z = 7 # new binding z₁
        z = 8 # update z₁

    x = 9  # update x₁
    y = 10 # update y₁
    z = 11 # new binding z₂
```

C (with GCC extensions):

```c
void main() {

    x = 1;      // error
    int x = 2;  // new binding x₁
    int x = 3;  // error
    x = 4;      // update x₁
    int y = 5;  // new binding y₁

    void f(int x) { // new binding x₂
        x = 6;      // update x₂
        y = 7;      // update y₂
        int z = 8;  // new binding z₁
    }

    x = 9;  // update x₁
    z = 10; // error

}
```

Scope and lifetime

Scope

The *scope* of a variable is the part of the program where references to the variable are valid.

Different languages have different *scoping rules*, which specify where variables are in scope within different language constructs.

There are two broad categories, but a lot of variation within these categories.

- *Static* (or *lexical*) scoping resolves variable references based on the position of each reference in the AST of the program
    - Almost all modern languages
- *Dynamic* scoping resolves variable references based on the runtime environment at each reference to a variable during execution
    - bash, PowerShell, Emacs Lisp, …
    - Occasionally opt-in for individual variables (Perl, Common Lisp, Haskell (GHC), …)
    - Sometimes used in the implementation of *exception handling* (Java, Python, …)

Scoping rules

For our little imperative lambda language, we'll use a simplified version of the **static** scoping rules from C.

Our language will have a special form for *declaring local* variables:

```
e ::= … | var x : t = e | x = e

plusOne = λx. var y : num = 1; x + y
```

With C-style local variable declarations in the imperative syntax:

```
num plusOne(num x) { num y = 1; return x + y }
```

Scoping rules

Taking inspiration from C:

-   Each function body is a *block*; the function's arguments are in scope within the body
-   Each branch of an `if/then/else` construct is a block
-   A local variable's scope is from its declaration to the end of the block it's declared in

```
unit f(num x) {  // x comes into scope
  num y = 1;     // y comes into scope
  if x < y {
    num z = 2;  // z comes into scope
  } else {       // z goes out of scope
    num w = 3;  // w comes into scope
  }              // w goes out of scope
}                // x, y go out of scope
```

Lifetime

The *lifetime* of a value is the period of execution during which it's guaranteed to be in memory.

There are many approaches to lifetime management. Among the most common:

- A variable with a *static* (or *lexical*) lifetime is in memory until the end of the scope it was declared in
- A variable with a *manually managed* lifetime is in scope until a special `free` function is called on it to explicitly free up the memory
- A *garbage-collected* variable is in scope until there are no live references to it left in the runtime environment

Procedural evaluation

Procedural evaluation

A simple set of rules for implementing function calls under static scope/lifetime rules can be implemented with an *activation stack.*

This is a common procedure to **execute** and **compile** procedural programs.

- When a function is *invoked* (called/applied),
    - An *activation record* (or *stack frame*) is pushed onto a global stack
    - Bindings for the function arguments are added to the environment in the function's activation record
- When a variable is declared within the function, it gets added to the environment in the function's activation record
- When a function returns, its activation record is popped off the stack

The activation record has space for the function's arguments and local variables, along with a return address and sometimes other information.

Procedural evaluation

Other blocks, like if branches and while loop bodies, are handled similarly.

- When a variable is declared within the block, it gets added to the environment
- When execution leaves the block, all variables added in the block are removed from the environment

The address of a lexically-scoped variable can be computed in constant time,

so getting the value of a lexically-scoped variable reference takes the same amount of time regardless of how far down the activation stack it is.

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.        num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D — lines 1-5

B — lines 6-13

C — lines 8-11

A — lines 15-17

A main	ρ = ∅ return = <quit>

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.      y = z;
11.    }
12.    return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.    absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D
B
C
A

B absPlusOne	ρ = x ↦ -2 return = line 17
A main	ρ = ∅ return = <quit>

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.       num z = x + y;
3.       return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.       num y = x;
8.       if x < 0 {
9.          num z = 0 - x;
10.         y = z;
11.      }
12.      return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.      absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D (lines 1-5)
B (lines 6-13)
C (lines 8-11)
A (lines 15-17)

| B absPlusOne	$\rho = y \mapsto -2$, $x \mapsto -2$ return = line 17
A main	$\rho = \varnothing$ return = \<quit\>

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.      y = z;
11.    }
12.    return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.    absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D — { lines 1–5 }

B — { lines 6–13 }

C — { lines 8–11 }

A — { lines 15–17 }

C absPlusOne	$\rho = y \mapsto -2, x \mapsto -2$ return = line 17
A main	$\rho = \varnothing$ return = <quit>

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.        num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D { 1. – 5.

B { 6. – 13.

C } 8. – 11.

A { 15. – 17.

C absPlusOne	ρ = z ↦ 2, y ↦ -2, x ↦ -2 return = line 17
A main	ρ = ∅ return = \<quit\>

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.        num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.      }
12.      return plus(y, 1);
13.    }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D — lines 1-5
B — lines 6-13
C — lines 8-11
A — lines 15-17

C absPlusOne	ρ = z ↦ 2, y ↦ 2, x ↦ -2 return = line 17
A main	ρ = ∅ return = \<quit\>

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.        num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.      }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D
B
C
A

B absPlusOne	ρ = ~~z ↦ 2,~~ y ↦ 2, x ↦ -2 return = line 17
A main	ρ = ∅ return = <quit>

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.         num z = 0 - x;
10.        y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D

B

C

A

D plus	ρ = x ↦ 2, y ↦ 1 return = line 13
B absPlusOne	ρ = y ↦ 2, x ↦ -2 return = line 17
A main	ρ = ∅ return = <quit>

Procedural evaluation example

```
D  {  1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
          2.     num z = x + y;
          3.     return z;
          4.   }
          5.
B  {  6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
          7.     num y = x;
          8.     if x < 0 {
          9.       num z = 0 - x;      }  C
         10.       y = z;
         11.     }
         12.     return plus(y, 1);
         13.   }
         14.
A  {  15.   unit main() {
         16.     absPlusOne(-2);
         17.   }
```

D plus	ρ = z ↦ 3, x ↦ 2, y ↦ 1 return = line 13
B absPlusOne	ρ = y ↦ 2, x ↦ -2 return = line 17
A main	ρ = ∅ return = \<quit\>

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D — lines 1-5
B — lines 6-13
C — lines 8-11
A — lines 15-17

B absPlusOne	ρ = y ↦ 2, x ↦ -2 return = line 16
A main	ρ = ∅ return = <quit>

Procedural evaluation example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.      y = z;
11.    }
12.    return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.    absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D { (lines 1-5)

B { (lines 6-13)

C { (lines 8-11)

A { (lines 15-17)

| A main	ρ = ∅ return = \<quit>

Static and dynamic links

Scopes in a program can be syntactically *enclosed by* (or *nested in*) other scopes.

In programs with nested scopes, non-local variables are accessed through *links* between activation records.

- The *dynamic* link points to the next activation record on the stack
- The *static* link points to the nearest activation record for the enclosing static scope of the current (topmost) activation record

Enclosing scopes

```
1.   unit main() {
2.     num x = 1;
3.
4.     num addX(num y) {
5.       return x + y;
6.     }
7.
8.     num a = addX(3);
9.     x = 2;
10.    num b = addX(3);
11.  }
```

A

B

In this program, A is the (*static*) *enclosing scope* of B, because the **definition** of B is within A.

Evaluation with static links example

```
 1.  unit main() {
 2.    num x = 1;
 3.
 4.    num addX(num y) {
 5.      return x + y;
 6.    }
 7.
 8.    num a = addX(3);
 9.    x = 2;
10.    num b = addX(3);
11.  }
```

A

B

| A
main | ρ = ∅
return = <quit> |

Evaluation with static links example

```
 1.  unit main() {
 2.    num x = 1;
 _____
 3.
 4.    num addX(num y) {
 5.      return x + y;
 6.    }
 7.
 8.    num a = addX(3);
 9.    x = 2;
10.    num b = addX(3);
11.  }
```

A

B

| A
main | ρ = x ⊢ 1
return = \<quit> |

Evaluation with static links example

```
1.  unit main() {
2.     num x = 1;
3.
4.     num addX(num y) {
5.        return x + y;
6.     }
7.
8.     num a = addX(3);
9.     x = 2;
10.    num b = addX(3);
11. }
```

A

B

A main	ρ = addX ↦ λ(y: num). x + y, x ↦ 1 return = <quit>

Evaluation with static links example

```
1.   unit main() {
2.      num x = 1;
3.
4.      num addX(num y) {
        ─────────────────────
5.         return x + y;
6.      }
7.
8.      num a = addX(3);
9.      x = 2;
10.     num b = addX(3);
11.  }
```

A

B

When B is called, its static link points to the nearest activation record for A, because A is the enclosing scope for B.

B addX	ρ = y ↦ 3 return = line 9
A main	ρ = addX ↦ λ(y: num). x + y, x ↦ 1 return = \<quit\>

Evaluation with static links example

```
1.   unit main() {
2.      num x = 1;
3.
4.      num addX(num y) {
5.         return x + y;
6.      }
7.
8.      num a = addX(3);
9.      x = 2;
10.     num b = addX(3);
11.  }
```

A
B

When B is called, its static link points to the nearest activation record for A, because A is the enclosing scope for B.

The reference to x within B is resolved by following the static links and taking the value from the first environment in that chain that has a binding for x.

B addX	ρ = y ↦ 3 return = line 9
A main	ρ = addX ↦ λ(y: num). x + y, x ↦ 1 return = <quit>

Evaluation with static links example

```
1.   unit main() {
2.      num x = 1;
3.
4.      num addX(num y) {
5.         return x + y;
6.      }
7.
8.      num a = addX(3);
9.      x = 2;
10.     num b = addX(3);
11.  }
```

A

B

A
 main
	ρ = a ↦ 4,
	     addX ↦ λ(y: num). x + y,
	     x ↦ 1
	 return = \<quit\>

Evaluation with static links example

```
1.  unit main() {
2.    num x = 1;
3.
4.    num addX(num y) {
5.      return x + y;
6.    }
7.
8.    num a = addX(3);
9.    x = 2;
10.    num b = addX(3);
11.  }
```

A

B

| A main | ρ = a ↦ 4, addX ↦ λ(y: num). x + y, x ↦ 2 return = <quit> |

Evaluation with static links example

```
1.  unit main() {
2.    num x = 1;
3.
4.    num addX(num y) {
5.      return x + y;
6.    }
7.
8.    num a = addX(3);
9.    x = 2;
10.   num b = addX(3);
11. }
```

A

B

B addX	ρ = y ↦ 3 return = line 11

A
main
	ρ = a ↦ 4,
	    addX ↦ λ(y: num). x + y,
	    x ↦ 2
	return = \<quit\>

Evaluation with static links example

```
1.   unit main() {
2.     num x = 1;
3.
4.     num addX(num y) {
5.       return x + y;
6.     }
7.
8.     num a = addX(3);
9.     x = 2;
10.    num b = addX(3);
11.  }
```

A

B

When B is called, its static link points to the nearest activation record for A, because A is the enclosing scope for B.

The reference to `x` resolves to the **current** value of `x` in the enclosing scope, so it's different now than last time.

B addX	ρ = y ↦ 3 return = line 11

A
 main
	ρ = a ↦ 4,
	     addX ↦ λ(y: num). x + y,
	     x ↦ 2
	 return = <quit>

# Evaluation with static links example

```
1.  unit main() {
2.     num x = 1;
3.
4.     num addX(num y) {
5.        return x + y;
6.     }
7.
8.     num a = addX(3);
9.     x = 2;
10.    num b = addX(3);
11. }
```

A

B

A
main
	ρ = b ↦ 5, a ↦ 4,
	    addX ↦ λ(y: num). x + y,
	    x ↦ 2
	return = \<quit\>

Calling conventions

A *calling convention* specifies how arguments are passed in to functions.

- A *call-by-value* argument gets **copied** into an activation record when it's created
    - Modifications to function arguments are "undone" when the function returns
    - Copying involves some runtime work
    - Default in most languages
- A *call-by-reference* argument is a reference to the argument's original **location**
    - Modifications to function arguments are kept when the function returns
    - Avoids the work of copying
    - Sometimes harder to reason about (especially in concurrent programs)
    - Optional in some languages (C#, Ada)
    - Can be partially simulated with pointers (C, C++) and objects (Java, Python)

Call-by-value

In call-by-value execution of this `main` function, the value assigned to `y` is `1`, because the change to the value of `x` in `f` is not visible in the calling block.

```
unit f(num x) { x = x + 1; }

unit main() {
  num x = 1;
  f(x);
  num y = x;
}
```

Call-by-reference

In call-by-reference execution of this `main` function, the value assigned to `y` is `2`, because the change to `x` in `f` affects the variable that was passed in from the calling block as the `x` argument.

```
unit f(num x) { x = x + 1; }

unit main() {
  num x = 1;
  f(x);
  num y = x;
}
```

Procedural typechecking

Procedural typechecking

Evaluation with activation records suggests a procedure for **typechecking** procedural programs.

The typechecker moves through the code top to bottom, line by line, keeping track of a typing context.

- At every line, it typechecks the expression on that line
- When it enters a function, it adds the function's arguments to the context
- When it encounters a local variable declaration, it adds the variable to the context
- When it leaves a block, it removes the variables declared in that block from the context
- When it encounters a return statement, it checks the value's type against the return type
- When it leaves a function,
    - it removes the function's arguments and local variables from the context,
    - and adds the function itself to the context

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D (lines 1–5)

B (lines 6–13)

C (lines 8–11)

A (lines 15–17)

check	none
Γ	∅

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.         num z = 0 - x;
10.        y = z;
11.      }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D { (lines 1-5)
B { (lines 6-13)
C { (lines 8-11)
A { (lines 15-17)

check	none
Γ	x: num, y: num

Procedural typechecking example

```
 1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
 2.     num z = x + y;
 3.     return z;
 4.   }
 5.
 6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
 7.     num y = x;
 8.     if x < 0 {
 9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D (spans lines 1–5)
B (spans lines 6–13)
C (spans lines 8–11)
A (spans lines 15–17)

$$\text{T-Var} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t}{\Gamma \vdash x : t}$$

$$\text{T-Plus} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : num \qquad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : num}{\Gamma \vdash (e_1 + e_2) : num}$$

$$\text{T-Assign} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t \qquad \Gamma \vdash e : t}{\Gamma \vdash (x = e) : unit}$$

check	x: num && y: num
Γ	z: num, x: num, y: num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.        num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D
B
C
A

$$\text{T-Var} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t}{\Gamma \vdash x : t}$$

check	z: num
Γ	z: num, x: num, y: num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.       num z = x + y;
3.       return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.       num y = x;
8.       if x < 0 {
9.          num z = 0 - x;
10.         y = z;
11.      }
12.      return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.      absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D — (lines 1–5)
B — (lines 6–13)
C — (lines 8–11)
A — (lines 15–17)

check	none
Γ	~~z: num, x: num, y: num,~~ plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.      y = z;
11.    }
12.    return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.    absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D
B
C
A

check	none
Γ	x: num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.      y = z;
11.    }
12.    return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.    absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D { 1. – 5.

B { 6. – 13.

C { 8. – 11.

A { 15. – 17.

$$\text{T-Var} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t}{\Gamma \vdash x : t}$$

$$\text{T-Assign} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t \qquad \Gamma \vdash e : t}{\Gamma \vdash (x = e) : \text{unit}}$$

check	x: num
Γ	y: num, x: num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.          num z = 0 - x;
10.         y = z;
11.      }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D

B

C

A

$$\text{T-Num} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash n \ : \ num}$$

$$\text{T-Var} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) \ = \ t}{\Gamma \vdash x \ : \ t}$$

$$\text{T-Less} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 \ : \ num \qquad \Gamma \vdash e_2 \ : \ num}{\Gamma \vdash (e_1 \ < \ e_2) \ : \ bool}$$

check	(x < 0) : bool
Γ	y: num, x: num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.      y = z;
11.    }
12.    return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.    absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D
B
C
A

$$\text{T-Num} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash n : num}$$

$$\text{T-Var} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t}{\Gamma \vdash x : t}$$

$$\text{T-Minus} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : num \qquad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : num}{\Gamma \vdash (e_1 - e_2) : num}$$

$$\text{T-Assign} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t \qquad \Gamma \vdash e : t}{\Gamma \vdash (x = e) : unit}$$

check	(0 - x) : num
Γ	z: num, y: num, x: num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.        num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D — lines 1–5
B — lines 6–13
C — lines 8–11
A — lines 15–17

$$\text{T-Var} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t}{\Gamma \vdash x : t}$$

$$\text{T-Assign} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t \qquad \Gamma \vdash e : t}{\Gamma \vdash (x = e) : unit}$$

check	z: num
Γ	z: num, y: num, x: num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.        num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D — lines 1-5

B — lines 6-13

C — lines 8-11

A — lines 15-17

check	none
Γ	~~z: num,~~ y: num, x: num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

$$\text{T-Num} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash n : num}$$

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.        num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D (lines 1-5)

B (lines 6-13)

C (lines 8-11)

A (lines 15-17)

$$\text{T-Var} \quad \frac{\Gamma(x) = t}{\Gamma \vdash x : t}$$

$$\text{T-App} \quad \frac{e_1 : t_1 \rightarrow t_2 \qquad e_2 : t_1}{(e_1 \; e_2) : t_2}$$

check	(plus y 1) : num
Γ	y: num, x: num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.      y = z;
11.    }
12.    return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.    absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D — lines 1–5
B — lines 6–13
C — lines 8–11
A — lines 15–17

check	none
Γ	~~y: num, x: num,~~ absPlusOne: num → num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.    num plus(num x, num y) {
2.      num z = x + y;
3.      return z;
4.    }
5.
6.    num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.      num y = x;
8.      if x < 0 {
9.        num z = 0 - x;
10.       y = z;
11.     }
12.     return plus(y, 1);
13.   }
14.
15.   unit main() {
16.     absPlusOne(-2);
17.   }
```

D — lines 1–5
B — lines 6–13
C — lines 8–11
A — lines 15–17

check	none
Γ	absPlusOne : num → num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

$$\text{T-Num} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash n : num}$$

```
     1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
     2.     num z = x + y;
     3.     return z;
D    4.   }
     5.
     6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
     7.     num y = x;
     8.     if x < 0 {
     9.       num z = 0 - x;
B   10.       y = z;                  C
    11.     }
    12.     return plus(y, 1);
    13.   }
    14.
    15.   unit main() {
A   16.     absPlusOne(-2);
    17.   }
```

$$\text{T-App} \quad \frac{e_1 : t_1 \rightarrow t_2 \qquad e_2 : t_1}{(e_1\ e_2) : t_2}$$

check	absPlusOne(-2) is well-typed
Γ	absPlusOne : num → num, plus: num → num → num

Procedural typechecking example

```
1.   num plus(num x, num y) {
2.     num z = x + y;
3.     return z;
4.   }
5.
6.   num absPlusOne(num x) {
7.     num y = x;
8.     if x < 0 {
9.       num z = 0 - x;
10.      y = z;
11.    }
12.    return plus(y, 1);
13.  }
14.
15.  unit main() {
16.    absPlusOne(-2);
17.  }
```

D — lines 1–5

B — lines 6–13

C — lines 8–11

A — lines 15–17

$$\text{T-App} \quad \frac{e_1 \,:\, t_1 \rightarrow t_2 \qquad e_2 \,:\, t_1}{(e_1 \ e_2) \,:\, t_2}$$

check	none
Γ	main: unit $\rightarrow$ unit, absPlusOne : num $\rightarrow$ num, plus: num $\rightarrow$ num $\rightarrow$ num

Summary

- Imperative programs are characterized by commands with side effects
  - A referentially transparent expression has no side effects
- We can model imperative and procedural languages:
  - As extensions of functional languages
  - As state machines
- Scoping rules and lifetime rules define where variables are valid in a program and when they're "cleaned up" at runtime
  - Different languages have different scoping and lifetime rules
  - Different variables within the same language may have different scoping and lifetime rules
- Calling conventions define how arguments are passed in to a function
  - Different arguments in the same language may have different calling conventions
  - Language constructs can simulate calling conventions that aren't supported natively