

CIS 500  
Software Foundations  
Fall 2002

23 October

Administrivia

- ◆ [Use of homework solutions]
- ◆ [Study groups?]

References, continued

Final example

```
NatArray = Ref (Nat → Nat);  
  
newarray = λ_:Unit. ref (λn:Nat.0);  
          : Unit → NatArray  
  
lookup = λa:NatArray. λn:Nat. (!a) n;  
         : NatArray → Nat → Nat  
  
update = λa:NatArray. λm:Nat. λv:Nat.  
         let oldf = !a in  
         a := (λn:Nat. if equal m n then v else oldf n);  
         : NatArray → Nat → Nat → Unit
```

## Syntax

$t ::=$	terms
unit	unit constant
x	variable
$\lambda x:T. t$	abstraction
t t	application
ref t	reference creation
!t	dereference
t:=t	assignment

... plus other familiar types, in examples.

## Typing Rules

$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{ref } t_1 : \text{Ref } T_1}$	(T-REF)
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \text{Ref } T_1}{\Gamma \vdash !t_1 : T_1}$	(T-DEREF)
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \text{Ref } T_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 := t_2 : \text{Unit}}$	(T-ASSIGN)

## Evaluation

What is the **value** of the expression `ref 0`?

## Evaluation

What is the **value** of the expression `ref 0`?

Crucial observation: evaluating `ref 0` must **do** something.

Otherwise,

```
r = ref 0
s = ref 0
```

and

```
r = ref 0
s = r
```

would behave the same.

## Evaluation

What is the **value** of the expression `ref 0`?

Crucial observation: evaluating `ref 0` must **do** something.

Otherwise,

```
r = ref 0
s = ref 0
```

and

```
r = ref 0
s = r
```

would behave the same.

Specifically, evaluating `ref 0` should **allocate some storage** and return a **reference (or pointer)** to that storage.

## Evaluation

What is the **value** of the expression `ref 0`?

Crucial observation: evaluating `ref 0` must **do** something.

Otherwise,

```
r = ref 0
s = ref 0
```

and

```
r = ref 0
s = r
```

would behave the same.

Specifically, evaluating `ref 0` should **allocate some storage** and return a **reference (or pointer)** to that storage.

So what is a reference?

## The Store

A reference is a pointer into the memory (the **heap** or **store**).

What is the store?

## The Store

A reference is a pointer into the memory (the **heap** or **store**).

What is the store?

- ◆ Concretely: An array of 8-bit bytes, indexed by 32-bit integers.

## The Store

A reference is a pointer into the memory (the **heap** or **store**).

What is the store?

- ◆ Concretely: An array of 8-bit bytes, indexed by 32-bit integers.
- ◆ More abstractly: an array of **values**

## The Store

A reference is a pointer into the memory (the **heap** or **store**).

What is the store?

- ◆ Concretely: An array of 8-bit bytes, indexed by 32-bit integers.
- ◆ More abstractly: an array of **values**
- ◆ Even more abstractly: a partial function from **locations** to **values**.

## Locations

Syntax of values:

<code>v ::=</code>	<b>values</b>
<code>unit</code>	unit constant
<code>λx:T.t</code>	abstraction value
<code>l</code>	store location

... and since all values are terms...

## Syntax of Terms

<code>t ::=</code>	<b>terms</b>
<code>unit</code>	unit constant
<code>x</code>	variable
<code>λx:T.t</code>	abstraction
<code>t t</code>	application
<code>ref t</code>	reference creation
<code>!t</code>	dereference
<code>t:=t</code>	assignment
<code>l</code>	store location

## Aside

Does this mean we are going to allow programmers to write explicit locations in their programs?

No: This is just a modeling trick. We are enriching the language of terms to include some run-time structures, so that we can continue to formalize the evaluation relation as a relation between terms.

## Evaluation

The result of evaluating a term now depends on the store in which it is evaluated. Moreover, the result of evaluating a term is not just a value — we must also keep track of the changes that get made to the store.

I.e., the evaluation relation should now map a term and a store to a reduced term and a new store.

$$t \mid \mu \longrightarrow t' \mid \mu'$$

We use the metavariable  $\mu$  to range over stores.

## Evaluation

Evaluation rules for function abstraction and application are augmented with stores, but don't do anything with them.

$$\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{t_1 \ t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \ t_2 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-APP1})$$

$$\frac{t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_2 \mid \mu'}{v_1 \ t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow v_1 \ t'_2 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-APP2})$$

$$(\lambda x:T_{11}. t_{12}) \ v_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12} \mid \mu \quad (\text{E-APPABS})$$

A term  $!t_1$  first evaluates in  $t_1$  until it becomes a value...

$$\boxed{\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{!t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow !t'_1 \mid \mu'}} \quad (\text{E-DEREF})$$

... and then looks up this value (which must be a location, if the original term was well typed) and returns its contents in the current store:

$$\boxed{\frac{\mu(l) = v}{!l \mid \mu \longrightarrow v \mid \mu}} \quad (\text{E-DEREFLOC})$$

An assignment  $t_1 := t_2$  first evaluates in  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  until they become values...

$$\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{t_1 := t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 := t_2 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-ASSIGN1})$$

$$\frac{t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_2 \mid \mu'}{v_1 := t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow v_1 := t'_2 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-ASSIGN2})$$

... and then returns `unit` and an updated store:

$$l := v_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow \text{unit} \mid [l \mapsto v_2]\mu \quad (\text{E-ASSIGN})$$

A term of the form `ref t1` first evaluates inside  $t_1$  until it becomes a value...

$$\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{\text{ref } t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow \text{ref } t'_1 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-REF})$$

... and then chooses (allocates) a fresh location  $l$ , augments the store with a binding from  $l$  to  $v_1$ , and returns  $l$ :

$$\frac{l \notin \text{dom}(\mu)}{\text{ref } v_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow l \mid (\mu, l \mapsto v_1)} \quad (\text{E-REFV})$$

## Typing Locations

Q: What is the **type** of a **location**?

## Typing Locations

Q: What is the **type** of a **location**?

A: It depends on the store!

E.g., in the store  $(l_1 \mapsto \text{unit}, l_2 \mapsto \text{unit})$ , the term `!l2` has type `Unit`.

But in the store  $(l_1 \mapsto \text{unit}, l_2 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Unit}. x)$ , the term `!l2` has type `Unit → Unit`.

## Typing Locations — first try

Roughly:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mu(l) : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash l : \text{Ref } T_1}$$

## Typing Locations — first try

Roughly:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mu(l) : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash l : \text{Ref } T_1}$$

More precisely:

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \mu \vdash \mu(l) : T_1}{\Gamma \mid \mu \vdash l : \text{Ref } T_1}$$

I.e., typing is now a **four**-place relation (between contexts, **stores**, terms, and types).

## Problem

However, this rule is not completely satisfactory. For one thing, it can make typing derivations very large!

E.g., if

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu = l_1 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. 999, \\ l_2 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_1 (!l_1 x), \\ l_3 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_2 (!l_2 x), \\ l_4 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_3 (!l_3 x), \\ l_5 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_4 (!l_4 x)), \end{aligned}$$

then how big is the typing derivation for  $!l_5$ ?

## Problem!

But wait... it gets worse. Suppose

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu = l_1 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_2 x, \\ l_2 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_1 x), \end{aligned}$$

Now how big is the typing derivation for  $!l_2$ ?

## Store Typings

Observation: a given location in the store is **always** used to hold values of the **same** type.

These intended types can be collected into a **store typing** — a partial function from locations to types.

E.g., for

$$\mu = (l_1 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. 999, \\ l_2 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_1 (!l_1 x), \\ l_3 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_2 (!l_2 x), \\ l_4 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_3 (!l_3 x), \\ l_5 \mapsto \lambda x:\text{Nat}. !l_4 (!l_4 x),$$

A reasonable store typing would be

$$\Sigma = (l_1 \mapsto \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}, \\ l_2 \mapsto \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}, \\ l_3 \mapsto \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}, \\ l_4 \mapsto \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}, \\ l_5 \mapsto \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat})$$

Now, suppose we are given a store typing  $\Sigma$  describing the store  $\mu$  in which we intend to evaluate some term  $t$ . Then we can use  $\Sigma$  to look up the types of locations in  $t$  instead of calculating them from the values in  $\mu$ .

$$\frac{\Sigma(l) = T_1}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash l : \text{Ref } T_1} \quad (\text{T-LOC})$$

I.e., typing is now a four-place relation between contexts, **store typings**, terms, and types.

## Final typing rules

$$\frac{\Sigma(l) = T_1}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash l : \text{Ref } T_1} \quad (\text{T-LOC})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : T_1}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{ref } t_1 : \text{Ref } T_1} \quad (\text{T-REF})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : \text{Ref } T_{11}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash !t_1 : T_{11}} \quad (\text{T-DEREF})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : \text{Ref } T_{11} \quad \Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 := t_2 : \text{Unit}} \quad (\text{T-ASSIGN})$$



Aside: garbage collection

[...]

Aside: pointer arithmetic

[...]

Exceptions

[...]