



CS 3110

The Environment Model

Prof. Clarkson

Fall 2017

Today's music: Selections from *Doctor Who* soundtracks by Murray Gold

Review

Previously in 3110:

- Interpreters: ASTs, evaluation, parsing
- Formal syntax: BNF
- Formal semantics:
 - dynamic: small-step substitution model
 - static semantics

Today:

- More formal dynamic semantics: large-step, environment model

Review

- **Small-step substitution model:** substitute value for variable in body of **let** and functions
 - Good mental model
 - Not efficient: too much substitution at run time
- **Big-step environment model:** maintain a dictionary that binds variables to values
 - What OCaml really does

New evaluation relation

- **Big-step semantics:** we model just the reduction from the original expression to the final value
- Suppose $e \twoheadrightarrow e' \twoheadrightarrow \dots \twoheadrightarrow v$
- Abstract to $e \Rightarrow v$
 - forget intermediate expressions
 - read as e evaluates down to v , equiv. e big-steps to v
 - textbook notation: $e \Downarrow v$
- **Goal:** for all expressions e and values v ,
 $e \Rightarrow v$ if and only if $e \twoheadrightarrow^* v$
 - A 4110 theorem

Values

- Constants are already done evaluating
 - $42 \Rightarrow 42$
 - $\text{true} \Rightarrow \text{true}$
- In fact, all values big-step to themselves
 - $v \Rightarrow v$

Operator evaluation

$e1 + e2 \Rightarrow v$

if $e1 \Rightarrow i1$

and $e2 \Rightarrow i2$

and v is the result of primitive operation $i1 + i2$

e.g.,

`"big" ^ "red" ==> "bigred"`

`1 + 2 ==> 3`

`1 + (2+3) ==> 6`

Variables

- What does a variable name evaluate to?

x ==> ???

- Trick question: we don't have enough information to answer it
- Need to know what value variable was *bound* to
 - e.g., `let x = 2 in x+1`
 - e.g., `(fun x -> x+1) 2`
 - e.g., `match 2 with x -> x+1`
 - All evaluate to 3, but we reach a point where we need to know binding of **x**
- Until now, we've never needed this, because we always **substituted** before we ever get to a variable name

Variables

OCaml doesn't actually do substitution

```
(fun x -> 42) 0
```

waste of runtime resources to do substitution inside 42

Instead, OCaml lazily substitutes by maintaining
dynamic environment

Dynamic environment

- Dictionary of bindings of all current variables
- Changes throughout evaluation:
 - No bindings at \$:
`$ let x = 42 in
 let y = false in
 e`
 - One binding {**x:42**} at \$:
 `let x = 42 in
$ let y = false in
 e`
 - Two bindings {**x:42,y:false**} at \$:
 `let x = 42 in
 let y = false in
$ e`

Variable evaluation

To evaluate x in environment env

Look up value v of x in env

Return v

Type checking **guarantees that variable is bound**, so we can't ever fail to find a binding in dynamic environment

Evaluation relation

Extended notation:

$$\langle \mathbf{env}, \mathbf{e} \rangle \Rightarrow \mathbf{v}$$

Meaning: in dynamic environment **env**,
expression **e** big-steps to value **v**

$\langle \mathbf{env}, \mathbf{e} \rangle$ is called a *machine configuration*

Variable evaluation

$\langle \text{env}, x \rangle \Rightarrow v$
if $v = \text{env}(x)$

env(x) :

- meaning: the value to which **env** binds **x**
- think of it as looking up **x** in dictionary **env**

Redo: evaluation with environment

$\langle \text{env}, v \rangle \Rightarrow v$

$\langle \text{env}, e1 + e2 \rangle \Rightarrow v$

if $\langle \text{env}, e1 \rangle \Rightarrow i1$

and $\langle \text{env}, e2 \rangle \Rightarrow i2$

and v *is the result of primitive operation*
 $i1+i2$

Let expressions

To evaluate **let** **x** = **e1** in **e2** in environment **env**

Evaluate the binding expression **e1** to a value **v1** in environment **env**

$$\langle \text{env}, e1 \rangle \Rightarrow v1$$

Extend the environment to bind **x** to **v1**

$$\text{env}' = \text{env}[x \rightarrow v1] \quad \text{new notation}$$

Evaluate the body expression **e2** to a value **v2** in extended environment **env'**

$$\langle \text{env}', e2 \rangle \Rightarrow v2$$

Return **v2**

Let expression evaluation rule

$\langle \text{env}, \text{let } x = e1 \text{ in } e2 \rangle \implies v2$
if $\langle \text{env}, e1 \rangle \implies v1$
and $\langle \text{env}[x \rightarrow v1], e2 \rangle \implies v2$

Example: (let { } be the empty environment)

$\langle \{\}, \text{let } x = 42 \text{ in } x \rangle \implies 42$

Because...

- $\langle \{\}, 42 \rangle \implies 42$
- and $\langle \{\}[x \rightarrow 42], x \rangle \implies 42$
 - Because $\{x:42\}(x)=42$

Function values v1.0

Anonymous functions are values:

$$\langle \text{env}, \text{fun } x \rightarrow e \rangle \Rightarrow \text{fun } x \rightarrow e$$

Function application v1.0

To evaluate $e1\ e2$ in environment env

Evaluate $e1$ to a value $v1$ in environment env

$\langle env, e1 \rangle \Rightarrow v1$

*Note that $v1$ must be a function value $\mathbf{fun\ } x \rightarrow e$
because function application type checks*

Evaluate $e2$ to a value $v2$ in environment env

$\langle env, e2 \rangle \Rightarrow v2$

Extend environment to bind formal parameter x to actual value $v2$

$env' = env[x \rightarrow v2]$

Evaluate body e to a value v in environment env'

$\langle env', e \rangle \Rightarrow v$

Return v

Function application rule v1.0

$\langle \text{env}, e1 \ e2 \rangle \implies v$
if $\langle \text{env}, e1 \rangle \implies \text{fun } x \rightarrow e$
and $\langle \text{env}, e2 \rangle \implies v2$
and $\langle \text{env}[x \rightarrow v2], e \rangle \implies v$

Example:

$\langle \{\}, (\text{fun } x \rightarrow x) \ 1 \rangle \implies 1$
b/c $\langle \{\}, \text{fun } x \rightarrow x \rangle \implies \text{fun } x \rightarrow x$
and $\langle \{\}, 1 \rangle \implies 1$
and $\langle \{\} [x \rightarrow 1], x \rangle \implies 1$

Question

What do you think this expression should evaluate to?

```
let x = 1 in  
let f = fun y -> x in  
let x = 2 in  
  f 0
```

- A. 1
- B. 2

Scope: OCaml

What does OCaml say this evaluates to?

```
let x = 1 in
let f = fun y -> x in
let x = 2 in
  f 0
- : int = 1
```

Scope: our semantics

What does our semantics say?

```
let x = 1 in
```

```
{x:1} let f = fun y -> x in
```

```
{x:1, f: (fun y->x)} let x = 2 in
```

```
{x:2, f: (fun y->x)} f 0
```

$\langle \{x:2, f: (\text{fun } y \rightarrow x)\}, f \ 0 \rangle \Rightarrow ???$

1. Evaluate **f** to a value, i.e., **fun y->x**
2. Evaluate **0** to a value, i.e., **0**
3. Extend environment to map parameter:
{x:2, f: (fun y->x), y:0}
4. Evaluate body **x** in that environment
5. Return **2**

2 <> 1

Why different answers?

Two different rules for variable scope:

- Rule of *dynamic scope* (our semantics so far)
- Rule of *lexical scope* (OCaml)

Dynamic scope

Rule of dynamic scope: The body of a function is evaluated in the current dynamic environment at the time the function is **called**, not the old dynamic environment that existed at the time the function was defined.

- Causes our semantics to use latest binding of **x**
- Thus return **2**

Lexical scope

Rule of lexical scope: The body of a function is evaluated in the old dynamic environment that existed at the time the function was **defined**, not the current environment when the function is called.

- Causes OCaml to use earlier binding of **x**
- Thus return **1**

Lexical scope

Rule of
evaluator
existed
the current
called.

- Cause
- Thus



on is
that
d, not
is

Lexical vs. dynamic scope

- Consensus after decades of programming language design is that **lexical scope is the right choice**
 - it supports the Principle of Name Irrelevance: name of variable shouldn't matter to meaning of program
 - programmers free to change names of local variables
 - type checker can prevent more run-time errors
- Dynamic scope is useful in some situations
 - Some languages use it as the norm (e.g., Emacs LISP, LaTeX)
 - Some languages have special ways to do it (e.g., Perl, Racket)
 - But most languages just don't have it
- Exception handling resembles dynamic scope:
 - **raise e** transfers control to the “most recent” exception handler
 - like how dynamic scope uses “most recent” binding of variable

Implementing time travel

Q: How can functions be evaluated in old environments?

A: The language implementation keeps old environments around as necessary

Implementing time travel

A function value is really a data structure called a **function closure** that has **two parts**:

- The **code**, an expression **e**
- The **environment** **env** that was current when the function was defined
- We'll notate that data structure as $(|e, env|)$

$(|e, env|)$ is like a pair

- But **indivisible**: you cannot write OCaml syntax to access the pieces
- And **inexpressible**: you cannot directly write it in OCaml syntax

Function application v2.0

orange = changed from v1.0

To evaluate **e1 e2** in environment **env**

Evaluate **e1** to a value **v1** in environment **env**

$\langle \text{env}, e1 \rangle \Rightarrow v1$

Note that **v1** must be *closure* (**| fun x -> e , defenv |**)

Evaluate **e2** to a value **v2** in environment **env**

$\langle \text{env}, e2 \rangle \Rightarrow v2$

Extend *closure* environment to bind formal parameter **x** to actual value **v2**

$\text{env}' = \text{defenv}[x \rightarrow v2]$

Evaluate body **e** to a value **v** in environment **env'**

$\langle \text{env}', e \rangle \Rightarrow v$

Return **v**

Function application rule v2.0

$\langle \text{env}, e1\ e2 \rangle \Rightarrow v$

if $\langle \text{env}, e1 \rangle \Rightarrow$

$(| \text{fun } x \rightarrow e \ , \ \text{defenv} |)$

and $\langle \text{env}, e2 \rangle \Rightarrow v2$

and $\langle \text{defenv}[x \rightarrow v2], e \rangle \Rightarrow v$

Function values v2.0

Anonymous functions **fun** **x** \rightarrow **e** are closures:

$\langle \text{env}, \text{fun } x \rightarrow e \rangle$

$\Rightarrow (| \text{fun } x \rightarrow e |, \text{env} |)$

Closures in OCaml bytecode compiler

<https://github.com/ocaml/ocaml/search?q=kclosure>

Results in `ocaml/ocaml`

`bytecomp/instruct.ml`

OCaml

Showing the top match Last indexed on Sep 15, 2016

```
63 | Krestart
64 | Kgrab of int (* number of arguments *)
65 | Kclosure of label * int
```

`bytecomp/printinstr.ml`

OCaml

Showing the top match Last indexed on Sep 15, 2016

```
35 | Kgrab n -> fprintf ppf "\tgrab %i" n
36 | Kclosure(lbl, n) ->
37   fprintf ppf "\tclosure L%i, %i" lbl n
```

`bytecomp/instruct.mli`

OCaml

Showing the top match Last indexed on Aug 10

```
84 | Kgrab of int (* number of arguments *)
85 | Kclosure of label * int
86 | Kclosurerec of label list * int
87 | Koffsetclosure of int
```


Closures in Java

- Nested classes can simulate closures
 - Used everywhere for Swing GUI!
<http://docs.oracle.com/javase/tutorial/uiswing/events/generalrules.html#innerClasses>
 - You've done it yourself already in 2110
- Java 8 adds higher-order functions and closures

Closures in C

- In C, a *function pointer* is just a code pointer, period. No environment.
- To simulate closures, a common **idiom**:
Define function pointers to take an extra, explicit environment argument
 - But without generics, no good choice for type of list elements or the environment
 - Use `void*` and various type casts...
- From Linux kernel:
<http://lxr.free-electrons.com/source/include/linux/kthread.h#L13>

Interpreter for expr. lang.

See `interp4.ml` in code for this lecture for implementation with closures

Upcoming events

- [today or tomorrow] A4 out

This is closure.

THIS IS 3110