The Environment Model

Prof. Clarkson
Fall 2018

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

Attendance question

Does there exist a well-typed program **`e`** such that **`e -->* x + 42`**?

A. Yes

B. No

Review

Previously in 3110:

- Interpreters
- Small-step substitution model

Today:

- Large-step environment model

Review

- **Small-step substitution model:** substitute value for variable
  - Good mental model
  - Not efficient: too much substitution at run time
- **Big-step environment model:** maintain a dictionary that binds variables to values

New evaluation relation

- **Big-step semantics:** we model just the reduction from the original expression to the final value

- Suppose `e --> e' --> ... --> v`
- Abstract to `e ==> v`
  - forget intermediate expressions
  - read as `e` *evaluates down to* `v`, equiv. `e` *big-steps to* `v`
  - textbook notation: `e` ⇓ `v`

- **Goal:** for all expressions `e` and values `v`, `e ==> v` if and only if `e -->* v`
  - A 4110 theorem

Values

- Constants are already done evaluating
  - `42 ==> 42`
  - `true ==> true`

- In fact, all values big-step to themselves

  `v ==> v`

Operator evaluation

`e1 + e2 ==> v`

if `e1 ==> i1`

and `e2 ==> i2`

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

Variables

What does a variable name evaluate to?

```
x ==> ???
```

Trick question: we don't have enough information to answer it

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:

`<env, e> ==> v`

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

`<env, e>` is called a *machine configuration*

Variable evaluation

```
<env, x> ==> v
   if v = 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

<env, v> ==> v

<env, e1 + e2> ==> v

if **<env, e1> ==> i1**

and **<env, e2> ==> 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`**

```
<env, e1> ==> v1
```

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

```
env' = env[x -> v1]
```

new notation

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

```
<env', e2> ==> v2
```

Return **`v2`**

Let expression evaluation rule

```
<env, let x=e1 in e2> ==> v2
  if <env, e1> ==> v1
  and <env[x -> v1], e2> ==> v2
```

Function values v1.0

Anonymous functions are values:

```
<env, fun x -> e> ==> fun x -> e
```

Function application v1.0

To evaluate `e1 e2` in environment `env`

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

```
<env,e1> ==> v1
```

Note that **`v1`** *must be a function value* **`fun x -> e`**
because function application type checks

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

```
<env,e2> ==> v2
```

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

```
env' = env[x -> v2]
```

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

```
<env',e> ==> v
```

Return `v`

Function application rule v1.0

```
<env,e1 e2> ==> v
  if <env,e1> ==> fun x -> e
  and <env,e2> ==> v2
  and <env[x -> v2],e> ==> v
```

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
```

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

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 n is evaluate that existed , not the curr n is called.

– Cause

– Thus

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`**

```
<env,e1> ==> v1
```

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

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

```
<env,e2> ==> v2
```

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

```
env' = defenv[x -> v2]
```

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

```
<env',e> ==> v
```

Return **`v`**

Function application rule v2.0

```
<env, e1 e2> ==> v
   if <env, e1> ==>
       (|fun x -> e , defenv|)
   and <env, e2> ==> v2
   and <defenv[x -> v2], e> ==> v
```

Function values v2.0

Anonymous functions **`fun x-> e`** are closures:

```
<env, fun x -> e>
==> (|fun x -> e , 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

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

bytecomp/printinstr.ml

OCaml

Showing the top match Last indexed on Sep 15, 2016

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

bytecomp/instruct.mli

OCaml

Showing the top match Last indexed on Aug 10

```
  | Kgrab of int                          (* number of arguments *)
  | Kclosure of label * int
  | Kclosurerec of label list * int
  | 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

Upcoming events

- N/A

This is closure.

THIS IS 3110