Closures

Refinement

 $\underset{\bigcirc \bigcirc}{\text{Mapping to Implementations}}$



Environments

Thomas Sewell UNSW Term 3 2024

Closures

Refinement

Mapping to Implementations

Where we're at

• We refined the abstract M-Machine to a C-Machine, with explicit stacks:

 $s \succ e \qquad s \prec v$

• Function application is still executed via substitution:

 $(\texttt{Apply } \langle\!\langle f.x. \ e \rangle\!\rangle \ \Box) \triangleright s \prec v \ \mapsto_C \ s \succ e[x := v, f := (\texttt{Fun } (f.x.e))]$

• We're going to extend our C-Machine to replace substitutions with an environment, giving us a new *E-Machine*

Refinement

Mapping to Implementations

Environments

Definition

An *environment* is a context containing the values of variables.

It is like the states of TinyImp, except the value of a variable never changes.

 $\frac{\eta \text{ Env}}{\bullet \text{ Env}} \quad \frac{\eta \text{ Env}}{x = v, \eta \text{ Env}}$

 $\eta(x)$ denotes the leftmost value bound to to x in η .

Let's change our machine states to include an environment:

$$s \mid \eta \succ e \qquad s \mid \eta \prec v$$

3

Refinement

Mapping to Implementations

First Attempt

First, we'll add a rule for consulting the environment if we encounter a free variable:

$$s \mid \eta \succ x \quad \mapsto_E \quad s \mid \eta \prec \eta(x)$$

Then, we just need to handle function application.

One broken attempt:

 $(\texttt{Apply } \langle\!\langle f.x. \ e \rangle\!\rangle \ \Box) \triangleright s \mid \eta \prec v \ \mapsto_E \ s \mid (x = v, f = \langle\!\langle f.x. \ e \rangle\!\rangle, \eta) \succ e$

We don't know when to remove the variables again!

Refinement

Mapping to Implementations

Second Attempt

We will extend our stacks to allow us to save the old environment to it.

 $\frac{\eta \text{ Env } s \text{ Stack}}{\eta \triangleright s \text{ Stack}}$

When we call a function, we save the environment to the stack.

 $(\text{Apply } \langle\!\langle f.x. \ e \rangle\!\rangle \Box) \triangleright s \mid \eta \prec v \ \mapsto_E \ \eta \triangleright s \mid (x = v, f = \langle\!\langle f.x. \ e \rangle\!\rangle, \eta) \succ e$

When the function returns, we restore the old environment, clearing out the new bindings:

 $\eta \triangleright s \mid \eta' \prec v \mapsto_E s \mid \eta \prec v$

This attempt is also broken (we'll see why soon)



Seems to work for basic examples, but is there some way to break it?

Closures

Refinement

Mapping to Implementations

Closure Capture

- \circ | ≻ (Ap (Ap (Fun (f.x. (Fun (g.y. x)))) (N 3)) (N 4))
- $\mapsto_{E} (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \succ (\operatorname{Ap} (\operatorname{Fun} (f.x. (\operatorname{Fun} (g.y. x)))) (\operatorname{N} 3))$
- $\mapsto_E \quad (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 3)) \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \succ (\operatorname{Fun} (f.x. (\operatorname{Fun} (g.y. x))))$
- $\mapsto_E \quad (\operatorname{Ap} \square (\operatorname{N} 3)) \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap} \square (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \prec \langle\!\langle f.x. (\operatorname{Fun} (g.y. x)) \rangle\!\rangle$
- $\mapsto_{E} (\operatorname{Ap} \langle\!\langle f \cdots \rangle\!\rangle \Box) \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \succ (\operatorname{N} 3)$
- $\mapsto_E \quad (\operatorname{Ap}\, \langle\!\langle f \cdots \rangle\!\rangle \,\,\square) \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap}\,\square \,\,(\operatorname{N}\, 4)) \triangleright \circ \,|\, \bullet \prec 3$
- $\mapsto_E \quad \bullet \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{\mathbb{N}} 4)) \triangleright \circ \mid x = 3, f = \langle\!\langle f \cdots \rangle\!\rangle, \bullet \succ (\operatorname{Fun} (g.y. x))$
- $\mapsto_E \quad \bullet \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{\mathbb{N}} 4)) \triangleright \circ \mid x = 3, f = \langle\!\langle f \cdots \rangle\!\rangle, \bullet \prec \langle\!\langle g.y. x \rangle\!\rangle$
- $\mapsto_E \quad (\operatorname{Ap}\,\Box\,(\operatorname{N}\,4)) \triangleright \circ \mid \bullet \prec \langle\!\langle g.y.\,\, x \rangle\!\rangle$
- $\mapsto_E \quad (\operatorname{Ap} \langle\!\langle g.y. \ x \rangle\!\rangle \ \Box) \triangleright \circ \mid \bullet \succ (\operatorname{N} 4)$
- $\mapsto_E \quad (\operatorname{Ap} \langle\!\langle g.y. \ x \rangle\!\rangle \ \Box) \triangleright \circ \mid \bullet \prec 4$
- $\mapsto_E \quad \bullet \triangleright \circ \mid y = 4, g = \langle \langle g.y. x \rangle \rangle, \bullet \succ x$ Oh no! We're stuck!

Closures

Refinement

Mapping to Implementations

Something went wrong!

When we return functions, the function's body escapes the scope of bound variables from where it as defined:

(let x = 3 in recfun f y = x + y) 5

The function value $\langle\!\langle f.y. x + y \rangle\!\rangle$, when it is applied, does not "remember" that x = 3.

Solution: Store the environment inside the function value!

 $s \mid \eta \succ (\texttt{Recfun } (f.x. \ e)) \mapsto_E s \mid \eta \prec \langle\!\langle \eta, \ f.x. \ e
angle\!
angle$

This type of function value is called a *closure*.



Refinement

Mapping to Implementations



Closures

Refinement

Mapping to Implementations

 $\circ \mid \bullet \succ (Ap (Ap (Fun (f.x. (Fun (g.y. x)))) (N 3)) (N 4))$ $(\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \succ (\operatorname{Ap} (\operatorname{Fun} (f.x. (\operatorname{Fun} (g.y. x)))) (\operatorname{N} 3))$ $(\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 3)) \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \succ (\operatorname{Fun} (f.x. (\operatorname{Fun} (g.y. x))))$ $(\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 3)) \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \prec \langle \langle \bullet, f.x. (\operatorname{Fun} (g.y. x)) \rangle \rangle$ $(\operatorname{Ap} \langle\!\langle \bullet, f \cdots \rangle\!\rangle \Box) \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \succ (\operatorname{N} 3)$ $(\operatorname{Ap} \langle\!\langle \bullet, f \cdots \rangle\!\rangle \Box) \triangleright (\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \prec 3$ • \triangleright (Ap \Box (N 4)) $\triangleright \circ \mid x = 3, f = \langle \langle f \cdots \rangle \rangle, \bullet \succ$ (Fun (g.y.x)) • \triangleright (Ap \Box (N 4)) \triangleright \circ | $x = 3, f = \langle \langle f \cdots \rangle \rangle, \bullet \prec \langle \langle (x = 3, f = \cdots, \bullet), g, y, x \rangle \rangle$ $(\operatorname{Ap} \Box (\operatorname{N} 4)) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \prec \langle \langle (x = 3, f = \cdots, \bullet), g. y. x \rangle \rangle$ $(\operatorname{Ap} \langle\!\langle (x = 3, f = \cdots, \bullet), g. y. x \rangle\!\rangle \Box) \triangleright \circ \mid \bullet \succ (\mathbb{N} 4)$ $(\operatorname{Ap} \langle \langle (x = 3, f = \cdots, \bullet), g. y. x \rangle \rangle \Box) \triangleright \circ | \bullet \prec 4$ • $\triangleright \circ \mid y = 4, g = \langle \langle g.y. x \rangle \rangle, x = 3, f = \cdots, \bullet \succ x$ • $\triangleright \circ \mid y = 4, g = \langle \langle g. y. x \rangle \rangle, x = 3, f = \cdots, \bullet \prec 3$ $\circ | \bullet \prec 3$

Closure 0000 Refinement

Mapping to Implementations

Refinement

- We already sketched a proof that each C-machine execution has a corresponding M-machine execution (refinement).
- This means any functional correctness (not security or cost) property we prove about all M-machine executions of a program apply just as well to any C-machine executions of the same program.
- Now we want to prove that each E-machine execution has a corresponding C-machine execution (and therefore an M-machine execution).

Ingredients for Refinement

Once again, we want an abstraction function \mathcal{A} that converts E-machine states to C-machine states, such that:

- Each initial state in the E-machine is mapped to an initial state in the C-Machine.
- Each final state in the E-machine is mapped to a final state in the C-Machine.
- For each E-machine transition, either there is a corresponding C-Machine transition, or the two E-machine states map to the same C-machine state.

How to define \mathcal{A} ?

- Our abstraction function \mathcal{A} applies the environment η as a substitution to the current expression, and to the stack, starting at the left.
- If any environment is encountered in the stack, switch to substituting with that environment instead.
- E-Machine values are converted to C-Machine values merely by applying the environment inside closures as a substitution to the expression inside the closure.

With such a function definition, it is trivial to prove that each E-Machine transition has a corresponding transition in the C-Machine, as it is 1:1.

Except!

There is one rule which is not 1:1. Which one?

Semantics Refinement to Program Refinement

The C-Machine and M-machine on these slides have been presented in a very abstract way.

However these program transformations have taken us much closer to an implementation:

- The states (with \Box gaps) of the C-Machine are the nodes of the control-flow graph of the program.
- The environments of our E-machine become concrete objects:
 - Stack frames
 - Closure objects (also called thunks)
- The next step is to adjust the program to make this semantics explicit.

And we've learned how to *prove* that our transformations are correct, whether we are adjusting the semantics or the program.

Most compilers do such program-to-program transformations of this kind, but there is no canonical set of them.

Refinement

 $\underset{\bigcirc \Phi}{\text{Mapping to Implementations}}$

An Alternative: A Normalisation

Here is an alternative approach to the C-Machine construction.

First, put the program in A Normal form:

2 + (3 * (4 + x))

$$\Longrightarrow$$

let $v_1 = 4 + x$ in let $v_2 = 3 + v_1$ in $2 + v_2$

We can prove this transformation is correct, for instance by refinement.

• The need for fresh names v_1, v_2, \ldots is a nuisance.

¹⁵ We can now simplify the use of \Box in our C-Machine. How?