## Assigning to a Variable

What is the result of this program?

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { let } \mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x}) \text { set } \mathbf{x}=1 \\
\text { in let } \mathbf{y}=0 \\
\text { in }\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y}) ; \\
\mathbf{y}\}
\end{gathered}
$$

Is it 0 or $1 ?$

## Assigning to a Variable

let $f=\operatorname{proc}(x)$ set $x=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assigning to a Variable


$\mathbf{x}$ set $\mathrm{x}=1 \boldsymbol{1}$
let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})$ set $\mathrm{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assigning to a Variable


let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assigning to a Variable


let $f=\operatorname{proc}(x)$ set $x=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assigning to a Variable


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assigning to a Variable


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assigning to a Variable



So the answer is 0
let $f=\operatorname{proc}(x)$ set $x=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Variables in C++

```
void \(f(\) int \(x)\{\)
    x \(=1\);
\}
int main() \{
    int \(y=0\);
    f(y);
    return \(Y\);
\}
```

The result above is 0 , too

## Variables in C++

```
void f(int\& x) \{
        \(\mathbf{x}=1 ;\)
\}
int main() \{
    int \(y=0\);
    f (y) ;
    return \(Y\);
\}
```

But the result above is 1

## Variables in C++

```
void f(int& x) {
    x = 1;
}
int main() {
    int }y=0
    f(y);
    return Y;
}
```

This example shows call-by-reference.
The previous example showed call-by-value.

## Assignment and Call-by-Reference

Adding call-by-reference parameters to our language
let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assignment and Call-by-Reference



$$
\& \mathbf{x} \text { set } \mathbf{x = 1}
$$

let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assignment and Call-by-Reference


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assignment and Call-by-Reference


let $f=\operatorname{proc}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(f y)$;
y \}

## Assignment and Call-by-Reference



The pointer from one environment frame to another is questionable, because frames are supposed to point to values
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assignment and Call-by-Reference


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Assignment and Call-by-Reference


let $f=\operatorname{proc}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in \{ (f y);
y \}

## Interpreter Changes

Same as before:

- Expressed values: Number + Proc
- Denoted values: Ref(Expressed Value)

The difference is that application doesn't always create a new location for a new variable binding
=> Separate location creation from environment extension

# Assignment and Call-by-Reference 



The old way
let $x=10$
$y=12$
in $+(x, y)$

## Assignment and Call-by-Reference



The new way
let $x=10$
$y=12$
in $+(x, y)$

## Call-by-Reference

## Do the previous evaluation the new way...

let $f=\operatorname{proc}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Call-by-Reference



## $\& \mathbf{x}$ set $\mathbf{x}=1 \mid$

let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Call-by-Reference


let $f=\operatorname{proc}(\& x)$ set $x=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Call-by-Reference


let $f=\operatorname{proc}(\& x)$ set $x=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(f y)$;
y \}

## Call-by-Reference



This time, the new environment frame points to a location box, which is consistent with other frames
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y $\}$

## Call-by-Reference


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Call-by-Reference


let $f=\operatorname{proc}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
y \}

## Call-by-Reference with Non-variables



If call-by-reference argument is not a variable...
let $f=\operatorname{proc}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in \{ (f 0);
y \}

## Call-by-Reference with Non-variables


... create a location
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f} 0)$;
y \}

## Interpreter Changes

- Add call-by-reference arguments (indicated by \&)
- New var datatype, with cbv-var and cbr-var variants
- Create explicit locations for variables

```
location : expval -> location
location-val : location -> expval
location-set! : location expval -> void
```

- Change variable lookup to de-reference locations
- Change set to work on locations
- Add eval-fun-rands and change apply-proc


## \& versus * in C++

```
void f(int* x) {
    *x = 1;
}
int main() {
    int y = 0;
    f(&y);
    return y;
}
```

- This is back to call-by-value, but with a reference as a value
- To study this form of call, we can add explicit references to our language, too


## Call-by-Value with References

$\mathbf{x} \operatorname{setref}(\mathbf{x}, 1) \mid$
let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})$ setref( $\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in \{ (fref(y));
y \}

## Call-by-Value with References


let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})$ setref( $\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in $\{(\mathbf{f r e f}(\mathbf{y})$ );
y \}

## Call-by-Value with References


let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})$ setref( $\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$
in \{ (fref(y));
y \}

## Call-by-Value with References

Q

$\Rightarrow y_{0} \times 0$
let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x}) \operatorname{setref}(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in \{ (fref(y));

$$
\mathbf{y}\}
$$

## Call-by-Value with References


let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})$ setref( $\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in $\{(\mathbf{f} \operatorname{ref}(\mathbf{y}))$;

$$
\mathbf{y}\}
$$

## Call-by-Value with References



$y \mid 0<0 \lll$

let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x}) \operatorname{setref}(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in \{ ( $\mathbf{f r e f}(\mathbf{y})$ );
y \}

## Call-by-Value with References


let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x}) \operatorname{setref}(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in \{ ( $\mathbf{f r e f}(\mathbf{y})$ );
y \}

## Call-by-Value with References


let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x}) \operatorname{setref}(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in $\{(\mathbf{f r e f}(\mathbf{y})$ );
y \}

## Interpreter Changes for References

Revised language:

- Expressed vals: Number + Proc + Ref(Expressed Val)
- Denoted vals: Ref(Expressed Val)

Interpreter changes:

- Add reference values
- Add ref form and setref primitive


## Lazy Evaluation of Function Arguments

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { let } \mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x}) 0 \\
& \text { in }(\mathbf{f}+(1,+(2,+(3,+(4,+(5,6))))))
\end{aligned}
$$

The computed 21 is never used.

What if we were lazy about computing function arguments (in case they aren't used)?

## Lazy Evaluation of Function Arguments

One way to laziness:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { let } \mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x t h u n k}) 0 \\
& \text { in }(\mathbf{f} \operatorname{proc}()+(1,+(2,+(3,+(4,+(5,6)))))) \\
& \text { let } \mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x t h u n k})-((\mathbf{x t h u n k}), 7) \\
& \text { in }(\mathbf{f} \operatorname{proc}()+(1,+(2,+(3,+(4,+(5,6))))))
\end{aligned}
$$

By using proc to delay evaluation, we can avoid unnecessary computation.

How about making the language compute function arguments lazily in all applications?

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments

let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{0}$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{p r o c}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{0}$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


$+(1,2)$

Application creates a new kind of green box, with two slots: a thunk
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{0}$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{p r o c}(\mathbf{x}) 0$
in (f+(1,2))

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments



The result is 0
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x}) 0$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments

let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in ( $\mathbf{f}+(1,2)$ )

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


lookup of $\mathbf{x}$...
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in ( $\mathbf{f}+(1,2)$ )

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


... forces evaluation of the thunk
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in (f $+(1,2)$ )

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


so 3 is the value of $\mathbf{x}$
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments



The result is 2
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments

Lazy expression that needs its environment...
let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=7$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=7$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=7$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=7$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments



Evaluation of $\mathbf{x}$ forces the thunk...
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=7$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments



Triggering evaluation with the thunk's environment, not the current one
let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=7$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


(The result will be 7)
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=7$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments

What if the right-hand side for $\mathbf{y}$ is an expression, instead of a value?
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=+(3,4)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=+(3,4)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments



Added thunk for the value of $\mathbf{y}$
let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=+(3,4)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments



Another thunk for the argument of f
let $\mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=+(3,4)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments



Evaluation of $\mathbf{x}$ forces a thunk...
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=+(3,4)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


which, in turn, forces another thunk...
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=+(3,4)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


and so on (to get 7)
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, 1)$
in let $\mathbf{y}=+(3,4)$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1, \mathbf{y}))$

## Implementing Lazy Evaluation

Interpreter changes:

- Change eval-fun-rands to create thunks
- Change variable lookup to force thunk evaluation

(Implement in DrScheme)

## Call-by-Name and Call-by-Need

The lazy strategy we just implemented is call-by-name

- Advantage: unneeded arguments are not computed
- Disadvantage: needed arguments may be computed many times

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { let } \mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x})+(\mathbf{x},+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})) \\
& \text { in }(\mathbf{f}+(1,+(2,+(3,+(4,+(5,6))))))
\end{aligned}
$$

Best of both worlds: call-by-need

- Evaluates each lazy expression once, then remembers the result


## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments

Start as before...
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


lookup of $\mathbf{x}$...
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$
in (f+(1,2))

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


... forces evaluation of the thunk to get 3
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$
in (f $+(1,2)$ )

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


so change $\mathbf{x}$ to 3 --- which is the essence of call-by-need
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


lookup of $\mathbf{x}$ again gets 3
let $\mathbf{f}=\boldsymbol{\operatorname { p r o c }}(\mathbf{x})-(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$
in $(\mathbf{f}+(1,2))$

## Evaluation with Lazy Arguments


(The result is 0 )
let $f=\operatorname{proc}(\& \mathbf{x})$ set $\mathbf{x}=1$
in let $\mathbf{y}=0$ in $\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y})$;
$y\}$

## Implementing Call-by-Need

Interpreter changes:

- Change variable lookup to replace thunks in locations with their values
(Implement in DrScheme)


## Calling Convention Terminology

- Call-by-name and call-by-need = lazy evaluation
- Call-by-value = eager evaluation

Call-by-reference can augment either...
... but the combination of reference and laziness is difficult to reason about

## Popular Calling-Convention Choices

- Most languages are call-by-value
- C, C++, Pascal, Scheme, Java, ML, Smalltalk...
- Some provide call-by-reference
- C++, Pascal
- A few are call-by-need
- Haskell
- Practically no languages are call-by-name


## Popularity of Laziness

Why don't more languages provide lazy evaluation?

- Disadvantage: evaluation order is not obvious

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { let } \mathbf{x}=0 \quad \mathbf{f}=\ldots \\
& \text { in let } \mathbf{y}=\text { set } \mathbf{x}=1 \\
& \mathbf{z}=\text { set } \mathbf{x}=2 \\
& \text { in }\{(\mathbf{f} \mathbf{y} \mathbf{z}) ; \mathbf{x}\}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Popularity of Laziness

Why do some languages provide lazy evaluation?

- Evaluation order does not matter if the language has no set form
- Such languages are called purely functional
- Note: call-by-reference is meaningless in a purely functional language
- A language with set can be called imperative


## Laziness and Eagerness

Even in a purely functional language, lazy and eager evaluation can produce different results

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { let } \mathbf{f}=\operatorname{proc}(\mathbf{x}) 0 \\
& \text { in }(\mathbf{f} \text { [loop forever] })
\end{aligned}
$$

- Eager answer: none
- Lazy answer: 0


## Summary

- Call-by-reference
- split location from environment representation
- handle function arguments/variables specially
- Call-by-name
- thunk all argument expressions
- modify variable lookup to evaluate thunks
- Call-by-need
- revise variable lookup to install computed thunk result

