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Thread A

```c
void foo(void) {
    a = 1;
    b = 1;
}
```

Thread B

```c
void bar(void) {
    while (b == 0){};
    assert (a==1);
}
```

**Intuition:** the assertion will never fail
Thread A

```c
void foo(void) {
    a = 1;
    b = 1;
}
```

Thread B

```c
void bar(void) {
    while (b == 0){};
    assert (a==1);
}
```

**Intuition:** the assertion will never fail

⚠️ **Real execution:** given enough tries, the assertion may eventually fail

~~> in need of defining a Memory Model
Memory Models

Memory interactions behave differently in presence of
- multiple concurrent threads
- data replication in hierarchical and/or distributed memory systems
- deferred communication of updates

Memory Models are a product of negotiating
- restrictions of freedom of implementation to guarantee race related properties
- establishment of freedom of implementation to enable *program* and *machine model* optimizations

⇝ Modern Languages include the memory model in their language definition
Strict Consistency

Motivated by sequential computing, we intuitively implicitly transfer our idea of semantics of memory accesses to concurrent computation. This leads to our idealistic model *Strict Consistency*:

**Definition (Strict consistency)**

Independently of which process reads or writes, the value from the most recent write to a location is observable by reads from the respective location immediately after the write occurs.

Although ideally desired, practically not existing

⚠️ absolute global time problematic

⚠️ physically not possible

⇝ strict consistency is too strong to be realistic
Abandoning absolute time

Thread A

```c
void foo(void) {
  a = 1;
  b = 1;
}
```

Thread B

```c
void bar(void) {
  while (b == 0) {};
  assert(a == 1);
}
```

- Initial state of a and b is 0
- A writes a before it writes b
- B should see b go to 1 before executing the assert statement
- The assert statement should always hold

⇝ Here correctness means: writing a 1 to a happens before reading a 1 in b

Still, any of the following may happen:

⇝ Idea: state correctness in terms of what event may happen before another one
Happend-Before Relation and Diagram
Events in a Distributed System

A process as a series of events [Lam78]: Given a distributed system of processes $P, Q, R, \ldots$, each process $P$ consists of events $p_1, p_2, \ldots$. If $p_i$ is an event that sends a message to $Q$, then there is some event $q_j$ in $Q$ that receives this message and $p_i$ happened before $q_j$. 

---

Example:

$p_3 \rightarrow p_1 \rightarrow p_2 \rightarrow p_4 \rightarrow q_1 \rightarrow q_2 \rightarrow q_3 \rightarrow q_4 \rightarrow q_5 \rightarrow q_6 \rightarrow q_7 \rightarrow r_1 \rightarrow r_2 \rightarrow r_3 \rightarrow r_4$
Events in a Distributed System

A process as a series of events [Lam78]: Given a distributed system of processes $P, Q, R, \ldots$, each process $P$ consists of events $p_1, p_2, \ldots$.

Example:

- $p_3$ happened before $p_1$ happened before $p_2$.
- $p_4$ happened before $q_j$ for some event $q_j$ in $Q$ that receives a message sent by $p_3$.

- Event $p_i$ in process $P$ happened before $p_{i+1}$.
- If $p_i$ is an event that sends a message to $Q$ then there is some event $q_j$ in $Q$ that receives this message and $p_i$ happened before $q_j$. 

Diagram:

- Events $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4$ in $P$.
- Events $q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4, q_5, q_6, q_7$ in $Q$.
- Events $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4$ in $R$. 

Arrows indicate order and communication between processes.
The Happened-Before Relation

**Definition**

If an event \( p \) happened before an event \( q \) then \( p \rightarrow q \).

Observe:
- \( ightarrow \) is partial (neither \( p \rightarrow q \) or \( q \rightarrow p \) may hold).
- \( ightarrow \) is irreflexive (\( p \rightarrow p \) never holds).
- \( ightarrow \) is transitive (if \( p \rightarrow q \) and \( q \rightarrow r \) then \( p \rightarrow r \)).
- \( ightarrow \) is asymmetric (if \( p \rightarrow q \) then \( \neg (q \rightarrow p) \)).

\( ightarrow \) the \( ightarrow \) relation is a strict partial order.
The Happened-Before Relation

Definition
If an event $p$ happened before an event $q$ then $p \rightarrow q$.

Observe:
- $\rightarrow$ is partial (neither $p \rightarrow q$ or $q \rightarrow p$ may hold)
- $\rightarrow$ is irreflexive ($p \rightarrow p$ never holds)
- $\rightarrow$ is transitive ($p \rightarrow q \land q \rightarrow r$ then $p \rightarrow r$)
- $\rightarrow$ is asymmetric (if $p \rightarrow q$ then $\neg(q \rightarrow p)$)

$\Rightarrow$ the $\rightarrow$ relation is a strict partial order
Let \( a \not\rightarrow b \) abbreviate \( \neg(a \rightarrow b) \).

**Definition**

Two distinct events \( p \) and \( q \) are said to be **concurrent** if \( p \not\rightarrow q \) and \( q \not\rightarrow p \).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} & p_1 & p_2 & p_3 & p_4 \\
\text{Q} & q_1 & q_2 & q_3 & q_4 & q_5 & q_6 & q_7 \\
\text{R} & r_1 & r_2 & r_3 & r_4 \\
\end{array}
\]

- \( p_1 \rightarrow r_4 \) in the example
- \( p_3 \) and \( q_3 \) are, in fact, concurrent since \( p_3 \not\rightarrow q_3 \) and \( q_3 \not\rightarrow p_3 \)
Ordering

Let $C$ be a *logical clock* i.e. $C$ assigns a *globally unique* time-stamp $C(p)$ to each event $p$.

**Definition (Clock Condition)**

Function $C$ satisfies the *clock condition* if for any events $p, q$

$$p \rightarrow q \implies C(p) < C(q)$$

For a distributed system the *clock condition* holds iff:

1. $p_i$ and $p_j$ are events of $P$ and $p_i \rightarrow p_j$ then $C(p_i) < C(p_j)$
2. $p$ is the sending of a message by process $P$ and $q$ is the reception of this message by process $Q$ then $C(p) < C(q)$

$\Rightarrow$ a logical clock $C$ that satisfies the clock condition describes a total order $a < b$ (with $C(a) < C(b)$) that embeds the strict partial order $\rightarrow$

$\Rightarrow$ use the process model and $\rightarrow$ to define better consistency model
Ordering

Let \( C \) be a \textit{logical clock} i.e. \( C \) assigns a \textit{globally unique} time-stamp \( C(p) \) to each event \( p \).

**Definition (Clock Condition)**

Function \( C \) satisfies the \textit{clock condition} if for any events \( p, q \)

\[
p \rightarrow q \quad \Rightarrow \quad C(p) < C(q)
\]

For a distributed system the \textit{clock condition} holds iff:

1. \( p_i \) and \( p_j \) are events of \( P \) and \( p_i \rightarrow p_j \) then \( C(p_i) < C(p_j) \)
2. \( p \) is the sending of a message by process \( P \) and \( q \) is the reception of this message by process \( Q \) then \( C(p) < C(q) \)
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Let $C$ be a *logical clock* i.e. $C$ assigns a *globally unique* time-stamp $C(p)$ to each event $p$.

**Definition (Clock Condition)**

Function $C$ satisfies the *clock condition* if for any events $p, q$

$$ p \rightarrow q \implies C(p) < C(q) $$

For a distributed system the *clock condition* holds iff:

1. $p_i$ and $p_j$ are events of $P$ and $p_i \rightarrow p_j$ then $C(p_i) < C(p_j)$
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⇝ a logical clock $C$ that satisfies the clock condition describes a *total order* $a < b$ (with $C(a) < C(b)$) that *embeds* the strict partial order $\rightarrow$
Ordering

Let $C$ be a *logical clock* i.e. $C$ assigns a *globally unique* time-stamp $C(p)$ to each event $p$.

**Definition (Clock Condition)**

Function $C$ satisfies the *clock condition* if for any events $p, q$

\[ p \rightarrow q \implies C(p) < C(q) \]

For a distributed system the *clock condition* holds iff:

1. $p_i$ and $p_j$ are events of $P$ and $p_i \rightarrow p_j$ then $C(p_i) < C(p_j)$
2. $p$ is the sending of a message by process $P$ and $q$ is the reception of this message by process $Q$ then $C(p) < C(q)$

⇝ a logical clock $C$ that satisfies the clock condition describes a *total order* $a < b$ (with $C(a) < C(b)$) that *embeds* the strict partial order $\rightarrow$

The *set* defined by all $C$ that satisfy the clock condition is exactly the *set* of executions possible in the system.

⇝ use the process model and $\rightarrow$ to define better consistency model
Defining $C$ Satisfying the Clock Condition

Given:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
e & p_1 & p_2 & p_3 & p_4 \\
C(e) & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
e & q_1 & q_2 & q_3 & q_4 & q_5 & q_6 & q_7 \\
C(e) & & & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
e & r_1 & r_2 & r_3 & r_4 \\
C(e) & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]
Defining $C$ Satisfying the Clock Condition

Given:

- $p_3$
- $p_1$, $p_2$, $p_4$
- $q_1$, $q_2$, $q_3$, $q_4$, $q_5$, $q_6$, $q_7$
- $r_1$, $r_2$, $r_3$, $r_4$
- $P$, $Q$, $R$
- $e$, $p_1$, $p_2$, $p_3$, $p_4$
- $C(e)$: 1, 4, 7, 12
- $e$, $q_1$, $q_2$, $q_3$, $q_4$, $q_5$, $q_6$, $q_7$
- $C(e)$: 2, 3, 5, 6, 11, 13, 14
- $e$, $r_1$, $r_2$, $r_3$, $r_4$
- $C(e)$: 8, 9, 10, 15
Summing up Happened-Before Relations

We can model concurrency using processes and events:

- there is a \textit{happened-before} relation between the events of each process
- there is a \textit{happened-before} relation between communicating events
- \textit{happened-before} is a strict partial order
- a clock is a total strict order that embeds the \textit{happened-before} partial order
Memory Consistency Models based on the Happened-Before Relation
Idea: use happened-before diagrams to model more relaxed memory models.

Given a path through each of the threads of a program:
- consider the actions of each thread as events of a process
- use more processes to model memory
  - here: one process per variable in memory
- concisely represent some interleavings
Happened-Before Based Memory Models

Idea: use happened-before diagrams to model more relaxed memory models.

Given a path through each of the threads of a program:

- consider the actions of each thread as events of a process
- use more processes to model memory
  - here: one process per variable in memory
- \(\leadsto\) concisely represent some interleavings

\(\leadsto\) We establish a model for \textit{Sequential Consistency}. 
Sequential Consistency

Definition (Sequential Consistency Condition [Lam78])
The result of any execution is the same as if the memory operations
- of each individual processor appear in the order specified by its program
- of all processors joined were executed in some sequential order

Sequential Consistency applied to Multiprocessor Programs:
Given a program with $n$ threads,

1. for fixed event sequences $p_0^1, p_1^1, \ldots$ and $p_0^2, p_1^2, \ldots$ and $p_0^n, p_1^n, \ldots$ keeping the program order,
2. executions obeying the clock condition on the $p_i^j$,
3. all executions have the same result

Yet, in other words:

- 1. defines the execution path of each thread
- 2. each execution mentioned in 2 is one interleaving of processes
- 3. declares that the result of running the threads with these interleavings is always the same.
Working with Sequential Consistency

Sequential Consistency in Multiprocessor Programs:
Given a program with \( n \) threads,

1. for fixed event sequences \( p_0^1, p_1^1, \ldots \) and \( p_0^2, p_1^2, \ldots \) and \( p_0^n, p_1^n, \ldots \) keeping the program order,
2. executions obeying the clock condition on the \( p_j^i \),
3. all executions have the same result

Idea for showing that a system is not sequentially consistent:

- pick a result obtained from a program run on a SC system
- pick an execution 1 and a total ordering of all operations 2
- add extra processes to model other system components
- the original order 2 becomes a partial order \( \rightarrow \)
- show that total orderings \( C' \) exist for \( \rightarrow \) for which the result differs
Definition (Sequential Consistency)

1. Memory operations in program order ($\leq$) are embedded into the memory order ($\sqsubseteq$)

$$\text{Op}_i[a] \leq \text{Op}_i[b'] \Rightarrow \text{Op}_i[a] \sqsubseteq \text{Op}_i[b']$$

2. A load’s value is determined by the latest write wrt. memory order

$$\text{val}(\text{Ld}_i[a]) = \text{val}(\text{St}_j[a]) \mid \text{St}_j[a] = \max \{\text{St}_k[a] \mid \text{St}_k[a] \sqsubseteq \text{Ld}_i[a]\}$$

with

- $\text{Op}_i[a]$ any memory access to address $a$ by CPU $i$
- $\text{Ld}_i[a]$ a load from address $a$ by CPU $i$
- $\text{St}_i[a]$ a store to address $a$ by CPU $i$
- Program order $\leq$ being specified by the control flow of the programs executed by their associated CPUs; only orders operations on the same CPU
Weakening the Model

Observation: more concurrency possible, if we model each memory location separately, i.e. as a different process

Sequential consistency still obeyed:
- the accesses of foo to a occurs before b
- the first two read accesses to b are in parallel to a=1

Conclusion: There is no observable change if accesses to different memory locations can happen in parallel.
Benefits of Sequential Consistency

- Concisely represent *all* interleavings that are due to variations in timing
- Synchronization using time is uncommon for software
- A good model for correct behaviors of concurrent programs
- Program results besides SC results are undesirable (they contain *races*)
Benefits of Sequential Consistency

- Concisely represent all interleavings that are due to variations in timing
- Synchronization using time is uncommon for software

\[ \Rightarrow \] A good model for correct behaviors of concurrent programs

\[ \Rightarrow \] Program results besides SC results are undesirable (they contain races)

Realistic model for simple hardware architectures:

- Sequential consistency model suitable for concurrent processors that acquire exclusive access to memory
- Processors can speed up computation by using caches and still made to maintain sequential consistency
Benefits of Sequential Consistency

- concisely represent all interleavings that are due to variations in timing
- synchronization using time is uncommon for software
  ⇾ a good model for correct behaviors of concurrent programs
  ⇾ program results besides SC results are undesirable (they contain races)

Realistic model for simple hardware architectures:

- sequential consistency model suitable for concurrent processors that acquire exclusive access to memory
- processors can speed up computation by using caches and still made to maintain sequential consistency

Not realistic for elaborate hardware with out-of-order stores:

- what other processors see is determined by complex optimizations to cacheline management
  ⇾ internal workings of caches
Introducing Caches: The MESI Protocol
Introducing Caches

Idea: each cache line one process

Observations:
⚠️ naive replication of memory in cache lines creates incoherency
Cache Coherency: Formal Spec [SHW11, p. 14]

Definition (Cache Coherency)

1. Memory operations in program order (≤) are embedded into the memory order (⊆)
   \[ \text{Op}_i[a] \leq \text{Op}_i[a]' \Rightarrow \text{Op}_i[a] \subseteq \text{Op}_i[a]' \]

2. A load's value is determined by the latest write wrt. memory order
   \[ \text{val}(\text{Ld}_i[a]) = \text{val}(\text{St}_j[a] \mid \text{St}_j[a] = \max \{\text{St}_k[a] \mid \text{St}_k[a] \subseteq \text{Ld}_i[a]\}) \]

- This definition superficially looks close to the definition of SC – except that it covers only singular memory locations instead of all memory locations accessed in a program
- Caches and memory can communicate using messaging, following some particular protocol to establish cache coherency
  (⇝ Cache Coherence Protocol)
The MESI Cache Coherence Protocol: States [PP84]

Processors use caches to avoid a costly round-trip to RAM for every memory access.
- programs often access the same memory area repeatedly (e.g. stack)
- keeping a local mirror image of certain memory regions requires bookkeeping about who has the latest copy

Each cache line is in one of the states $M, E, S, I$: $M \leftrightarrow E \leftrightarrow S \rightarrow I$
The MESI Cache Coherence Protocol: States [PP84]
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The MESI Cache Coherence Protocol: States [PP84]

Processors use caches to avoid a costly round-trip to RAM for every memory access.

- programs often access the same memory area repeatedly (e.g. stack)
- keeping a local mirror image of certain memory regions requires bookkeeping about who has the latest copy

Each cache line is in one of the states $M, E, S, I$:
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- $E$: the content is in no other cache; it is *exclusive* to this cache and can be overwritten without consulting other caches
The MESI Cache Coherence Protocol: States [PP84]

Processors use caches to avoid a costly round-trip to RAM for every memory access.
- programs often access the same memory area repeatedly (e.g. stack)
- keeping a local mirror image of certain memory regions requires bookkeeping about who has the latest copy

Each cache line is in one of the states $M, E, S, I$:

- **$I$**: it is *invalid* and is ready for re-use
- **$S$**: other caches have an identical copy of this cache line, it is *shared*
- **$E$**: the content is in no other cache; it is *exclusive* to this cache and can be overwritten without consulting other caches
- **$M$**: the content is exclusive to this cache and has furthermore been *modified*
Processors use caches to avoid a costly round-trip to RAM for every memory access.
- programs often access the same memory area repeatedly (e.g. stack)
- keeping a local mirror image of certain memory regions requires bookkeeping about who has the latest copy

Each cache line is in one of the states $M, E, S, I$:

- $I$: it is *invalid* and is ready for re-use
- $S$: other caches have an identical copy of this cache line, it is *shared*
- $E$: the content is in no other cache; it is *exclusive* to this cache and can be overwritten without consulting other caches
- $M$: the content is exclusive to this cache and has furthermore been *modified*

~> the global state of cache lines is kept consistent by sending *messages*
The MESI Cache Coherence Protocol: Messages

Moving data between caches is coordinated by sending messages [McK10]:

- **Read**: sent if CPU needs to read from an address
- **Read Response**: when in state E or S, response to a Read message, carries the data for the requested address
- **Invalidate**: asks others to evict a cache line
- **Invalidate Acknowledge**: reply indicating that a cache line has been evicted
- **Read Invalidate**: like Read + Invalidate (also called “read with intend to modify”)
- **Writeback**: Read Response when in state M, as a side effect noticing main memory about modifications to the cacheline, changing sender’s state to S

We mostly consider messages between processors. Upon Read Invalidate, a processor replies with Read Response/Writeback before the Invalidate Acknowledge is sent.
MESI Example

Consider how the following code might execute:

Thread A

a = 1; // A.1
b = 1; // A.2

Thread B

while (b == 0) {}; // B.1
assert(a == 1); // B.2

- in all examples, the initial values of variables are assumed to be 0
- suppose that a and b reside in different cache lines
- assume that a cache line is larger than the variable itself
- we write the content of a cache line as
  - $M_x$: modified, with value $x$
  - $E_x$: exclusive, with value $x$
  - $S_x$: shared, with value $x$
  - $I$: invalid
**MESI Example (I)**

### Thread A

```plaintext
a = 1; // A.1
b = 1; // A.2
```

### Thread B

```plaintext
while (b == 0) {}; // B.1
assert(a == 1); // B.2
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>statement</th>
<th>CPU A</th>
<th>CPU B</th>
<th>RAM</th>
<th>message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>S0</td>
<td>S0</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Thread A**

```plaintext
a = 1;  // A.1
b = 1;  // A.2
```

**Thread B**

```plaintext
while (b == 0) {};  // B.1
assert(a == 1);  // B.2
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>statement</th>
<th>CPU A</th>
<th>CPU B</th>
<th>RAM</th>
<th>message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MESI Example: Happened Before Model

Idea: each cache line one process, A caches b=0 as E, B caches a=0 as E

Observations:
- each memory access must complete before executing next instruction \( \leadsto \) add edge
- second execution of test \( b==0 \) stays within cache \( \leadsto \) no traffic
MESI Example: Happened Before Model

Idea: each cache line one process, A caches $b=0$ as E, B caches $a=0$ as E

Observations:
- each memory access must complete before executing next instruction $\rightsquigarrow$ add edge
- second execution of test $b==0$ stays within cache $\rightsquigarrow$ no traffic
Summary: MESI Cache Coherence Protocol

**Sequential Consistency:**
- specifies that the system must appear to execute all threads’ loads and stores to *all memory locations* in a total order that respects the program order of each thread
- a characterization of well-behaved programs
- a model for differing speed of execution
- for fixed paths through the threads *and* a total order between accesses to the same variables: executions can be illustrated by a happened-before diagram with one process per variable

**Cache Coherency:**
- A *cache coherent* system must appear to execute all threads’ loads and stores to a *single memory location* in a total order that respects the program order of each thread
- MESI cache coherence protocol ensures SC for processors with caches
Introducing Store Buffers: Out-Of-Order Stores
### Out-of-Order Execution

⚠️ performance problem: writes always stall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thread A</th>
<th>Thread B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>a = 1;</code></td>
<td><code>while (b == 0) {}</code>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>b = 1;</code></td>
<td><code>assert(a == 1);</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.1
A.2
B.1
B.2

![Diagram showing cache and memory operations for thread A and B](https://via.placeholder.com/150)
### Out-of-Order Execution

⚠️ performance problem: writes always stall

#### Thread A

```c
a = 1; // A.1
b = 1; // A.2
```

#### Thread B

```c
while (b == 0) {}; // B.1
assert(a == 1); // B.2
```

~> CPU A should continue executing after `a = 1;`
⚠️ Abstract Machine Model: defines semantics of memory accesses

CPU A

CPU B

- put each store into a store buffer and continue execution
- Store buffers apply stores in various orders:
  - FIFO (Sparc/x86-TSO)
  - unordered (Sparc PSO)
- program order still needs to be observed locally
  - store buffer snoops read channel and
  - on matching address, returns the youngest value in buffer
Definition (Total Store Order)

1. The store order wrt. memory (\(\sqsubseteq\)) is total

\[ \forall a, b \in \text{addr}, i, j \in \text{CPU} \ (St_i[a] \sqsubseteq St_j[b]) \lor (St_j[b] \sqsubseteq St_i[a]) \]

2. Stores in program order (\(\leq\)) are embedded into the memory order (\(\sqsubseteq\))

\[ St_i[a] \leq St_i[b] \Rightarrow St_i[a] \sqsubseteq St_i[b] \]

3. Loads preceding an operation (wrt. program order \(\leq\)) are embedded into the memory order (\(\sqsubseteq\))

\[ Ld_i[a] \leq Op_i[b] \Rightarrow Ld_i[a] \sqsubseteq Op_i[b] \]

4. A load’s value is determined by the latest write as observed by the local CPU

\[ \text{val}(Ld_i[a]) = \max (\{St_k[a] \mid St_k[a] \subseteq Ld_i[a]\} \cup \{St_i[a] \mid St_i[a] \leq Ld_i[a]\}) \]

Particularly, one ordering property from SC is not guaranteed:

\[ St_i[a] \leq Ld_i[b] \nRightarrow \ St_i[a] \sqsubseteq Ld_i[b] \]

⚠️ Local stores may be observed earlier by local loads then from somewhere else!
Happened-Before Model for TSO

Thread A

\[ a = 1; \]  
\[ \text{printf}("%d", b); \]

Thread B

\[ b = 1; \]  
\[ \text{printf}("%d", a); \]

Assume cache A contains: a: S0, b: S0, cache B contains: a: S0, b: S0

Diagram:

- Thread A:
  - Store `a` to cache A
  - Print `b`

- Thread B:
  - Store `b` to cache B
  - Print `a`
The x86 CPU, powering desktops and servers around the world is a common representative of a TSO Memory Model based CPU.

- FIFO store buffers keep quite strong consistency properties
- The major obstacle to Sequential Consistency is

$$St_i[a] \leq Ld_i[b] \not\Rightarrow St_i[a] \sqsubseteq Ld_i[b]$$

- modern x86 CPUs provide the `mfence` instruction
- `mfence` orders all memory instructions:

$$Op_i \leq mfence() \leq Op'_i \Rightarrow Op_i \sqsubseteq Op'_i$$

- a fence between write and loads gives sequentially consistent CPU behavior (and is as slow as a CPU without store buffer)

~~ use fences only when necessary
### Definition (Partial Store Order)

1. The store order wrt. memory (\(\sqsubseteq\)) is total
   \[
   \forall a,b \in \text{addr}, i,j \in \text{CPU} \quad (\text{St}_i[a] \sqsubseteq \text{St}_j[b]) \lor (\text{St}_j[b] \sqsubseteq \text{St}_i[a])
   \]

2. Fenced stores in program order (\(\leq\)) are embedded into the memory order (\(\sqsubseteq\))
   \[
   \text{St}_i[a] \leq \text{sfence()} \leq \text{St}_i[b] \Rightarrow \text{St}_i[a] \sqsubseteq \text{St}_i[b]
   \]

3. Stores to the same address in program order (\(\leq\)) are embedded into the memory order (\(\sqsubseteq\))
   \[
   \text{St}_i[a] \leq \text{St}_i[a]' \Rightarrow \text{St}_i[a] \sqsubseteq \text{St}_i[a]'
   \]

4. Loads preceding another operation (wrt. program order \(\leq\)) are embedded into the memory order (\(\sqsubseteq\))
   \[
   \text{Ld}_i[a] \leq \text{Op}_i[b] \Rightarrow \text{Ld}_i[a] \sqsubseteq \text{Op}_i[b]
   \]

5. A load’s value is determined by the latest write as observed by the local CPU
   \[
   \text{val}(\text{Ld}_i[a]) = \text{val}(\text{St}_j[a] | \text{St}_j[a] = \max \{\text{St}_k[a] | \text{St}_k[a] \sqsubseteq \text{Ld}_i[a]\} \cup \{\text{St}_i[a] | \text{St}_i[a] \leq \text{Ld}_i[a]\})
   \]

⚠️ Now also stores are not guaranteed to be in order any more:

\[
\text{St}_i[a] \leq \text{St}_i[b] \nLeftrightarrow \text{St}_i[a] \sqsubseteq \text{St}_i[b]
\]

⇝ What about sequential consistency for the whole system?
Happened-Before Model for PSO

**Thread A**

```plaintext
a = 1;
b = 1;
```

**Thread B**

```plaintext
while (b == 0) {};
assert(a == 1);
```

Assume cache A contains: a: S0, b: E0, cache B contains: a: S0, b: I

```
St[a]  b
Ld[b]  invalidate
invalidate ack
Ld[a]
write back
read
```

a=1 b=1
b==0 a==1
Explicit Synchronization: Write Barrier

Overtaking of messages *may be desirable* and does not need to be prohibited in general.

- generalized store buffers render programs incorrect that assume sequential consistency between *different* CPUs
- whenever a store in front of another operation in one CPU must be observable in this order *by a different CPU*, an explicit *write barrier* has to be inserted
  - a write barrier marks all current store operations in the store buffer
  - the next store operation is only executed when all marked stores in the buffer have completed
Happened-Before Model for Write Barriers

Thread A

\[ a = 1; \]
\[ \text{sfence();} \]
\[ b = 1; \]

Thread B

\[ \text{while } (b == 0) \{ \}; \]
\[ \text{assert}(a == 1); \]

Assume cache A contains: \( a: \text{S0, b: E0} \), cache B contains: \( a: \text{S0, b: I} \)
Further weakening the model: O-o-O Reads
Relaxed Memory Order

Communication of cache updates is still costly:
- a cache-intense computation can fill up store buffers in CPUs
- waiting for invalidation acknowledgements may still happen
- invalidation acknowledgements are delayed on busy caches

立即承认一个无效化，然后稍后应用。
- 将每个无效化消息放入一个无效化队列中。
- 如果一个 MESI 消息需要发送有关无效化队列中的缓存行，则等待直到行被无效化。

⚠️ 本地加载和存储不咨询无效化队列。

What about sequential consistency?
Definition (Relaxed Memory Order)

1. Fenced memory accesses in program order (≤) are embedded into the memory order (⊆)
   \[ Op_i[a] \leq \text{mfence()} \leq Op_i[b] \Rightarrow Op_i[a] \subseteq Op_i[b] \]

2. Stores to the same address in program order (≤) are embedded into the memory order (⊆)
   \[ Op_i[a] \leq St_i[a]' \Rightarrow Op_i[a] \subseteq St_i[a]' \]

3. Operations dependent on a load (wrt. dependence →) are embedded in the memory order (⊆)
   \[ Ld_i[a] \rightarrow Op_i[b] \Rightarrow Ld_i[a] \subseteq Op_i[b] \]

4. A load’s value is determined by the latest write as observed by the local CPU
   \[ val(Ld_i[a]) = \max(\{St_k[a] | St_k[a] \subseteq Ld_i[a]\} \cup \{St_i[a] | St_i[a] \leq Ld_i[a]\}) \]

⚠️ Now we need the notion of dependence →:

- Memory access to the same address:
  \[ St_i[a] \leq Ld_i[a] \Rightarrow St_i[a] \rightarrow Ld_i[a] \]

- Register reads are dependent on latest register writes:
  \[ Ld_i[a]' = \max(Ld_i[a]' | \text{targetreg}(Ld_i[a]') = \text{srcreg}(St_i[b]) \land Ld_i[a]' \leq St_i[b]) \Rightarrow Ld_i[a]' \rightarrow St_i[b] \]

- Stores within branched blocks are dependent on branch conditionals:
  \[ (Op_i[a] \leq St_i[b]) \land Op_i[a] \rightarrow \text{condbranch} \leq St_i[b] \Rightarrow Op_i[a] \rightarrow St_i[b] \]
Happened-Before Model for Invalidate Queues

Thread A

\[
a = 1;
\]
\[
sfence();
\]
\[
b = 1;
\]

Thread B

\[
\text{while } (b \equiv 0) \{ \};
\]
\[
\text{assert}(a \equiv 1);
\]

Assume cache A contains: \(a: S0, b: E0\), cache B contains: \(a: S0, b: I\).
Explicit Synchronization: Read Barriers

Read accesses do not consult the invalidate queue.

- might read an out-of-date value
- need a way to establish sequential consistency between writes of other processors and local reads
- insert an explicit *read barrier* before the read access
  - a read barrier marks all entries in the invalidate queue
  - the next read operation is only executed once all marked invalidations have completed
- a read barrier *before* each read gives sequentially consistent read behavior (and is as slow as a system without invalidate queue)

.match each write barrier in one process with a read barrier in another process
Happened-Before Model for Read Barriers

Thread A

\[
a = 1; \\
sfence(); \\
b = 1;
\]

Thread B

\[
\text{while} (b == 0) 
\{ 
\}
\]
\[
\text{lfence(); assert(a == 1);}
\]
Example: The Dekker Algorithm on RMO Systems
Using Memory Barriers: the Dekker Algorithm

Mutual exclusion of two processes with busy waiting.

//flag[] is boolean array; and turn is an integer
flag[0] = false;
flag[1] = false;
turn = 0;  // or 1

P0:
flag[0] = true;
while (flag[1] == true)
  if (turn != 0) {
    flag[0] = false;
    while (turn != 0) {
      // busy wait
    }
    flag[0] = true;
  }
// critical section
turn = 1;
flag[0] = false;
Using Memory Barriers: the Dekker Algorithm

Mutual exclusion of \textit{two} processes with busy waiting.

//flag[] is boolean array; and turn is an integer
flag[0] = false;
flag[1] = false;
turn = 0;  // or 1

P0:
flag[0] = true;
while (flag[1] == true)
    if (turn != 0) {
        flag[0] = false;
        while (turn != 0) {
            // busy wait
        }
        flag[0] = true;
    }
// critical section
turn = 1;
flag[0] = false;

P1:
flag[1] = true;
while (flag[0] == true)
    if (turn != 1) {
        flag[1] = false;
        while (turn != 1) {
            // busy wait
        }
        flag[1] = true;
    }
// critical section
turn = 0;
flag[1] = false;
The Idea Behind Dekker

Communication via three variables:

- \( \text{flag}[i] == \text{true} \) process \( P_i \) wants to enter its critical section
- \( \text{turn} == i \) process \( P_i \) has priority when both want to enter

\[ \text{P0:} \]
```java
flag[0] = true;
while (flag[1] == true)
    if (turn != 0) {
        flag[0] = false;
        while (turn != 0) {
            // busy wait
        }
        flag[0] = true;
    }
// critical section
turn = 1;
flag[0] = false;
```

In process \( P_i \):

- if \( P_{i-1} \) does not want to enter, proceed immediately to the critical section
The Idea Behind Dekker
Communication via three variables:
- \( \text{flag}[i] == \text{true} \) process \( P_i \) wants to enter its critical section
- \( \text{turn} == i \) process \( P_i \) has priority when both want to enter

\begin{verbatim}
P0:
flag[0] = true;
while (flag[1] == true)
  if (turn != 0) {
    flag[0] = false;
    while (turn != 0) {
      // busy wait
    }
    flag[0] = true;
  }
// critical section
turn   = 1;
flag[0] = false;
\end{verbatim}

In process \( P_i \):
- if \( P_{1-i} \) does not want to enter, proceed immediately to the critical section
- \( \rightsquigarrow \) flag\[i\] is a lock and may be implemented as such
The Idea Behind Dekker

Communication via three variables:
- flag[i]==true process $P_i$ wants to enter its critical section
- turn==i process $P_i$ has priority when both want to enter

**P0:**

```java
flag[0] = true;
while (flag[1] == true) {
  if (turn != 0) {
    flag[0] = false;
    while (turn != 0) {
      // busy wait
    }
    flag[0] = true;
  }
}
// critical section
turn = 1;
flag[0] = false;
```

In process $P_i$:
- if $P_{1-i}$ does not want to enter, proceed immediately to the critical section

$\Rightarrow$ flag[i] is a lock and may be implemented as such
- if $P_{1-i}$ also wants to enter, wait for turn to be set to i
The Idea Behind Dekker
Communication via three variables:

- $\text{flag}[i] == \text{true}$ process $P_i$ wants to enter its critical section
- $\text{turn} == i$ process $P_i$ has priority when both want to enter

**P0:**
```plaintext
flag[0] = true;
while (flag[1] == true)
    if (turn != 0) {
        flag[0] = false;
        while (turn != 0) {
            // busy wait
        }
        flag[0] = true;
    }
// critical section
turn  = 1;
flag[0] = false;
```

In process $P_i$:
- if $P_{1-i}$ does not want to enter, proceed immediately to the critical section

$\implies$ flag[i] is a lock and may be implemented as such
- if $P_{1-i}$ also wants to enter, wait for turn to be set to $i$
- while waiting for turn, reset flag[i] to enable $P_{1-i}$ to progress
Dekker’s Algorithm and RMO

Problem: Dekker’s algorithm requires sequential consistency.
Idea: insert memory barriers between all variables common to both threads.
Dekker’s Algorithm and RMO

Problem: Dekker’s algorithm requires sequential consistency.
Idea: insert memory barriers between all variables common to both threads.

```c
P0:
flag[0] = true;
sfence();
while (lfence(), flag[1] == true)
    if (lfence(), turn != 0) {
        flag[0] = false;
sfence();
        while (lfence(), turn != 0) {
            // busy wait
        }
        flag[0] = true;
sfence();
    }
// critical section
turn = 1;
sfence();
flag[0] = false; sfence();
```

- insert a load memory barrier `lfence()` in front of every read from common variables
Problem: Dekker’s algorithm requires sequential consistency.
Idea: insert memory barriers between all variables common to both threads.

```c
P0:
flag[0] = true;
sfence();
while (lfence(), flag[1] == true) {
    if (lfence(), turn != 0) {
        flag[0] = false;
sfence();
        while (lfence(), turn != 0){
            // busy wait
        }
        flag[0] = true;
sfence();
    }
    // critical section
    turn = 1;
sfence();
    flag[0] = false; sfence();
}
```

- insert a load memory barrier `lfence()` in front of every read from common variables
- insert a write memory barrier `sfence()` after writing a variable that is read in the other thread
Problem: Dekker’s algorithm requires sequential consistency.
Idea: insert memory barriers between all variables common to both threads.

P0:
flag[0] = true;
sfence();
while (lfence(), flag[1] == true) {
    if (lfence(), turn != 0) {
        flag[0] = false;
sfence();
        while (lfence(), turn != 0) {
            // busy wait
        }
        flag[0] = true;
sfence();
    }
    // critical section
    turn = 1;
sfence();
    flag[0] = false; sfence();
}

- Insert a load memory barrier `lfence()` in front of every read from common variables.
- Insert a write memory barrier `sfence()` after writing a variable that is read in the other thread.
- The `lfence()` of the first iteration of each loop may be combined with the preceding `sfence()` to an `mfence()`.
Highly optimized CPUs may use a relaxed memory model:
- reads and writes are not synchronized unless requested by the user
- many kinds of memory barriers exist with subtle differences
  - ARM, PowerPC, Alpha, ia-64, even x86 (SSE Write Combining)

memory barriers are the “lowest-level” of synchronization
Memory barriers reside at the lowest level of synchronization primitives.

Discussion

Where are they useful?
when blocking should not de-schedule threads
when several processes implement automata and coordinate their transitions via common synchronized variables
communication protocol implementations
OS provides synchronization facilities based on memory barriers

Why might they not be appropriate?
difficult to get right, best suited for specific well-understood algorithms
often synchronization with locks is as fast and easier
too many fences are costly if store/invalidate buffers are bottleneck
Discussion

Memory barriers reside at the lowest level of synchronization primitives.

Where are they useful?
- when blocking should not de-schedule threads
- when several processes implement automata and coordinate their transitions via common synchronized variables
  ⇝ protocol implementations
  ⇝ OS provides synchronization facilities based on memory barriers

Why might they not be appropriate?
- difficult to get right, best suited for specific well-understood algorithms
- often synchronization with locks is as fast and easier
- too many fences are costly if store/invalidate buffers are bottleneck
Before Optimization

```c
int x = 0;
for (int i=0; i<100; i++){
    x = 1;
    printf("%d",x);
}
```
Memory Models and Compilers

Before Optimization

```c
int x = 0;
for (int i=0; i<100; i++){
    x = 1;
    printf("%d",x);
}
```

After Optimization

```c
int x = 1;
for (int i=0; i<100; i++){
    printf("%d",x);
}
```

Standard Program Optimizations

comprises *loop-invariant code motion* and *dead store elimination*, e.g.


Memory Models and Compilers

Before Optimization

```c
int x = 0;
for (int i=0; i<100; i++) {
    x = 1;
    printf("%d", x);
}
```

After Optimization

```c
int x = 1;
for (int i=0; i<100; i++) {
    printf("%d", x);
}
```

Standard Program Optimizations

comprises *loop-invariant code motion* and *dead store elimination*, e.g.

⚠️ having another thread executing `x = 0;` changes observable behaviour depending on optimizing or not

⇝ Compiler also depends on consistency guarantees
⇝ Demand for Memory Models on language level
Memory Models and C-Compilers

Keeping semantics I

```c
int x = 0;
for (int i=0; i<100; i++) {
    sfence();
    x = 1;
    printf("%d",x);
}
```

Java-Compilers even generate barriers around accesses to volatile variables.
Compilers may also reorder store instructions
Write barriers keep the compiler from reordering across
The specification of volatile keeps the C-Compiler from reordering memory accesses to this address
Compilers may also reorder store instructions

Write barriers keep the compiler from reordering across

The specification of `volatile` keeps the C-Compiler from reordering memory accesses to this address

Java-Compilers even generate barriers around accesses to `volatile` variables
Summary

Learning Outcomes

1. Strict Consistency
2. Happened-before Relation
3. Sequential Consistency
4. The MESI Cache Model
5. TSO: FIFO store buffers
6. PSO: store buffers
7. RMO: invalidate queues
8. Reestablishing Sequential Consistency with memory barriers
9. Dekker’s Algorithm for Mutual Exclusion
Many-Core Machines’ Read Responses congest the bus

In that case: Intel’s MESIF (Forward) to reduce communication overhead.

⚠️ But in general, Symmetric multi-processing (SMP) has its limits:

- a memory-intensive computation may cause contention on the bus
- the speed of the bus is limited since the electrical signal has to travel to all participants
- point-to-point connections are faster than a bus, but do not provide possibility of forming consensus
Many-Core Machines’ Read Responses congest the bus

In that case: Intel’s MESIF (Forward) to reduce communication overhead.

⚠️ But in general, Symmetric multi-processing (SMP) has its limits:

- a memory-intensive computation may cause contention on the bus
- the speed of the bus is limited since the electrical signal has to travel to all participants
- point-to-point connections are faster than a bus, but do not provide possibility of forming consensus

⇝ use a bus locally, use point-to-point links globally: NUMA
Many-Core Machines’ Read Responses congest the bus

In that case: Intel’s MESIF (Forward) to reduce communication overhead.

⚠️ But in general, Symmetric multi-processing (SMP) has its limits:
- a memory-intensive computation may cause contention on the bus
- the speed of the bus is limited since the electrical signal has to travel to all participants
- point-to-point connections are faster than a bus, but do not provide possibility of forming consensus

⇝ use a bus locally, use point-to-point links globally: NUMA
- *non-uniform memory access* partitions the memory amongst CPUs
- a directory states which CPU holds a memory region
- Interprocess communication between Cache-Controllers (*ccNUMA*): onchip on Opteron or in chipset on Itanium
Overhead of NUMA Systems

Communication overhead in a NUMA system.

- Processors in a NUMA system may be fully or partially connected.
- The directory of who stores an address is partitioned amongst processors.

A cache miss that cannot be satisfied by the local memory at $A$:

- $A$ sends a retrieve request to processor $B$ owning the directory
- $B$ tells the processor $C$ who holds the content
- $C$ sends data (or status) to $A$ and sends acknowledge to $B$
- $B$ completes transmission by an acknowledge to $A$

source: [Int09]
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Cache Coherence vs. Memory Consistency Models

- **Sequential Consistency** specifies that the system must appear to execute all threads’ loads and stores to *all memory locations* in a total order that respects the program order of each thread.

- A *cache coherent* system must appear to execute all threads’ loads and stores to a *single memory location* in a total order that respects the program order of each thread.

All discussed memory models (SC, TSO, PSO, RMO) provide cache coherence!
Programming Languages

Concurrency: Atomic Executions, Locks and Monitors

Dr. Michael Petter
Winter 2019
Why Memory Barriers are not Enough

Often, *multiple memory locations* may only be modified exclusively by one thread during a computation.

- use barriers to implement automata that ensure *mutual exclusion*

~~ generalize the re-occurring *concept* of enforcing mutual exclusion
Often, *multiple memory locations* may only be modified exclusively by one thread during a computation.

- Use barriers to implement automata that ensure *mutual exclusion*

 generalize the re-occurring *concept* of enforcing mutual exclusion

**Needed:** interaction with *multiple memory locations* within a *single step*:

\[
\begin{align*}
A & \quad a=1, b=1 \\
a & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \\
b & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad
\end{align*}
\]
Atomic Executions

A concurrent program consists of several threads that share resources:

- resources can be memory locations or memory mapped I/O
  - a file can be modified through a shared handle, e.g.
- usually invariants must be retained wrt. resources
  - e.g. a head and tail pointer must delimit a linked list
  - an invariant may span multiple resources
  - during an update, the invariant may be temporarily locally broken

~⇒ multiple resources must be updated together to ensure the invariant
Atomic Executions

A concurrent program consists of several threads that share resources:
- resources can be *memory locations* or *memory mapped I/O*
  - a file can be modified through a shared handle, e.g.
- usually *invariants* must be retained wrt. resources
  - e.g. a head and tail pointer must delimit a linked list
  - an invariant may span *multiple* resources
  - during an update, the invariant may be temporarily *locally broken*

⇒ multiple resources must be updated together to ensure the invariant

Ideally, a sequence of operations that update shared resources should be *atomic* [Harris et al.(2010)Harris, Larus, and Rajwar]. This would ensure that the invariant never seems to be broken.
Atomic Executions

A concurrent program consists of several threads that share resources:
- resources can be memory locations or memory mapped I/O
  - a file can be modified through a shared handle, e.g.
- usually invariants must be retained wrt. resources
  - e.g. a head and tail pointer must delimit a linked list
  - an invariant may span multiple resources
  - during an update, the invariant may be temporarily locally broken

⇒ multiple resources must be updated together to ensure the invariant

Ideally, a sequence of operations that update shared resources should be atomic [Harris et al.(2010)Harris, Larus, and Rajwar]. This would ensure that the invariant never seems to be broken.

Definition (Atomic Execution)

A computation forms an atomic execution if its effect can only be observed as a single transformation on the memory.
Overview

We will address the *established* ways of managing synchronization. The presented techniques
- are available on most platforms
- likely to be found in most existing (concurrent) software
- provide solutions to common concurrency tasks
- are the source of common concurrency problems

The techniques are applicable to C, C++ (pthread), Java, C# and other imperative languages.

Learning Outcomes

1. Principle of Atomic Executions
2. Wait-Free Algorithms based on Atomic Operations
3. Locks: Mutex, Semaphore, and Monitor
4. Deadlocks: Concept and Prevention
Overview
We will address the *established* ways of managing synchronization. The presented techniques

- are available on most platforms
- likely to be found in most existing (concurrent) software
- provide solutions to common concurrency tasks
- are the source of common concurrency problems

The techniques are applicable to C, C++ (pthreads), Java, C# and other imperative languages.

Learning Outcomes

1. Principle of Atomic Executions
2. Wait-Free Algorithms based on Atomic Operations
3. Locks: Mutex, Semaphore, and Monitor
4. Deadlocks: Concept and Prevention
Wait-Free Atomic Executions
Wait-Free Updates

Which operations on a CPU are atomic? (j, k and tmp are registers)

Program 1
i++;

Program 2
j = i;
i = i+k;

Program 3
int tmp = i;
i = j;
j = tmp;
### Wait-Free Updates

Which operations on a CPU are atomic? (\(j,k\) and \(tmp\) are registers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program 1</th>
<th>Program 2</th>
<th>Program 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i++;)</td>
<td>(j = i;) (i = i+k;)</td>
<td>(\text{int}\ tmp = i;) (i = j;) (j = tmp;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answer:**

- none by default (even without store and invalidate buffers, *why?*)
Wait-Free Updates

Which operations on a CPU are atomic? (j, k and tmp are registers)

Program 1
i++;

Program 2
j = i;
i = i+k;

Program 3
int tmp = i;
i = j;
j = tmp;

Answer:
● none by default (even without store and invalidate buffers, \textit{why}?)

\textbf{⚠️} The load and store (even i++’s) may be interleaved with a store from another processor.
**Wait-Free Updates**

Which operations on a CPU are atomic? (j, k and tmp are registers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program 1</th>
<th>Program 2</th>
<th>Program 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>i++;</code></td>
<td><code>j = i;</code></td>
<td><code>int tmp = i;</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answer:**
- none by default (even without store and invalidate buffers, *why?*)

⚠️ The load and store (even `i++`'s) may be interleaved with a store from another processor.

All of the programs *can* be made atomic executions (e.g. on x86):
- `i` must be in memory
- **Idea:** *lock the cache bus* for an address for the duration of an instruction
Wait-Free Updates

Which operations on a CPU are atomic? (j,k and tmp are registers)

Program 1
i++;

Program 2
j = i;
i = i+k;

Program 3
int tmp = i;
i = j;
j = tmp;

Answer:
- none by default (even without store and invalidate buffers, why?)
- The load and store (even i++’s) may be interleaved with a store from another processor.

All of the programs can be made atomic executions (e.g. on x86):
- i must be in memory
- Idea: lock the cache bus for an address for the duration of an instruction

Program 1
lock inc [addr_i]

Program 2 (fetch-and-add)
mov eax,reg_k
lock xadd [addr_i],eax
mov reg_j,eax

Program 3 (atomic-exchange)
lock xchg [addr_i],reg_j
Garbage collectors often use a *bumper pointer* to allocate memory:

**Bumper Pointer Allocation**

```c
char heap[1<<20];
char* firstFree = &heap[0];

char* alloc(int size) {
    char* start = firstFree;
    firstFree = firstFree + size;

    if (start+size>sizeof(heap)) garbage_collect();
    return start;
}
```

- `firstFree` points to the first unused byte
- each allocation reserves the next `size` bytes in `heap`
Wait-Free Bumper-Pointer Allocation

Garbage collectors often use a *bumper pointer* to allocate memory:

**Bumper Pointer Allocation**

```c
char heap[1<<20];
char* firstFree = &heap[0];

char* alloc(int size) {
    char* start;
    asm("lock; xadd %0, %1" : "=r"(start),"=m"(firstFree):
        "0"(size),"m"(firstFree) : "memory");
    if (start+size>sizeof(heap)) garbage_collect();
    return start;
}
```

- *firstFree* points to the first unused byte
- each allocation reserves the next *size* bytes in *heap*

Thread-safe implementation:
- *alloc*’s core functionality matches Program 2: fetch-and-add
- inline assembler (GCC/AT&T syntax in the example)
Marking Statements as Atomic

Rather than writing assembler: use *made-up* keyword `atomic`:

**Program 1**

```c
atomic {
    i++;
}
```

**Program 2**

```c
atomic {
    j = i;
    i = i+k;
}
```

**Program 3**

```c
atomic {
    int tmp = i;
    i = j;
    j = tmp;
}
```
Marking Statements as Atomic

Rather than writing assembler: use *made-up* keyword `atomic`:

Program 1
```plaintext
atomic {
    i++;
}
```

Program 2
```plaintext
atomic {
    j = i;
    i = i+k;
}
```

Program 3
```plaintext
atomic {
    int tmp = i;
    i = j;
    j = tmp;
}
```

The statements in an `atomic` block execute as *atomic execution*:

![Diagram showing atomic execution](attachment://atomic_diagram.png)
Marking Statements as Atomic

Rather than writing assembler: use made-up keyword `atomic`:

**Program 1**

```
atomic {
    i++;
}
```

**Program 2**

```
atomic {
    j = i;
    i = i+k;
}
```

**Program 3**

```
atomic {
    int tmp = i;
    i = j;
    j = tmp;
}
```

The statements in an `atomic` block execute as `atomic execution`:

- `atomic` only translatable when a corresponding atomic CPU instruction exist
- the notion of requesting `atomic execution` is a general concept
Wait-Free Synchronization

Wait-Free algorithms are limited to a single instruction:

- no control flow possible, no behavioral change depending on data
- often, there are instructions that execute an operation conditionally

Program 4
atomic {
    r = b;
    b = 0;
}

Program 5
atomic {
    r = b;
    b = 1;
}

Program 6
atomic {
    r = (k==i);
    if (r) i = j;
}

Operations **update** a memory cell and **return** the previous value.

- the first two operations can be seen as setting a flag $b$ to $v \in \{0, 1\}$ and returning its previous state.
  - the operation implementing programs 4 and 5 is called **set-and-test**
- the third case generalizes this to setting a variable $i$ to the value of $j$, if $i$’s old value is equal to $k$’s.
  - the operation implementing program 6 is called **compare-and-swap**
Wait-Free Synchronization

Wait-Free algorithms are limited to a single instruction:
- no control flow possible, no behavioral change depending on data
- often, there are instructions that execute an operation conditionally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| atomic {
  r = b;
  b = 0;
}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| atomic {
  r = b;
  b = 1;
}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| atomic {
  r = (k==i);
  if (r) i = j;
}

Operations update a memory cell and return the previous value.
- the first two operations can be seen as setting a flag \( b \) to \( v \in \{0, 1\} \) and returning its previous state.
  - the operation implementing programs 4 and 5 is called set-and-test
- the third case generalizes this to setting a variable \( i \) to the value of \( j \), if \( i \)'s old value is equal to \( k \)'s.
  - the operation implementing program 6 is called compare-and-swap

\( \leadsto \) use as building blocks for algorithms that can fail
Lock-Free Algorithms
Lock-Free Algorithms

If a wait-free implementation is not possible, a lock-free implementation might still be viable.
Lock-Free Algorithms

If a *wait-free* implementation is not possible, a *lock-free* implementation might still be viable.

Common usage pattern for *compare and swap*:
1. read the initial value in $i$ into $k$ (using memory barriers)
2. compute a new value $j = f(k)$
3. update $i$ to $j$ if $i = k$ still holds
4. go to first step if $i \neq k$ meanwhile
Lock-Free Algorithms

If a *wait-free* implementation is not possible, a *lock-free* implementation might still be viable.

Common usage pattern for *compare and swap*:

1. read the initial value in $i$ into $k$ (using memory barriers)
2. compute a new value $j = f(k)$
3. update $i$ to $j$ if $i = k$ still holds
4. go to first step if $i \neq k$ meanwhile

⚠️ note: $i = k$ must imply that no thread has updated $i$
Lock-Free Algorithms

If a \textit{wait-free} implementation is not possible, a \textit{lock-free} implementation might still be viable.

Common usage pattern for \textit{compare and swap}:

1. read the initial value in $i$ into $k$ (using memory barriers)
2. compute a new value $j = f(k)$
3. update $i$ to $j$ if $i = k$ still holds
4. go to first step if $i \neq k$ meanwhile

⚠ note: $i = k$ must imply that no thread has updated $i$

General recipe for \textit{lock-free} algorithms

- given a compare-and-swap operation for $n$ bytes
- try to group variables for which an invariant must hold into $n$ bytes
- read these bytes atomically
- compute a new value
- perform a compare-and-swap operation on these $n$ bytes
Lock-Free Algorithms

If a wait-free implementation is not possible, a lock-free implementation might still be viable.

Common usage pattern for compare and swap:
1. read the initial value in $i$ into $k$ (using memory barriers)
2. compute a new value $j = f(k)$
3. update $i$ to $j$ if $i = k$ still holds
4. go to first step if $i \neq k$ meanwhile

⚠️ note: $i = k$ must imply that no thread has updated $i$

General recipe for lock-free algorithms

- given a compare-and-swap operation for $n$ bytes
- try to group variables for which an invariant must hold into $n$ bytes
- read these bytes atomically
- compute a new value
- perform a compare-and-swap operation on these $n$ bytes

⇝ computing new value must be repeatable or pure
Limitations of Wait- and Lock-Free Algorithms

Wait-/Lock-Free algorithms are severely limited in terms of their computation:

- restricted to the semantics of a *single* atomic operation
- set of atomic operations is architecture specific, but often includes
  - exchange of a memory cell with a register
  - compare-and-swap of a register with a memory cell
  - fetch-and-add on integers in memory
  - modify-and-test on bits in memory
- provided instructions usually allow only one memory operand
Limitations of Wait- and Lock-Free Algorithms

Wait-/Lock-Free algorithms are severely limited in terms of their computation:

- restricted to the semantics of a single atomic operation
- set of atomic operations is architecture specific, but often includes
  - exchange of a memory cell with a register
  - compare-and-swap of a register with a memory cell
  - fetch-and-add on integers in memory
  - modify-and-test on bits in memory
- provided instructions usually allow only one memory operand

⇝ Lock-Free instructions as building blocks for Locks
Locked Atomic Executions
A lock is a data structure that
- can be *acquired* and *released*
- ensures *mutual exclusion*: only one thread may hold the lock at a time
- *blocks* other threads attempts to acquire while held by a different thread
- protects a *critical section*: a piece of code that may produce incorrect results when entered concurrently from several threads

⚠️ may *deadlock* the program
Semaphores and Mutexes

A (counting) *semaphore* is an integer $s$ with the following operations:

```c
void signal(int *s) {
    atomic {
        *s = *s + 1;
    }
}
```

```c
void wait(int *s) {
    bool avail;
    do {
        atomic {
            avail = *s>0;
            if (avail) (*s)--;
        }
    } while (!avail);
}
```

A counting semaphore can track how many resources are still available. A thread acquiring a resource executes `wait()` if a resource is still available; `wait()` returns once a thread finishes using a resource, it calls `signal()` to release. Special case: initializing with $s=1$ gives a binary semaphore: can be used to block and unblock a thread, can be used to protect a single resource. In this case the data structure is also called mutex.
A (counting) *semaphore* is an integer \( s \) with the following operations:

```c
void signal(int *s) {
    atomic { *s = *s + 1; }
}

void wait(int *s) {
    bool avail;
    do {
        atomic {
            avail = *s>0;
            if (avail) (*s)--;
        }
    } while (!avail);
}
```

A counting semaphore can track how many resources are still available.

- a thread *acquiring* a resource executes `wait()`
- if a resource is still available, `wait()` returns
- once a thread finishes using a resource, it calls `signal()` to *release*
Semaphores and Mutexes

A (counting) **semaphore** is an integer $s$ with the following operations:

```c
void signal(int *s) {
atomic {
    *s = *s + 1;
}
}
```

```c
void wait(int *s) {
    bool avail;
    do {
        atomic {
            avail = *s>0;
            if (avail) (*s)--;  
        }
    } while (!avail);
}
```

A counting semaphore can track how many resources are still available.

- a thread **acquiring** a resource executes `wait()`
- if a resource is still available, `wait()` returns
- once a thread finishes using a resource, it calls `signal()` to **release**

Special case: initializing with $s = 1$ gives a **binary** semaphore:

- can be used to block and unblock a thread
- can be used to protect a single resource

$\rightarrow$ in this case the data structure is also called **mutex**
A semaphore does not have to wait busily:

```c
void signal(int *s) {
    atomic { *s = *s + 1; }
    wake(s);
}

void wait(int *s) {
    bool avail;
    do {
        atomic {
            avail = *s>0;
            if (avail) (*s)--;
        }
        if (!avail) de_schedule(s);
    } while (!avail);
}
```

Busy waiting is avoided: a thread failing to decrease *s executes de_schedule() which enters the operating system and inserts the current thread into a queue of threads that will be woken up when *s becomes non-zero, usually by monitoring writes to s. Once a thread calls wake(s), the first thread waiting on s is extracted and the operating system lets it return from its call to de_schedule().
Implementation of Semaphores

A semaphore does not have to wait busily:

```c
void signal(int *s) {
    atomic { *s = *s + 1; }
    wake(s);
}

void wait(int *s) {
    bool avail;
    do {
        atomic {
            avail = *s>0;
            if (avail) (*s)--;
        }
        if (!avail) de_schedule(s);
    } while (!avail);
}
```

Busy waiting is avoided:
- a thread failing to decrease *s executes `de_schedule()`
- `de_schedule()` enters the operating system and inserts the current thread into a queue of threads that will be woken up when *s becomes non-zero, usually by monitoring writes to s (⇝ FUTEX_WAIT)
- once a thread calls `wake(s)`, the first thread t waiting on s is extracted
- the operating system lets t return from its call to `de_schedule()`
Practical Implementation of Semaphores

Certain optimisations are possible:

```c
void signal(int *s) {
    atomic { *s = *s + 1; }
    wake(s);
}
```

```c
void wait(int *s) {
    bool avail;
    do {
        atomic {
            avail = *s>0;
            if (avail) (*s)--;  // critical section
        }
        if (!avail) de_schedule(s);
    } while (!avail);
}
```

In general, the implementation is more complicated

- `wait()` may busy wait for a few iterations
  - avoids de-scheduling if the lock is released frequently
  - better throughput for semaphores that are held for a short time

- `wake(s)` informs the scheduler that `s` has been written to
Practical Implementation of Semaphores

Certain optimisations are possible:

```c
void signal(int *s) {
    atomic { *s = *s + 1; }
    wake(s);
}
```

```c
void wait(int *s) {
    bool avail;
    do {
        atomic {
            avail = *s>0;
            if (avail) (*s)--;
        }
        if (!avail) de_schedule(s);
    } while (!avail);
}
```

In general, the implementation is more complicated

- `wait()` may busy wait for a few iterations
  - avoids de-scheduling if the lock is released frequently
  - better throughput for semaphores that are held for a short time

- `wake(s)` informs the scheduler that `s` has been written to

\[ \Rightarrow \] using a semaphore with a single core reduces to

```c
if (*s) (*s)--; /* critical section */ (*s)++;
```
One common use of semaphores is to guarantee mutual exclusion. In this case, a binary semaphore is also called a *mutex*.  

E.g. add a lock to the double-ended queue data structure.

⚠️ decide what needs protection and what not.
Often, a data structure can be made thread-safe by
- acquiring a lock upon entering a function of the data structure
- releasing the lock upon exit from this function
Monitors: An Automatic, Re-entrant Mutex

Often, a data structure can be made thread-safe by

- **acquiring** a lock upon **entering** a function of the data structure
- **releasing** the lock upon **exit** from this function

Locking each procedure body that accesses a data structure:

1. is a re-occurring pattern, should be generalized
2. becomes problematic in recursive calls: it blocks

**E.g.** a thread $t$ waits for a data structure to be filled

- $t$ will call `pop()` and obtain $-1$
- $t$ then has to call again, until an element is available
- $t$ is busy waiting and produces contention on the lock ▲
Monitors: An Automatic, Re-entrant Mutex

Often, a data structure can be made thread-safe by

- **acquiring** a lock upon **entering** a function of the data structure
- **releasing** the lock upon **exit** from this function

Locking each procedure body that accesses a data structure:

1. is a re-occurring pattern, should be generalized
2. becomes problematic in recursive calls: it blocks

**E.g.** a thread \( t \) waits for a data structure to be filled

- \( t \) will call \( \text{pop()} \) and obtain \(-1\)
- \( t \) then has to call again, until an element is available
- \( \sim \) \( t \) is busy waiting and produces contention on the lock 😨

**Monitor**: a mechanism to address these problems:

1. a procedure associated with a monitor acquires a lock on entry and releases it on exit
2. if that lock is already taken by the current thread, proceed
Monitors: An Automatic, Re-entrant Mutex

Often, a data structure can be made thread-safe by

- *acquiring* a lock upon *entering* a function of the data structure
- *releasing* the lock upon *exit* from this function

Locking each procedure body that accesses a data structure:

1. is a re-occurring pattern, should be generalized
2. becomes problematic in recursive calls: it blocks

*E.g.* a thread $t$ waits for a data structure to be filled

- $t$ will call $\text{pop()}$ and obtain $-1$
- $t$ then has to call again, until an element is available

$\Rightarrow$ $t$ is busy waiting and produces contention on the lock ⚠

*Monitor*: a mechanism to address these problems:

1. a procedure associated with a monitor acquires a lock on entry and releases it on exit
2. if that lock is already taken by the current thread, proceed

$\Rightarrow$ we need a way to release the lock after the return of the last recursive call
Implementation of a Basic Monitor

A monitor contains a semaphore **count** and the id **tid** of the occupying thread:

```c
typedef struct monitor mon_t;
struct monitor { int tid; int count; };
void monitor_init(mon_t* m) { memset(m, 0, sizeof(mon_t)); }
```

Define `monitor_enter` and `monitor_leave`:

- Ensure mutual exclusion of accesses to `mon`
- Track how many times we called a monitored procedure recursively

```c
void monitor_enter(mon_t *m) {
    bool mine = false;
    while (!mine) {
        mine = thread_id()==m->tid;
        if (mine) m->count++;
        else atomic {
            if (m->tid==0) {
                m->tid = thread_id();
                mine = true; m->count=1;
            };
        };
        if (!mine) de_schedule(&m->tid);
    } }
```

```c
void monitor_leave(mon_t *m) {
    m->count--;
    if (m->count==0) {
        atomic {
            m->tid=0;
        }
        wake(&m->tid);
    }
}
```
Implementation of a Basic Monitor

A monitor contains a semaphore **count** and the id **tid** of the occupying thread:

```c
typedef struct monitor mon_t;
struct monitor { int tid; int count; };
void monitor_init(mon_t* m) { memset(m, 0, sizeof(mon_t)); }
```

Define **monitor_enter** and **monitor_leave**:

- ensure mutual exclusion of accesses to **mon**
- track how many times we called a monitored procedure recursively

```c
void monitor_enter(mon_t *m) {
    bool mine = false;
    while (!mine) {
        mine = thread_id()==m->tid;
        if (mine) m->count++; else
            atomic {
                if (m->tid==0) {
                    m->tid = thread_id();
                    mine = true; m->count=1;
                }
            }
        if (!mine) de_schedule(&m->tid);
    }
}

void monitor_leave(mon_t *m) {
    m->count--;
    if (m->count==0) {
        atomic {
            m->tid=0;
        }
        wake(&m->tid);
    }
}
```
Condition Variables

✓ Monitors simplify the construction of thread-safe resources.

Still: Efficiency problem when using resource to synchronize:

E.g. a thread $t$ waits for a data structure to be filled:

- $t$ will call $\text{pop()}$ and obtain $-1$
- $t$ then has to call again, until an element is available
- $t$ is busy waiting and produces contention on the lock
**Condition Variables**

✓ Monitors simplify the construction of thread-safe resources.

Still: Efficiency problem when using resource to synchronize:

E.g. a thread $t$ waits for a data structure to be filled:

- $t$ will call `pop()` and obtain -1
- $t$ then has to call again, until an element is available

$\Rightarrow$ $t$ is busy waiting and produces contention on the lock

Idea: create a *condition variable* on which to block while waiting:

```c
struct monitor { int tid; int count; int cond; int cond2;... };
```
Condition Variables

✓ Monitors simplify the construction of thread-safe resources.

Still: Efficiency problem when using resource to synchronize:

E.g. a thread $t$ waits for a data structure to be filled:

- $t$ will call `pop()` and obtain `-1`
- $t$ then has to call again, until an element is available
- $t$ is busy waiting and produces contention on the lock

Idea: create a **condition variable** on which to block while waiting:

```c
struct monitor { int tid; int count; int cond; int cond2;... }
```

Define these two functions:

1. **wait** for the condition to become true
   - called while being **inside** the monitor
   - temporarily **releases** the monitor and blocks
   - when **signalled**, re-acquires the monitor and returns

2. **signal** waiting threads that they may be able to proceed
   - one/all waiting threads that called **wait** will be woken up, two possibilities:
     - **signal-and-urgent-wait**: the signalling thread suspends and continues once the signalled thread has released the monitor
     - **signal-and-continue**: the signalling thread continues, any signalled thread enters when the monitor becomes available
Signal-And-Urgent-Wait Semantics

Requires one queue for each condition $c$ and a suspended queue $s$:

- A thread who tries to enter a monitor is added to queue $e$ if the monitor is occupied.
- A call to `wait` on condition $a$ adds thread to the queue $a.q$.
- A call to `signal` for $a$ adds thread to queue $s$ (suspended).
- One thread from the $a$ queue is woken up.
- `signal` on $a$ is a no-op if $a.q$ is empty.
- If a thread leaves, it wakes up one thread waiting on $s$.
- If $s$ is empty, it wakes up one thread from $e$.

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monitor_(synchronization)
Signal-And-Urgent-Wait Semantics

Requires one queue for each condition $c$ and a suspended queue $s$:

- A thread who tries to enter a monitor is added to queue $e$ if the monitor is occupied.
- A call to `wait` on condition $a$ adds the thread to the queue $a.q$.
- A call to `signal` for $a$ adds the thread to the queue $s$ (suspended).
- One thread from the $a$ queue is woken up.
- `signal` on $a$ is a no-op if $a.q$ is empty.
- If a thread leaves, it wakes up one thread waiting on $s$.
- If $s$ is empty, it wakes up one thread from $e$.

$\downarrow$ Queue $s$ has priority over $e$.

Signal-And-Continue Semantics

Here, the signal function is usually called notify.

- a call to wait on condition \(a\) adds a thread to the queue \(a.q\)
- a call to notify for \(a\) adds one thread from \(a.q\) to \(e\) (unless \(a.q\) is empty)
- if a thread leaves, it wakes up one thread waiting on \(e\)
Signal-And-Continue Semantics

Here, the signal function is usually called \textit{notify}.

- a call to \texttt{wait} on condition \texttt{a} adds thread to the queue \texttt{a.q}
- a call to \texttt{notify} for \texttt{a} adds one thread from \texttt{a.q} to \texttt{e} (unless \texttt{a.q} is empty)
- if a thread leaves, it wakes up one thread waiting on \texttt{e}

\[\rightsquigarrow\text{signalled threads compete for the monitor}\]

- assuming FIFO ordering on \texttt{e}, threads who tried to enter between \texttt{wait} and \texttt{notify} will run first
- need additional queue \texttt{s} if waiting threads should have priority
Implementing Condition Variables

We implement the simpler *signal-and-continue* semantics for a single condition variable:

A notified thread is simply woken up and competes for the monitor.

```c
void cond_wait(mon_t *m) {
    assert(m->tid==thread_id());
    int old_count = m->count;
    m->tid = 0;
    wait(&m->cond);
    bool next_to_enter;
    do {
        atomic {
            next_to_enter = m->tid==0;
            if (next_to_enter) {
                m->tid = thread_id();
                m->count = old_count;
            }
        }
        if (!next_to_enter) de_schedule(&m->tid);
    } while (!next_to_enter);
}

void cond_notify(mon_t *m) {
    // wake up other threads
    signal(&m->cond);
}
```
A Note on Notify

With *signal-and-continue* semantics, two notify functions exist:

1. **notify**: wakes up exactly one thread waiting on condition variable
2. **notifyAll**: wakes up all threads waiting on a condition variable
A Note on Notify

With *signal-and-continue* semantics, two notify functions exist:

1. **notify**: wakes up exactly one thread waiting on condition variable
2. **notifyAll**: wakes up all threads waiting on a condition variable

⚠️ an implementation often becomes easier if *notify* means *notify some*

⇝ programmer should assume that thread is not the only one woken up
Monitors with a single condition variable are built into *Java* and *C#*:

```java
class C {
    public synchronized void f() {
        // body of f
    }
}
```

is equivalent to

```java
class C {
    public void f() {
        monitor_enter(this);
        // body of f
        monitor_leave(this);
    }
}
```

with *Object* containing:

```java
private int mon_var;
private int mon_count;
private int cond_var;
protected void monitor_enter();
protected void monitor_leave();
```

Deadlocks
### Definition (Deadlock)

A deadlock is a situation in which two processes are waiting for the respective other to finish, and thus neither ever does.

(The definition generalizes to a set of actions with a cyclic dependency.)
Definition (Deadlock)
A deadlock is a situation in which two processes are waiting for the respective other to finish, and thus neither ever does.

(The definition generalizes to a set of actions with a cyclic dependency.)

Consider this Java class:

```java
class Foo {
    public Foo other = null;
    public synchronized void bar() {
        ... if (*) other.bar(); ...
    }
}
```

and two instances:

```java
Foo a = new Foo(), b = new Foo();
a.other = b; b.other = a;
// in parallel:
a.bar() || b.bar();
```

Sequence leading to a deadlock:
- threads A and B execute `a.bar()` and `b.bar()`
- `a.bar()` acquires the monitor of `a`
- `b.bar()` acquires the monitor of `b`
- A happens to execute `other.bar()`
- A blocks on the monitor of `b`
- B happens to execute `other.bar()`
- ⇝ both `block` indefinitely
Deadlocks with Monitors

Definition (Deadlock)

A deadlock is a situation in which two processes are waiting for the respective other to finish, and thus neither ever does.

(The definition generalizes to a set of actions with a cyclic dependency.)

Consider this Java class:

```java
class Foo {
    public Foo other = null;
    public synchronized void bar() {
        ... if (*) other.bar(); ... }
}
```

and two instances:

```java
Foo a = new Foo(), b = new Foo();
a.other = b; b.other = a;
// in parallel:
a.bar() || b.bar();
```

Sequence leading to a deadlock:

- threads $A$ and $B$ execute `a.bar()` and `b.bar()`
- `a.bar()` acquires the monitor of $a$
- `b.bar()` acquires the monitor of $b$
- $A$ happens to execute `other.bar()`
- $A$ blocks on the monitor of $b$
- $B$ happens to execute `other.bar()`
- $B$ blocks on the monitor of $a$

$\implies$ both block indefinitely

How can this situation be avoided?
Treatment of Deadlocks

Observation: Deadlocks occur if the following four conditions hold [Coffman et al. (1971) Coffman, Elphick, and Shoshani]:

1. **mutual exclusion**: processes require exclusive access
2. **wait for**: a process holds resources while waiting for more
3. **no preemption**: resources cannot be taken away from processes
4. **circular wait**: waiting processes form a cycle

The occurrence of deadlocks can be:

1. **ignored**: for the lack of better approaches, can be reasonable if deadlocks are rare
2. **detection**: check within OS for a cycle, requires ability to preempt
3. **prevention**: design programs to be deadlock-free
4. **avoidance**: use additional information about a program that allows the OS to schedule threads so that they do not deadlock

⇝ prevention is the only safe approach on standard operating systems can be achieved using lock-free algorithms but what about algorithms that require locking?
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Treatment of Deadlocks

Observation: Deadlocks occur if the following four conditions hold [Coffman et al. (1971)]:

1. **mutual exclusion**: processes require exclusive access
2. **wait for**: a process holds resources while waiting for more
3. **no preemption**: resources cannot be taken away from processes
4. **circular wait**: waiting processes form a cycle

The occurrence of deadlocks can be:

1. **ignored**: for the lack of better approaches, can be reasonable if deadlocks are rare
2. **detection**: check within OS for a cycle, requires ability to preempt
3. **prevention**: design programs to be deadlock-free
4. **avoidance**: use additional information about a program that allows the OS to schedule threads so that they do not deadlock

~ prevention is the only safe approach on standard operating systems

- can be achieved using lock-free algorithms
- but what about algorithms that require locking?
Deadlock Prevention through Partial Order

Observation: A cycle cannot occur if locks are *partially ordered*.

**Definition (lock sets)**

Let $L$ denote the set of locks. We call $\lambda(p) \subseteq L$ the lock set at $p$, i.e. the set of locks that may be in the “acquired” state at program point $p$. 

Each time a lock is acquired, we track the lock set at $p$:

**Definition (lock order)**

Define $\lhd \subseteq L \times L$ such that $l \lhd l'$ iff $l \in \lambda(p)$ and the statement at $p$ is of the form $\text{wait}(l')$ or $\text{monitor enter}(l')$. Define the lock order $\prec = \lhd +$. 

Deadlock Prevention through Partial Order

Observation: A cycle cannot occur if locks are partially ordered.

Definition (lock sets)
Let $L$ denote the set of locks. We call $\lambda(p) \subseteq L$ the lock set at $p$, i.e. the set of locks that may be in the “acquired” state at program point $p$.

We require the transitive closure $\sigma^+$ of a relation $\sigma$:

Definition (transitive closure)
Let $\sigma \subseteq X \times X$ be a relation. Its transitive closure is $\sigma^+ = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma^i$ where

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma^0 &= \sigma \\
\sigma^{i+1} &= \left\{ \langle x_1, x_3 \rangle \mid \exists x_2 \in X : \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \in \sigma^i \land \langle x_2, x_3 \rangle \in \sigma^i \right\} \cup \sigma^i
\end{align*}
\]
Deadlock Prevention through Partial Order

Observation: A cycle cannot occur if locks are *partially ordered*.

**Definition (lock sets)**

Let $L$ denote the set of locks. We call $\lambda(p) \subseteq L$ the lock set at $p$, i.e. the set of locks that may be in the “acquired” state at program point $p$.

We require the transitive closure $\sigma^+$ of a relation $\sigma$:

**Definition (transitive closure)**

Let $\sigma \subseteq X \times X$ be a relation. Its transitive closure is $\sigma^+ = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma^i$ where

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma^0 &= \sigma \\
\sigma^{i+1} &= \{ \langle x_1, x_3 \rangle \mid \exists x_2 \in X. \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \in \sigma^i \land \langle x_2, x_3 \rangle \in \sigma^i \} \cup \sigma^i
\end{align*}
\]

Each time a lock is acquired, we track the lock set at $p$:

**Definition (lock order)**

Define $\triangleleft \subseteq L \times L$ such that $l \triangleleft l'$ iff $l \in \lambda(p)$ and the statement at $p$ is of the form `wait(l')` or `monitor_enter(l')`. Define the lock order $\prec = \triangleleft^+$. 
Freedom of Deadlock

The following holds for a program with mutexes and monitors:

**Theorem (freedom of deadlock)**

If there exists no \( a \in L \) with \( a \prec a \) then the program is free of deadlocks.
Freedom of Deadlock

The following holds for a program with mutexes and monitors:

Theorem (freedom of deadlock)

If there exists no $a \in L$ with $a \prec a$ then the program is free of deadlocks.

Suppose a program blocks on semaphores (mutexes) $L_S$ and on monitors $L_M$ such that $L = L_S \cup L_M$.

Theorem (freedom of deadlock for monitors)

If $\forall a \in L_S. a \not\prec a$ and $\forall a \in L_M, b \in L. a \prec b \land b \prec a \Rightarrow a = b$ then the program is free of deadlocks.
**Freedom of Deadlock**

The following holds for a program with mutexes and monitors:

**Theorem (freedom of deadlock)**

*If there exists no* \( a \in L \) *with* \( a \prec a \) *then the program is free of deadlocks.*

Suppose a program blocks on semaphores (mutexes) \( L_S \) and on monitors \( L_M \) such that \( L = L_S \cup L_M \).

**Theorem (freedom of deadlock for monitors)**

*If* \( \forall a \in L_S. a \not\prec a \) *and* \( \forall a \in L_M, b \in L. a \prec b \land b \prec a \Rightarrow a = b \) *then the program is free of deadlocks.*

**Note:** the set \( L \) contains *instances* of a lock.

- the set of lock instances can vary at runtime
- if we statically want to ensure that deadlocks cannot occur:
  - summarize every lock/monitor that may have several instances into one
  - a summary lock/monitor \( \bar{a} \in L_M \) represents several concrete ones
  - thus, if \( \bar{a} \prec \bar{a} \) then this might not be a self-cycle
  - require that \( \bar{a} \not\prec \bar{a} \) for all summarized monitors \( \bar{a} \in L_M \)
Inferring locksets and lockset order in practice

⚠️ fix a representation for locksets

⇝ in our case: $L$ comprises all lines, where any object is created.

```
0:  Foo  a = new Foo();
1:  Foo  b = new Foo();
2:   a.other = b;
3:   b.other = a;
4: 
5: 
6:   bar(&a); || bar(&b);
7: 
8:  void bar(this) { 
9:    monitor_enter(this);
10:   if (*) {
11:      ...
12:      bar(&other);
13:      ...
14:    } 
15:    monitor_leave(this);
16: } 
```
Inferring locksets and lockset order in practice

⚠️ fix a representation for locksets

⇝ in our case: \( L \) comprises all lines, where any object is created.

\[
\begin{align*}
0: \quad & \text{Foo } a = \text{new } \text{Foo}(); \\
1: \quad & \text{Foo } b = \text{new } \text{Foo}(); \\
2: \quad & a.\text{other} = b; \\
3: \quad & b.\text{other} = a; \\
4: \quad & \text{bar}(&a); \mid \mid \text{bar}(&b); \\
5: \quad & \\
6: \quad & \text{bar}(&a); \mid \mid \text{bar}(&b); \\
7: \quad & \\
8: \quad & \text{void } \text{bar}(\text{this})\{ \\
9: \quad & \quad \text{monitor}_\text{enter}(\text{this}); \\
10: \quad & \quad \text{if } (*) \{ \\
11: \quad & \quad \quad \ldots \\
12: \quad & \quad \quad \text{bar}(&\text{other}); \\
13: \quad & \quad \quad \ldots \\
14: \quad & \quad \} \\
15: \quad & \quad \text{monitor}_\text{leave}(\text{this}); \\
16: \quad & \}
\end{align*}
\]

\( \lambda(8) = \{ \} \)
Inferring locksets and lockset order in practice

⚠️ fix a representation for locksets

⇝ in our case: $L$ comprises all lines, where any object is created.

```
0: Foo a = new Foo();
1: Foo b = new Foo();
2: a.other = b;
3: b.other = a;
4:
5:
6: bar(&a); || bar(&b);
7:
8: void bar(this) {
9: monitor_enter(this);
10: if (*) {
11: ...
12: bar(&other);
13: ...
14: }
15: monitor_leave(this);
16: }
```

$\lambda(9) = \{l_0, l_1\}$

this = {&a, &b}

$\text{Lockorder}$ ▶
Inferring locksets and lockset order in practice

⚠️ fix a representation for locksets

⇒ in our case: \( L \) comprises all lines, where any object is created.

```java
0: Foo a = new Foo();
1: Foo b = new Foo();
2: a.other = b;
3: b.other = a;
4: bar(&a); || bar(&b);
5:
6: bar(&a); || bar(&b);
7:
8: void bar(this) { 8: void bar(this) {
9: monitor_enter(this); 9: monitor_enter(this);
10: if (*) {
11: ... 11: ... 11: ...
12: bar(&other);
13: ... 14: }
15: monitor_leave(this);
16: }
```

\( \lambda(11) = \{l_0, l_1\} \)

\( \text{this} = \{&a, &b\} \)
Inferring locksets and lockset order in practice

⚠ fix a representation for locksets
⇝ in our case: $L$ comprises all lines, where any object is created.

```
0: Foo a = new Foo();
1: Foo b = new Foo();
2: a.other = b;
3: b.other = a;
4: bar(&a); || bar(&b);
5: ...
6: bar(&a); || bar(&b);
7: ...
8: void bar(this) {
9:     monitor_enter(this);
10: ...
11:     if (*) {
12:         bar(&other);
13:         ...
14:     }
15:     other = {&a, &b}
16: }
```

$\lambda(11) = \{l_0, l_1\}$

This = \{&a, &b\}

other = \{&a, &b\}

Lockorder

...
Inferring locksets and lockset order in practice

⚠️ fix a representation for locksets
⇝ in our case: \( L \) comprises all lines, where any object is created.

\[
\lambda(8) = \{l_0, l_1\}
\]

\[
\text{this} = \{\&a, \&b\}
\]

\[
\text{other} = \{\&a, \&b\}
\]
Inferring locksets and lockset order in practice

⚠️ fix a representation for locksets

⇝ in our case: $L$ comprises all lines, where any object is created.

0: Foo a = new Foo();
1: Foo b = new Foo();
2: a.other = b;
3: b.other = a;
4:
5:
6: bar(&a); || bar(&b);
7:

\[ \lambda(9) = \{ l_0, l_1 \} \]

\text{Lockorder} \triangleleft \langle l_0, l_1 \rangle, \langle l_1, l_0 \rangle

this = \{&a, &b\}

\text{other} = \{&a, &b\}

8: void bar(this) {
9:    monitor.enter(this);
10:   if (*) {
11:      ...
12:      bar(&other);
13:      ...
14:   }
15:   other = \{&a, &b\}
16: }
Avoiding Deadlocks in Practice

⚠️ What to do when the lock order contains a cycle?
- determining which locks may be acquired at each program point is undecidable
  ➞ lock sets are an approximation
- an array of locks in $L_S$: lock in increasing array index sequence
- if $l \in \lambda(P)$ exists $l' \prec l$ is to be acquired
  ➞ change program: release $l$, acquire $l'$, then acquire $l$ again
  △ inefficient
- if a lock set contains a summarized lock $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{a}$ is to be acquired, we’re stuck
Locks Roundup
Consider replacing the specific locks with \texttt{atomic} annotations:

\begin{verbatim}
void pop() {
  ...
  wait(&q->t);
  ...
  if (*) { signal(&q->t); return; }
  ...
  if (c) wait(&q->s);
  ...
  if (c) signal(&q->s);
  signal(&q->t);
}
\end{verbatim}
Atomic Execution and Locks

Consider replacing the specific locks with \textbf{atomic} annotations:

\begin{verbatim}
stack: removal

void pop() {
    ...
    wait(&q->t);
    ...
    if (*) { signal(&q->t); return; }
    ...
    if (c) wait(&q->s);
    ...
    if (c) signal(&q->s);
    signal(&q->t);
}
\end{verbatim}

- nested \textbf{atomic} blocks still describe one atomic execution
- \textbf{atomic} blocks convey additional information over \textbf{atomic}
- \textbf{atomic} locks cannot easily be recovered from \textbf{atomic} declarations
Writing \textit{atomic} annotations around sequences of statements is a convenient way of programming.

Idea of mutexes: Implement \textit{atomic} sections with locks: a single lock could be used to protect all \textit{atomic} blocks. More concurrency is possible by using several locks. Some statements might modify variables that are never read by other threads, \Rightarrow no lock required. Statements in one \textit{atomic} block might access variables in a different order to another \textit{atomic} block, \Rightarrow deadlock possible with locks implementation. Creating too many locks can decrease the performance, especially when required to release locks in $\lambda(l)$ when acquiring $l$. Creating locks automatically is non-trivial and, thus, not standard in programming languages.
Outlook

Writing atomic annotations around sequences of statements is a convenient way of programming.

*Idea of mutexes:* Implement atomic sections with locks:
- a single lock could be used to protect all atomic blocks
- more concurrency is possible by using several locks
- some statements might modify variables that are never read by other threads $\implies$ no lock required
- statements in one atomic block might access variables in a different order to another atomic block $\implies$ deadlock possible with locks implementation
- creating too many locks can decrease the performance, especially when required to release locks in $\lambda(l)$ when acquiring $l$
Outlook

Writing *atomic* annotations around sequences of statements is a convenient way of programming.

*Idea of mutexes*: Implement *atomic* sections with locks:
- a single lock could be used to protect all *atomic* blocks
- more concurrency is possible by using several locks
- some statements might modify variables that are never read by other threads $\Rightarrow$ no lock required
- statements in one *atomic* block might access variables in a different order to another *atomic* block $\Rightarrow$ deadlock possible with locks implementation
- creating too many locks can decrease the performance, especially when required to release locks in $\lambda(l)$ when acquiring $l$

$\Rightarrow$ creating locks automatically is non-trivial and, thus, not standard in programming languages
Concurrency across Languages

In most systems programming languages (C,C++) we have

- the ability to use *atomic* operations
- we can implement *wait-free* algorithms

Java, C# and other higher-level languages provide monitors and possibly other concepts often simplify the programming but incur the same problems.
Concurrency across Languages

In most systems programming languages (C,C++) we have

- the ability to use *atomic* operations
  
  we can implement *wait-free* algorithms

In Java, C# and other higher-level languages

- provide monitors and possibly other concepts
- often simplify the programming but incur the same problems
Concurrent across Languages

In most systems programming languages (C,C++) we have

- the ability to use *atomic* operations
- we can implement *wait-free* algorithms

In Java, C# and other higher-level languages

- provide monitors and possibly other concepts
- often simplify the programming but incur the same problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>language</th>
<th>barriers</th>
<th>wait-/lock-free</th>
<th>semaphore</th>
<th>mutex</th>
<th>monitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C,C++</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java,C#</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) some pthread implementations allow a *reentrant* attribute

(b) newer API extensions (*java.util.concurrent.atomic.* and System.Threading.Interlocked resp.)

(c) simulate semaphores using an object with two *synchronized* methods
Summary

Classification of concurrency algorithms:
- wait-free, lock-free, locked
- next on the agenda: transactional

*Wait-free* algorithms:
- never block, always succeed, never deadlock, no starvation
- very limited in expressivity

*Lock-free* algorithms:
- never block, may fail, never deadlock, may starve
- invariant may only span a few bytes (8 on Intel)

*Locking* algorithms:
- can guard arbitrary code
- can use several locks to enable more fine grained concurrency
- may deadlock
- semaphores are not re-entrant, monitors are

⇝ use algorithm that is best fit
E. G. Coffman, M. Elphick, and A. Shoshani.
System deadlocks.
ISSN 0360-0300.
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Abstraction and Concurrency

Two fundamental concepts to build larger software are:

**abstraction**: an object storing certain data and providing certain functionality may be used without reference to its internals.

**composition**: several objects can be combined to a new object without interference.

Both, *abstraction* and *composition* are closely related, since the ability to compose depends on the ability to abstract from details.
Abstraction and Concurrency

Two fundamental concepts to build larger software are:

**abstraction**: an object storing certain data and providing certain functionality may be used without reference to its internals

**composition**: several objects can be combined to a new object without interference

Both, *abstraction* and *composition* are closely related, since the ability to compose depends on the ability to abstract from details.

Consider an example:

- a linked list data structure exposes a fixed set of operations to modify the list structure, such as `push()` and `forAll()`
- a set object may internally use the list object and expose a set of operations, including `push()`

The `insert()` operations uses the `forAll()` operation to check if the element already exists and uses `push()` if not.
Abstraction and Concurrency

Two fundamental concepts to build larger software are:

**abstraction**: an object storing certain data and providing certain functionality may be used without reference to its internals

**composition**: several objects can be combined to a new object without interference

Both, *abstraction* and *composition* are closely related, since the ability to compose depends on the ability to abstract from details.

Consider an example:

- A linked list data structure exposes a fixed set of operations to modify the list structure, such as `push()` and `forEach()`
- A set object may internally use the list object and expose a set of operations, including `push()`

The `insert()` operation uses the `forEach()` operation to check if the element already exists and uses `push()` if not.

Wrapping the linked list in a mutex does not help to make the *set* thread-safe.

~~wrap the two calls in `insert()` in a mutex~~ use the *same* mutex
Abstraction and Concurrency

Two fundamental concepts to build larger software are:

- **abstraction**: an object storing certain data and providing certain functionality may be used without reference to its internals
- **composition**: several objects can be combined to a new object without interference

Both, abstraction and composition are closely related, since the ability to compose depends on the ability to abstract from details.

Consider an example:

- a linked list data structure exposes a fixed set of operations to modify the list structure, such as `push()` and `forAll()`
- a set object may internally use the list object and expose a set of operations, including `push()`

The `insert()` operations uses the `forAll()` operation to check if the element already exists and uses `push()` if not.

Wrapping the linked list in a mutex does not help to make the set thread-safe.

- wrap the two calls in `insert()` in a mutex
- but other list operations can still be called use the same mutex
- unlike sequential algorithms, thread-safe algorithms cannot always be composed to give new thread-safe algorithms
Transactional Memory [2]

Idea: automatically convert `atomic` blocks into code that ensures atomic execution of the statements.

```plaintext
atomic {
    // code
    if (cond) retry;
    atomic {
        // more code
    }
    // code
}
```
Transactional Memory [2]

Idea: automatically convert `atomic` blocks into code that ensures atomic execution of the statements.

```c
atomic {
    // code
    if (cond) retry;
    atomic {
        // more code
    }
    // code
}
```

Execute code as *transaction*:
- execute the code of an atomic block
- nested atomic blocks act like a single atomic block
- check that it runs without *conflicts* due to accesses from another thread
- if another thread interferes through conflicting updates:
  - undo the computation done so far
  - re-start the transaction
- provide a `retry` keyword similar to the `wait` of monitors
Semantics of Transactions

The goal is to use transactions to specify atomic executions. Transactions are rooted in databases where they have the ACID properties:

1. Atomicity: a transaction completes or seems not to have run ⇝ we call this failure atomicity to distinguish it from atomic executions
2. Consistency: each transaction transforms a consistent state to another consistent state. A consistent state is one in which certain invariants hold. Invariants depend on the application.
3. Isolation: among each other, transactions do not interfere ⇝ coexisting with non-transactional memory, isolation is not so evident.
4. Durability: the effects are permanent (w.r.t. main memory ✓)

Definition (Semantics of Transactions)
The result of running concurrent transactions must be identical to one execution of them in sequence. (⇝Serialization)
Semantics of Transactions

The goal is to use transactions to specify atomic executions.

Transactions are rooted in databases where they have the ACID properties:

atomicity: a transaction completes or seems not to have run
we call this failure atomicity to distinguish it from atomic executions

consistency: each transaction transforms a consistent state to another consistent state
- a consistent state is one in which certain invariants hold
- invariants depend on the application

isolation: among each other, transactions do not interfere
coexisting with non-transactional memory, isolation is not so evident

durability: the effects are permanent (w.r.t. main memory ✓)
Semantics of Transactions

The goal is to use transactions to specify atomic executions.

Transactions are rooted in databases where they have the ACID properties:

- **atomicity**: a transaction completes or seems not to have run
  - we call this failure atomicity to distinguish it from atomic executions
- **consistency**: each transaction transforms a consistent state to another consistent state
  - a consistent state is one in which certain invariants hold
  - invariants depend on the application
- **isolation**: among each other, transactions do not interfere
  - coexisting with non-transactional memory, isolation is not so evident
- **durability**: the effects are permanent (w.r.t. main memory ✓)

Definition (Semantics of Transactions)

The result of running concurrent transactions must be identical to one execution of them in sequence. (⇝ Serialization)
Consistency During Transactions

Consistency during a transaction.

ACID states how committed transactions behave but not what may happen until a transaction commits.

- a transaction, run on an inconsistent state may continue yielding inconsistent states
  \[\leadsto\] zombie transaction
- in the best case, the zombie transaction will be aborted eventually
- but transactions may cause havoc when run on inconsistent states

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{atomic} & \{ \\
\text{int } & \text{ tmp1 } = \text{x}; \\
\text{int } & \text{ tmp2 } = \text{y}; \\
\text{assert} & (\text{tmp1-tmp2==0}); \\
\} \\
\end{align*}
\]

⚠️ critical for null pointer derefs or divisions by zero, e.g.

Definition (opacity)

A TM system provides \emph{opacity} if failing transactions are serializable w.r.t. committing transactions.

\[\leadsto\] failing transactions still see a consistent view of memory
Can we mix transactions with code accessing memory non-transactionally?

- **strong isolation** retains order between accesses to TM and non-TM
- In **weak isolation**, guarantees are only given about memory accessed inside **atomic**

**Definition (SLA)**

The single-lock atomicity is a model in which the program executes as if all transactions acquire a single, program-wide mutual exclusion lock.

*like sequential consistency, SLA is a statement about program equivalence*
Weak- and Strong Isolation

Can we mix transactions with code accessing memory non-transactionally?

- **strong isolation** retains order between accesses to TM and non-TM
- In **weak isolation**, guarantees are only given about memory accessed inside **atomic**
  - no conflict detection for non-transactional accesses
  - \(\triangle\) standard **race problems**, e.g.
    ```c
    // Thread 1
    atomic {
        x = 42;
    }
    // Thread 2
    int tmp = x;
    ```
  - give programs with races the same semantics as if using a single global lock for all **atomic** blocks

**Definition (SLA)**

The **single-lock atomicity** is a model in which the program executes as if all transactions acquire a single, program-wide mutual exclusion lock.
Weak- and Strong Isolation

Can we mix transactions with code accessing memory non-transactionally?

- **strong isolation** retains order between accesses to TM and non-TM
- In **weak isolation**, guarantees are only given about memory accessed inside `atomic`
  - no conflict detection for non-transactional accesses
  - ▲ standard **race problems**, e.g.
    ```c
    // Thread 1
    atomic {
        x = 42;
    }
    // Thread 2
    int tmp = x;
    ▼ give programs with races the same semantics as if using a single global lock for all `atomic` blocks

Definition (SLA)

The **single-lock atomicity** is a model in which the program executes as if all transactions acquire a single, program-wide mutual exclusion lock.

▼ like **sequential consistency**, SLA is a statement about program equivalence
Disadvantages of the SLA model

The SLA model is simple but often too strong:

1. SLA has a weaker progress guarantee than a transaction should have
   
   ```
   // Thread 1
   atomic {
       while (true) {};
   }
   ```
   
   ```
   // Thread 2
   atomic {
       int tmp = x; // x in TM
   }
   ```

2. SLA correctness is too strong in practice

   ```
   // Thread 1
   data = 1;
   atomic {
   }
   ready = 1;
   ```

   ```
   // Thread 2
   atomic {
       int tmp = data;
       // Thread 1 not in atomic
       if (ready) {
           // use tmp
       }
   }
   ```

▶ under the SLA model, `atomic {}` acts as barrier
▶ intuitively, the two transactions should be independent rather than synchronize

⇝ need a weaker model for more flexible implementation of strong isolation
Transactional Sequential Consistency

How about a more permissive view of transaction semantics?
- TM should not have the blocking behaviour of locks
  the programmer cannot rely on synchronization

Definition (TSC)

The *transactional sequential consistency* is a model in which the accesses within each transaction are sequentially consistent.
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- TSC is weaker: gives *strong isolation*, but allows parallel execution ✓
- TSC is stronger: accesses within a transaction may *not* be re-ordered ▲!
Transactional Sequential Consistency

How about a more permissive view of transaction semantics?

- TM should not have the blocking behaviour of locks
- the programmer cannot rely on synchronization

Definition (TSC)

The transactional sequential consistency is a model in which the accesses within each transaction are sequentially consistent.

- TSC is weaker: gives strong isolation, but allows parallel execution
- TSC is stronger: accesses within a transaction may not be re-ordered

⇝ actual implementations use TSC with some race free re-orderings
A TM system must track which shared memory locations are accessed:
- convert every read access \( x \) from a shared variable to \( \text{ReadTx}(&x) \)
- convert every write access \( x = e \) to a shared variable to \( \text{WriteTx}(&x, e) \)

Convert \texttt{atomic} blocks as follows:

\begin{verbatim}
atomic {
    // code
}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
do {
    \text{StartTx();}
    // code with \text{ReadTx} and \text{WriteTx}
} while (!\text{CommitTx()});
\end{verbatim}
Translation of atomic-Blocks

A TM system must track which shared memory locations are accessed:
- convert every read access \( x \) from a shared variable to \( \text{ReadTx}(\&x) \)
- convert every write access \( x = e \) to a shared variable to \( \text{WriteTx}(\&x, e) \)

Convert \texttt{atomic} blocks as follows:

\[
\text{atomic} \{ \\
    // code \\
\} \quad \Rightarrow \\
\quad \text{do} \{ \\
    \text{StartTx}(); \\
    // code with ReadTx and WriteTx \\
    \} \text{ while (!CommitTx());}
\]

- translation can be done using a pre-processor
  - determining a minimal set of memory accesses that need to be transactional requires a good static analysis
  - idea: translate all accesses to global variables and the heap as TM
  - more fine-grained control using manual translation

- an actual implementation might provide a \texttt{retry} keyword
  - when executing \texttt{retry}, the transaction aborts and re-starts
  - the transaction will again wind up at \texttt{retry} unless its \texttt{read set} changes

\( \Rightarrow \) block until a variable in the read-set has changed
- similar to condition variables in monitors √
A software TM implementation allocates a *transaction descriptor* to store data specific to each *atomic* block, for instance:

- *undo-log* of all writes which have to be undone if a commit fails
- *redo-log* of all writes which are postponed until a commit
- *read- and write-set*: locations accessed so far
- *read- and write-version*: time stamp when value was accessed

Example:
Consider the TL2 STM (software transactional memory) implementation [1]:

- *provides opacity*: zombie transactions do not see inconsistent state
- *uses lazy versioning*: writes are stored in a *redo-log* and done on commit
- *validating conflict detection*: accessing a modified address aborts
A software TM implementation allocates a transaction descriptor to store data specific to each atomic block, for instance:

- **undo-log** of all writes which have to be undone if a commit fails
- **redo-log** of all writes which are postponed until a commit
- **read-** and **write-set**: locations accessed so far
- **read-** and **write-version**: time stamp when value was accessed

Example:
Consider the TL2 STM (software transactional memory) implementation [1]:

- provides **opacity**: zombie transactions do not see inconsistent state
- uses **lazy versioning**: writes are stored in a redo-log and done on commit
- **validating conflict detection**: accessing a modified address aborts
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The idea: obtain a version from the global counter on starting the transaction, the 
*read-version*, and watch out for accesses to newer versions throughout the transaction.

- A read $\text{ReadTx}$ from a field at offset of object $\text{obj}$ aborts,
  - when the objects version is younger than the transaction
  - when the object is locked at the moment of access

  or returns the read value and adds the accessed memory address to the *read-set*. 
Principles of TL2

The idea: obtain a version from the global counter on starting the transaction, the `read-version`, and watch out for accesses to newer versions throughout the transaction.

- A read `ReadTx` from a field at offset of object `obj` aborts,
  - when the objects version is younger than the transaction
  - when the object is locked at the moment of access
  or returns the read value and adds the accessed memory address to the `read-set`.
- `WriteTx` is simpler: add or update the location in the `redo-log`. 
The idea: obtain a version from the global counter on starting the transaction, the read-version, and watch out for accesses to newer versions throughout the transaction.

- A read ReadTx from a field at offset of object obj aborts,
  - when the objects version is younger than the transaction
  - when the object is locked at the moment of access
  or returns the read value and adds the accessed memory address to the read-set.

- WriteTx is simpler: add or update the location in the redo-log.

- CommitTx successively
  1. picks up locks for each written object
  2. increments the global version
  3. checks the read objects for being up to date

  before writing redo-log entries to memory while updating their version and releasing their locks
Properties of TL2

Opacity is guaranteed by aborting on a read accessing an inconsistent value:

- write redo-log
- StartTx ReadTx WriteTx ReadTx CommitTx
- memory state seems to be consistent
- validate read set
- increment global clock
- write redo-log

Other observations:

- read-only transactions just need to check that read versions are consistent (no need to increment the global clock)
- writing values still requires locks
  - deadlocks are still possible
  - since other transactions can be aborted, one can preempt transactions that are deadlocked
  - since lock accesses are generated, computing a lock order up-front might be possible
- there might be contention on the global clock
General Challenges when using STM

Executing `atomic` blocks by repeatedly trying to execute them non-atomically creates new problems:

- a transaction might unnecessarily be aborted
  - the granularity of what is locked might be too large
  - a TM implementation might impose restrictions:
    ```
    // Thread 1
    atomic { // clock=12
    ...
    atomic {
      WriteTx(&x,0) = 42; // clock=13
    }
    
    int r = ReadTx(&x,0);
    } // tx.RV==12 != clock
    ```

- lock-based commits can cause contention
  - organize cells that participate in a transaction in one object
  - compute a new object as result of a transaction
  - atomically replace a pointer to the old object with a pointer to the new object if the old object has not changed
    
- TM system should figure out which memory locations must be logged

- danger of live-locks: transaction B might abort A which might abort B ...
Integrating Non-TM Resources

Allowing access to other resources than memory inside an \textit{atomic} block poses problems:
- storage management, condition variables, \textit{volatile} variables, input/output
- semantics should be as if \textit{atomic} implements SLA or TSC semantics
Integrating Non-TM Resources

Allowing access to other resources than memory inside an atomic block poses problems:
- storage management, condition variables, volatile variables, input/output
- semantics should be as if atomic implements SLA or TSC semantics

Usual choice is one of the following:
- **Prohibit It.** Certain constructs do not make sense. Use compiler to reject these programs.
- **Execute It.** I/O operations may only happen in some runs (e.g. file writes usually go to a buffer). Abort if I/O happens.
- **Irrevocably Execute It.** Universal way to deal with operations that cannot be undone: enforce that this transaction terminates (possibly before starting) by making all other transactions conflict.
- **Integrate It.** Re-write code to be transactional: error logging, writing data to a file, . . ..
Integrating Non-TM Resources

Allowing access to other resources than memory inside an *atomic* block poses problems:

- storage management, condition variables, *volatile* variables, input/output
- semantics should be as if *atomic* implements SLA or TSC semantics

Usual choice is one of the following:

- **Prohibit It.** Certain constructs do not make sense. Use compiler to reject these programs.
- **Execute It.** I/O operations may only happen in some runs (e.g. file writes usually go to a buffer). Abort if I/O happens.
- **Irrevocably Execute It.** Universal way to deal with operations that cannot be undone: enforce that this transaction terminates (possibly before starting) by making all other transactions conflict.
- **Integrate It.** Re-write code to be transactional: error logging, writing data to a file, . . . .

⇝ currently best to use TM only for memory; check if TM supports irrevocable transactions
Hardware Transactional Memory
Hardware Transactional Memory

Transactions of a limited size can also be implemented in hardware:

- additional hardware to track read- and write-sets
- conflict detection is *eager* using the cache:
  - additional hardware makes it cheap to perform conflict detection
  - if a cache-line in the read set is invalidated, the transaction aborts
  - if a cache-line in the write set must be written-back, the transaction aborts

⇝ limited by fixed hardware resources, a software backup must be provided
Hardware Transactional Memory

Transactions of a limited size can also be implemented in hardware:

- additional hardware to track read- and write-sets
- conflict detection is *eager* using the cache:
  - additional hardware makes it cheap to perform conflict detection
  - if a cache-line in the read set is invalidated, the transaction aborts
  - if a cache-line in the write set must be written-back, the transaction aborts

⇝ limited by fixed hardware resources, a software backup must be provided

Two principal implementation of HTM:

1. Explicit Transactional Memory: each access is marked as transactional
   - similar to `StartTx`, `ReadTx`, `WriteTx`, and `CommitTx`
   - requires separate transaction instructions
   ⇝ a transaction has to be translated differently
     ▼ mixing transactional and non-transactional accesses is problematic

2. Implicit Transactional Memory: only the beginning and end of a transaction are marked
   - same instructions can be used, hardware interprets them as transactional
   - only instructions affecting memory that can be cached can be executed transactionally
   - hardware access, OS calls, page table changes, etc. all abort a transaction
   ⇝ provides *strong isolation*
Example for HTM

AMD Advanced Synchronization Facilities (ASF):
- defines a logical *speculative region*
- `LOCK MOV` instructions provide *explicit* data transfer between normal memory and speculative region
- aimed to implement larger atomic operations
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AMD Advanced Synchronization Facilities (ASF):
- defines a logical *speculative region*
- \texttt{LOCK MOV} instructions provide *explicit* data transfer between normal memory and speculative region
- aimed to implement larger atomic operations

Intel's TSX in Broadwell/Skylake microarchitecture (since Aug 2014):
- *implicitly transactional*, can use normal instructions within transactions
- tracks read/write set using a single *transaction* bit on cache lines
- provides space for a backup of the whole CPU state (registers, ...)
- use a simple counter to support nested transactions
- may abort at any time due to lack of resources
- aborting in an inner transaction means aborting all of them

Intel provides two software interfaces to TM:
1. Restricted Transactional Memory (RTM)
2. Hardware Lock Elision (HLE)
Example for HTM

AMD Advanced Synchronization Facilities (ASF):
- defines a logical *speculative region*
- **LOCK MOV** instructions provide *explicit* data transfer between normal memory and speculative region
- aimed to implement larger atomic operations

Intel's TSX in Broadwell/Skylake microarchitecture (since Aug 2014):
- *implicitly transactional*, can use normal instructions within transactions
- tracks read/write set using a single *transaction* bit on cache lines
- provides space for a backup of the whole CPU state (registers, ...)
- use a simple counter to support nested transactions
- may abort at any time due to lack of resources
- aborting in an inner transaction means aborting all of them

Intel provides two software interfaces to TM:
1. Restricted Transactional Memory (RTM)
2. Hardware Lock Elision (HLE)
Restricted Transactional Memory
Implementing RTM using the Cache (Intel)

Supporting Transactional operations:

- augment each cache line with an extra bit $T$
- introduce a nesting counter $C$ and a backup register set
Implementing RTM using the Cache (Intel)

Supporting Transactional operations:
- augment each cache line with an extra bit $T$
- introduce a nesting counter $C$ and a backup register set

additional transaction logic:
- $xbegin$ increments $C$ and, if $C = 0$, backs up registers and flushes buffer
  - subsequent read or write access to a cache line sets $T$ if $C > 0$
  - applying an $invalidate$ message to a cache line with $T$ flag issues $xabort$
  - observing a $read$ for a $modified$ cache line with $T$ flag issues $xabort$
- $xabort$ clears all $T$ flags and the store buffer, invalidates the former $TM$ lines, sets $C = 0$ and restores CPU registers
- $xend$ decrements $C$ and, if $C = 0$, clears all $T$ flags, flushes store buffer
Restricted Transactional Memory

Provides new instructions `xbegin`, `xend`, `xabort`, and `xtest`:

- `xbegin` *on transaction start* skips to the next instruction or *on abort*
  - continues at the given address
  - implicitly stores an error code in `eax`
- `xend` commits the transaction started by the most recent `xbegin`
- `xabort` aborts the whole transaction with an error code
- `xtest` checks if the processor is executing transactionally
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  - implicitly stores an error code in `eax`
- `xend` commits the transaction started by the most recent `xbegin`
- `xabort` aborts the whole transaction with an error code
- `xtest` checks if the processor is executing transactionally

The instruction `xbegin` is made accessible via library function `_xbegin()`:

```
_xbegin()

move   eax, 0xFFFFFFFF
xbegin _txnL1
_txnL1:
move   retval, eax
```
Restricted Transactional Memory

Provides new instructions `xbegin`, `xend`, `xabort`, and `xtest`:

- **`xbegin`** on transaction start skips to the next instruction or on abort
  - continues at the given address
  - implicitly stores an error code in `eax`
- **`xend`** commits the transaction started by the most recent `xbegin`
- **`xabort`** aborts the whole transaction with an error code
- **`xtest`** checks if the processor is executing transactionally

The instruction `xbegin` is made accessible via library function `_xbegin()`:

```c
_xbegin()
```

```c
move eax, 0xFFFFFFFF
xbegin _txnL1
_txnL1:
move retval, eax
```

```c
if(_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
  // transaction code
  _xend();
} else {
  // non-transactional fall-back
}
```
Restricted Transactional Memory

Provides new instructions `xbegin`, `xend`, `xabort`, and `xtest`:
- `xbegin` on transaction start skips to the next instruction or on abort
  - continues at the given address
  - implicitly stores an error code in `eax`
- `xend` commits the transaction started by the most recent `xbegin`
- `xabort` aborts the whole transaction with an error code
- `xtest` checks if the processor is executing transactionally

The instruction `xbegin` is made accessible via library function `_xbegin()`:

```plaintext
_xbegin()
move eax, 0xFFFFFFFF
xbegin _txnL1
_{txnL1:}
move retval, eax
```

```
if(_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
    // transaction code
    _xend();
} else {
    // non-transactional fall-back
}
```

⇝ user must provide fall-back code
Considerations for the Fall-Back Path

Consider executing the following code concurrently with itself:

```c
int data[100]; // shared
void update(int idx, int value) {
    if(_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
        data[idx] += value;
        _xend();
    } else {
        data[idx] += value;
    }
}
```

Several problems:
- the fall-back code may execute racing itself
- the fall-back code is not isolated from the transaction

⇝ First idea: ensure that the fall-back path is executed atomically
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}
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Considerations for the Fall-Back Path

Consider executing the following code concurrently with itself:

```c
int data[100]; // shared
void update(int idx, int value) {
    if(_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
        data[idx] += value;
        _xend();
    } else {
        data[idx] += value;
    }
}
```

⚠️ Several problems:
- the fall-back code may execute racing itself
- the fall-back code is not isolated from the transaction

⇝ First idea: ensure that the fall-back path is executed atomically
Use a lock to prevent the transaction from interrupting the fall-back path:

```c
int data[100]; // shared
int mutex;
void update(int idx, int value) {
    if(_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
        if (!mutex>0) _xabort();
        data[idx] += value;
        _xend();
    } else {
        wait(mutex);
        data[idx] += value;
        signal(mutex);
    }
}
```

- the fall-back code does not execute racing itself ✓
Protecting the Fall-Back Path

Use a lock to prevent the transaction from interrupting the fall-back path:

```c
int data[100]; // shared
int mutex;
void update(int idx, int value) {
  if(_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
    if (!mutex>0) _xabort();
    data[idx] += value;
    _xend();
  } else {
    wait(mutex);
    data[idx] += value;
    signal(mutex);
  }
}
```

- the fall-back code does not execute racing itself ✓
- the fall-back code is still not isolated from the transaction
Protecting the Fall-Back Path

Use a lock to prevent the transaction from interrupting the fall-back path:

```c
int data[100]; // shared
int mutex;
void update(int idx, int value) {
    if(_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
        if (!mutex>0) _xabort();
        data[idx] += value;
        _xend();
    } else {
        wait(mutex);
        data[idx] += value;
        signal(mutex);
    }
}
```

- the fall-back code does not execute racing itself ✓
- the fall-back code is now isolated from the transaction ✓
Happened Before Diagram for Transactions

Augment MESI states with extra bit $T$. CPU A: d:E5 t:E0, CPU B: d:I, tmp/value registers

**Thread A**

```c
int t = _xbegin();
int tmp = data[idx];
data[idx] = tmp + value;
_xend();
```

**Thread B**

```c
_xbegin();
int tmp = data[idx];
data[idx] = tmp + value;
_xend();
```
Common Code Pattern for Mutexes

Using HTM in order to implement mutex:

```c
int data[100]; // shared
int mutex;
void update(int idx, int val) {
    if (_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
        if (!mutex>0) _xabort();
        data[idx] += val;
        _xend();
    } else {
        wait(mutex);
        data[idx] += val;
        signal(mutex);
    }
}
```
Using HTM in order to implement mutex:

```c
int data[100]; // shared
int mutex;

void update(int idx, int val) {
    if(_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
        if (!mutex>0) _xabort();
        data[idx] += val;
        _xend();
    } else {
        wait(mutex);
        data[idx] += val;
        signal(mutex);
    }
}
```

```c
void update(int idx, int val) {
    lock(&mutex);
    data[idx] += val;
    unlock(&mutex);
}
```

```c
void lock(int* mutex) {
    if(_xbegin()==_XBEGIN_STARTED) {
        if (!*mutex>0) _xabort();
        else return;
    } wait(mutex);
    data[idx] += val;
    _xend();
}
```

```c
void unlock(int* mutex) {
    if (!*mutex>0) signal(mutex);
    else _xend();
}
```

- critical section may be executed without taking the lock (the lock is *elided*)
- as soon as one thread conflicts, it aborts, takes the lock in the fallback path and thereby aborts all other transactions that have read mutex
Hardware Lock Elision
Hardware Lock Elision

Observation: Using RTM to implement lock elision is a common pattern
⇝ provide special handling in hardware: HLE

Idea: Hardware Lock Elision

1. By default defer actual acquisition of the lock
2. Instead rely on HTM to sort out conflicting concurrent accesses
3. Fall back to actual locking only in case of conflicts
4. Support legacy lock code by locally acting as if semaphore value is actually modified

● requires annotations for lock instructions:
  ▶ instruction that increments the semaphore must be prefixed with \texttt{xacquire}
  ▶ instruction setting the semaphore to 0 must be prefixed with \texttt{xrelease}
  ▶ these prefixes are ignored on older platforms

● for a successful elision, all signal/wait operations of a lock must be annotated
Implementing Lock Elision

Transactional operation:
- re-uses infrastructure for Restricted Transactional Memory
- add a buffer for elided locks, similar to store buffer
Implementing Lock Elision

Transactional operation:
- re-uses infrastructure for Restricted Transactional Memory
- add a buffer for elided locks, similar to store buffer

**Diagram Description:**
- **CPU** interacts with **register bank** and **C**
- **store buffer** and **elided locks** connect to **cache**
  - **T**
- **Memory**

**Key Points:**
- **xacquire** of lock ensures *shared/exclusive* cache line state with **T**, issues **xbegin** and keeps the modified lock value in **elided lock buffer**
  - r/w access to other cache lines sets **T**
  - applying an **invalidate** message to a **T** cache line issues **xabort**, analogous for **read** message to a **TM** cache line
  - a **local CPU load** from the address of the elided lock accesses the buffer
- on **xrelease** on the same lock, decrement **C** and, if **C = 0**, clear **T** flags and elided locks buffer flush the store buffer
Transactional Memory: Summary

Transactional memory aims to provide atomic blocks for general code:
- frees the user from deciding how to lock data structures
- compositional way of communicating concurrently
- can be implemented using software (locks, atomic updates) or hardware

Pitfalls in implicit HTM:
- RTM requires a fall-back path
- no progress guarantee

HLE can be implemented in software using RTM
Transactional Memory: Summary

Transactional memory aims to provide atomic blocks for general code:
- frees the user from deciding how to lock data structures
- compositional way of communicating concurrently
- can be implemented using software (locks, atomic updates) or hardware

It is hard to get the details right:
- semantics of explicit HTM and STM transactions quite subtle when mixing with non-TM (weak vs. strong isolation)
- single-lock atomicity vs. transactional sequential consistency semantics
- STM not the right tool to synchronize threads without shared variables
- TM providing opacity (serializability) requires eager conflict detection or lazy version management

Pitfalls in implicit HTM:
- RTM requires a fall-back path
- no progress guarantee
- HLE can be implemented in software using RTM
Availability of TM Implementations:

- GCC can translate accesses in `__transaction_atomic` regions into libitm library calls.
- The library libitm provides different TM implementations:
  1. On systems with TSX, it maps atomic blocks to HTM instructions.
  2. On systems without TSX and for the fallback path, it resorts to STM.
- C++20 standardizes `synchronized/atomic_XXX` blocks.
- RTM support slowly introduced to OpenJDK Hotspot monitors.
Availability of TM Implementations:
- GCC can translate accesses in `_transaction_atomic` regions into `libitm` library calls
- The library `libitm` provides different TM implementations:
  1. On systems with TSX, it maps atomic blocks to HTM instructions
  2. On systems without TSX and for the fallback path, it resorts to STM
- C++20 standardizes `synchronized/atomic_XXX` blocks
- RTM support slowly introduced to OpenJDK Hotspot monitors

Use of hardware lock elision is limited:
- Allows to easily convert existing locks
- `pthread` locks in `glibc` use RTM [https://lwn.net/Articles/534758/](https://lwn.net/Articles/534758/):
  - Allows implementation of fallback mechanisms
  - HLE only special case of general lock
- Implementing monitors is challenging
  - Lock count and thread id may lead to conflicting accesses
  - In `pthreads`: error conditions often not checked anymore
Several other principles exist for concurrent programming:

1. non-blocking message passing (the actor model)
   - a program consists of actors that send messages
   - each actor has a queue of incoming messages
   - messages can be processed and new messages can be sent
   - special filtering of incoming messages
   - example: Erlang, many add-ons to existing languages

2. blocking message passing (CSP, $\pi$-calculus, join-calculus)
   - a process sends a message over a channel and blocks until the recipient accepts it
   - channels can be send over channels ($\pi$-calculus)
   - examples: Occam, Occam-$\pi$, Go

3. (immediate) priority ceiling
   - declare processes with priority and resources that each process may acquire
   - each resource has the maximum (ceiling) priority of all processes that may acquire it
   - a process’ priority at run-time increases to the maximum of the priorities of held resources
   - the process with the maximum (run-time) priority executes
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Section 1

Direct Function Calls
```c
#include <stdio.h>

void fun(int i) {
}
void bar(int i, double j) {
}

int main()
{
    fun(1);
    bar(1,1.2);
    void (*foo)(int);
    foo = fun;
    return 0;
}
```
Section 2

Overloading Function Names
Function Dispatching (ANSI C89)

```c
#include <stdio.h>

void println(int i) { print("%d\n",i); };
void println(float f) { print("%f\n",f); };

int main(){
    println(1.2);
    println(1);
    return 0;
}
```

Functions with same names but different parameters not legal
#include <stdio.h>

void println(int i) { print("%d\n", i); };
void println(float f) { print("%f\n", f); };

int main()
{
    println(1.2);
    println(1);
    return 0;
}
Generic Selection (C11)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{generic-selection} & \iff \_\text{Generic}(\text{exp}, \text{generic-assoclist}) \\
\text{generic-assoclist} & \iff (\text{generic-assoc},)^* \text{generic-assoc} \\
\text{generic-assoc} & \iff \text{typename} : \text{exp} \mid \text{default} : \text{exp}
\end{align*}
\]

Example:

```c
#include <stdio.h>
#define printf_dec_format(x) _Generic((x), \
    signed int: "%d", \
    float: "%f" )
#define println(x) printf(printf_dec_format(x), x), printf("\n");

int main(){
    println(1.2);
    println(1);
    return 0;
}
```
Generic Selection (C11)

\[
\text{generic-selection} \iff \_\text{Generic}(\text{exp, generic-assoclist})
\]
\[
\text{generic-assoclist} \iff (\text{generic-assoc,})* \text{generic-assoc}
\]
\[
\text{generic-assoc} \iff \text{typename} : \text{exp} \mid \text{default} : \text{exp}
\]

**Example:**

```c
#include <stdio.h>

int main() {
    printf(_Generic((1.2), signed int: "%d", float: "%f"), 1.2),
    printf("\n");
    printf(_Generic(( 1), signed int: "%d", float: "%f"), 1),
    printf("\n");
    return 0;
}
```
Overloading (Java/C++)

class D {
    public static void p(Object o) { System.out.print(o); }
    public int f(int i) { p("f(int): "); return i+1; }
    public double f(double d) { p("f(double): "); return d+1.3; }
}

public static void main() {
    D d = new D();
    D.p(d.f(2) + "\n");
    D.p(d.f(2.3) + "\n");
}
class D {
    public static void p(Object o) { System.out.print(o); }
    public int f(int i) { p("f(int): "); return i+1; }
    public double f(double d) { p("f(double): "); return d+1.3; }
}

public static void main() {
    D d = new D();
    D.p(d.f(2)+"\n");
    D.p(d.f(2.3)+"\n");
}

$ javac Overloading.java; java Overloading
f(int): 3
f(double): 3.6
Overloading with Inheritance (Java)

class B {
    public static void p(Object o) { System.out.print(o); }
    public int f(int i) { p("f(int): "); return i+1; }
}
class D extends B {
    public double f(double d) { p("f(double): "); return d+1.3; }
}

public static void main() {
    D d = new D();
    B.p(d.f(2)+"\n");
    B.p(d.f(2.3)+"\n");
}
class B {
    public static void p(Object o) { System.out.print(o); }
    public int f(int i) { p("f(int): "); return i+1; }
}

class D extends B {
    public double f(double d) { p("f(double): "); return d+1.3; }
}

public static void main() {
    D d = new D();
    B.p(d.f(2)+"\n");
    B.p(d.f(2.3)+"\n");
}

$ javac Overloading.java; java Overloading
f(int): 3
f(double): 3.6
Overloading with Scopes (C++)

```cpp
#include<iostream>
using namespace std;

class B { public:
    int f(int i) { cout << "f(int): "; return i+1; }
};
class D : public B { public:
    double f(double d) { cout << "f(double): "; return d+1.3; }
};

int main() {
    D* pd = new D;
    cout << pd->f(2) << '
';
    cout << pd->f(2.3) << '
';
}
```

$ ./overloading

```
f(double): 3.3
f(double): 3.6
f(int): 3
```
Overloading with Scopes (C++)

```cpp
#include<iostream>
using namespace std;
class B { public:
    int f(int i) { cout << "f(int): "; return i+1; }
};
class D : public B { public:
    double f(double d) { cout << "f(double): "; return d+1.3; }
};

int main() {
    D* pd = new D;
    cout << pd->f(2) << '
';
    cout << pd->f(2.3) << '
';
}
```

```bash
$ ./overloading
f(double): 3.3
f(double): 3.6
```
```cpp
#include<iostream>
using namespace std;

class B { public:
    int f(int i) { cout << "f(int): "; return i+1; }
};
class D : public B { public:
    using B::f;
    double f(double d) { cout << "f(double): "; return d+1.3; }
};

int main() {
    D* pd = new D;
    cout << pd->f(2) << '
';
    cout << pd->f(2.3) << '
';
}

> ./overloading
f(int): 3
f(double): 3.6
```

```
class D {
    public static void p(Object o) { System.out.print(o); }
    public int f(int i, double j) { p("f(i,d): "); return i; }
    public int f(double i, int j) { p("f(d,i): "); return j; }
}

public static void main() {
    D d = new D();
    D.p(d.f(2,2)+"\n");
}
Overloading Hassles

class D {
    public static void p(Object o) { System.out.print(o); }
    public int f(int i, double j) { p("f(i,d): "); return i; }
    public int f(double i, int j) { p("f(d,i): "); return j; }
}

public static void main() {
    D d = new D();
    D.p(d.f(2,2) + "\n");
}

>$ javac Overloading.java
Overloading.java:(?): error: reference to f is ambiguous

>$ javac Overloading.java
Overloading.java:(?): error: reference to f is ambiguous
**Static Methods are Statically Dispatched**

Let's consider a function call expression $f'(e_1,...,e_n)$ dispatching to handles $t_0$ which in turn invokes $f(t_1 p_1,...,t_n p_n)$. This dispatching is determined by the $n$-tuples $t_0',...,t_n'$.

The applicability of the method is governed by the subtype relation $\leq$ as follows:

$R f(T_1, . . . , T_n) \leq R' f'(T_1', . . . , T_n') \Rightarrow R \leq R' \land T_1' \leq T_1 \land \ldots \land T_n' \leq T_n'$
Static Methods are **Statically Dispatched**

**Function Call Expression**

Function to be dispatched

\[ f'(e_1, \ldots, e_n) \]
\[ \text{dispatches to} \]
\[ t_0 \quad f(t_1, p_1, \ldots, t_n, p_n) \]
\[ \text{handles} \]
\[ \text{determines} \]
\[ \text{is applicable to} \]
\[ t_0', \ldots, t_n' \]

**Signature**

**Concrete Method**

Provides calling target for a call

\[ f \]
\[ \text{is applicable to} \]
\[ f' \iff f \leq f' : \leq \text{is the subtype relation} : \]
\[ R f(T_1, \ldots, T_n) \leq R' f'(T'_1, \ldots, T'_n) \]
\[ \Rightarrow R \leq R' \land T'_i \leq T_i \]
Static Methods are *Statically Dispatched*

**Function Call Expression**
Function to be dispatched

- $f'(e_1,\ldots,e_n)$
- $t_0 \ f(t_1 \ p_1,\ldots,t_n \ p_n)$

**Signature**
- Function Name
- *Static* Types of Parameters
- Return Type

- $f'(e_1,\ldots,e_n)$
- $t_0 \ f(t_1 \ p_1,\ldots,t_n \ p_n)$

- dispatches to
- handles
- determines
- is applicable to

- $t_0'$
- $\ldots$
- $t_n'$

- $f'$

- $\leq$

- $\Rightarrow$

- $R \ f(T_1,\ldots,T_n) \leq R' f'(T'_1,\ldots,T'_n)$
Static Methods are \textit{S\-t\-a\-t\-i\-c\-a\-l\-l\-\-y  D\-i\-s\-p\-a\-c\-h\-i\-p\-a\-t\-e\-d}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Function Call Expression}
  \begin{itemize}
  \item Function to be dispatched
  \end{itemize}
\item \textbf{Concrete Method}
  \begin{itemize}
  \item Provides calling target for a call signature
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\begin{align*}
  f'(e_1, \ldots, e_n) & \quad \text{dispatches to} \quad t_0 \quad f(t_1 p_1, \ldots, t_n p_n) \\
  \text{determines} & \quad \text{handles} \quad \text{is applicable to} \quad t_0', \ldots, t_n'
\end{align*}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Signature}
  \begin{itemize}
  \item Function Name
  \item \textit{Static} Types of Parameters
  \item Return Type
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Signature}:
- Function Name
- \textit{Static} Types of Parameters
- Return Type

\textbf{Concrete Method}:
- Provides calling target for a call signature

\textbf{Function Call Expression}:
- Function to be dispatched

\textbf{Diagram}:
- Arrows indicating dispatching, handling, determining, and applicability relationships.
Static Methods are \textit{S}tatically \textit{D}ispatched

**Function Call Expression**
- Function to be dispatched

**Concrete Method**
- Provides calling target for a call signature

\begin{align*}
  f'(e_1, ..., e_n) & \xrightarrow{\text{dispatches to}} t_0 \\
  t_0 & \xrightarrow{\text{handles}} f(t_1 p_1, ..., t_n p_n) \\
  \text{Signature} & \\
  t_0', ..., t_n' & \xrightarrow{\text{determines}} f'(e_1, ..., e_n)
\end{align*}

\textit{f} \textit{is applicable to} \textit{f'} \iff f \leq f':

\leq \text{is the subtype relation:}

\[
R f(T_1, \ldots, T_n) \leq R' f'(T'_1, \ldots, T'_n) \Rightarrow R \leq R' \wedge T'_i \leq T_i
\]

**Signature**
- Function Name
- \textit{Static} Types of Parameters
- Return Type
Concept of methods being applicable for arguments:

```java
boolean isApplicable(MemberDefinition m, Type args[]) {
    // Sanity checks:
    Type mType = m.getType();
    if (!mType.isType(TC_METHOD)) return false;
    Type mArgs[] = mType.getArgumentTypes();
    if (args.length != mArgs.length) return false;
    for (int i = args.length ; --i >= 0 ;)
        if (!isMoreSpecific(args[i], mArgs[i])) return false;
    return true;
}
```

Concept of method signatures being more specific then others:

```java
boolean isMoreSpecific(MemberDefinition more, MemberDefinition less) {
    Type moreType = more.getClassDeclaration().getType();
    Type lessType = less.getClassDeclaration().getType();
    return isMoreSpecific(moreType, lessType) // return type based comparison
    && isApplicable(less, more.getType().getArgumentTypes()); // parameter type based
}
```
Finding the Most Specific Concrete Method

MemberDefinition matchMethod(Environment env, ClassDefinition accessor,
   Identifier methodName, Type[] argumentTypes) throws ... {

  // A tentative maximally specific method.
  MemberDefinition tentative = null;

  // A list of other methods which may be maximally specific too.
  List candidateList = null;

  // Get all the methods inherited by this class which have the name `methodName'
  for (MemberDefinition method : allMethods.lookupName(methodName)) {
    // See if this method is applicable.
    if (!env.isApplicable(method, argumentTypes)) continue;

    // See if this method is accessible.
    if ((accessor != null) && (!accessor.canAccess(env, method))) continue;

    if ((tentative == null) || (env.isMoreSpecific(method, tentative))){
      // `method' becomes our tentative maximally specific match.
      tentative = method;
    } else {
      // If this method could possibly be another maximally specific
      // method, add it to our list of other candidates.
      if (!env.isMoreSpecific(tentative, method)) {
        if (candidateList == null) candidateList = new ArrayList();
        candidateList.add(method);
      }
    }
  }

  if (tentative != null && candidateList != null) {
    // Find out if our `tentative' match is a uniquely maximally specific.
    for (MemberDefinition method : candidateList)
      if (!env.isMoreSpecific(tentative, method))
        throw new AmbiguousMember(tentative, method);
  }

  return tentative;
}
Section 3

Overriding Methods
Object Orientation

Emphasizing the Receiver of a Call

In Object Orientation, we see objects associating strongly with particular procedures, a.k.a. \textit{Methods}.

```
class Natural {
    int value;
}
void incBy(Natural n, int i) {
    n.value += Math.abs(i);
}
...
incBy(nat, 42);
```

```
class Natural {
    int value;
    void incBy(int i) {
        this.value += Math.abs(i);
    }
}
...
nat.incBy(42);
```

- Associating the first parameter as \textit{Receiver} of the method, and pulling it out of the parameters list
- Implicitely binding the first parameter to the fixed name \textit{this}
Emphasizing the *Receiver’s* Responsibility

An Object Oriented Subtype is supposed to take responsibility for calls to Methods that are associated with the type, that it specializes.

class Integral {
    int i;
    void incBy(int delta){
        i += delta;
    }
}
class Natural extends Integral {
    int value;
    void incBy(int i){
        this.value += Math.abs(i);
    }
}

Integral i = new Integral(-5);
i.incBy(42);
Natural n = new Natural(42);
 n.incBy(42);
i = n;
i.incBy(42);

⚠️ In OO, at runtime subtypes can inhabit statically more general typed variables

⇝ Implicitely call the specialized method!
Methods are dynamically dispatched

**Function Call Expression**
Call expression to be dispatched.

**Concrete Method**
Provides calling target for a call signature

- $f'(e_1,...,e_n)$
  - dispatches to $t_0$
  - handles $f(t_1 p_1,...,t_n p_n)$
  - determines $t_0',...,t_n'$
  - is applicable to $t_0',...,t_n'$

**Signature**
Static types of actual parameters.
Methods are dynamically dispatched.

**Function Call Expression**
Call expression to be dispatched.

- \( f'(e_1, \ldots, e_n) \)
- \( t_0 \)
- \( f(t_1 p_1, \ldots, t_n p_n) \)

**Concrete Method**
Provides calling target for a call signature.

- \( t_0 \)
- \( f(t_1 p_1, \ldots, t_n p_n) \)

**Signature**
Static types of actual parameters.

**Specializer**
Specialized types to be matched at the call.
How can we implement that?

Let’s look at what Java does!

The Java platform as example for state of the art OO systems:

- Static Javac-based compiler
- Dynamic Hotspot JIT-Compiler/Interpreter

Let’s watch the following code on its way to the CPU:

```java
public static void main(String[] args){
    Integral i = new Natural(1);
    i.incBy(42);
}
```
matchMethod returns the statically most specific signature

Codegeneration hardcodes `invokevirtual` with this signature

```
Code:
0: new #4 // class Natural
3: dup
4: iconst_1
5: invokespecial #5 // Method "<init>":(I)V
8: astore_1
9: aload_1
10: bipush 42
12: invokevirtual #6 // Method Integral.incBy:(I)V
15: return
```

What is the semantics of `invokevirtual`?
Bytecode

matchMethod returns the statically most specific signature

Codegeneration hardcodes invokevirtual with this signature

```
Code:
0: new #4 // class Natural
3: dup
4: iconst_1
5: invokespecial #5 // Method "<init>":(I)V
8: astore_1
9: aload_1
10: bipush 42
12: invokevirtual #6 // Method Integral.incBy:(I)V
15: return
```

What is the semantics of invokevirtual?

Check the runtime interpreter: Hotspot VM calls resolve_method!
void LinkResolver::resolve_method(methodHandle& resolved_method, KlassHandle resolved_klass,
    Symbol* method_name, Symbol* method_signature,
    KlassHandle current_klass) {

    // 1. check if klass is not interface
    if (resolved_klass->is_interface()) { //... throw "Found interface, but class was expected"

    // 2. lookup method in resolved klass and its super klasses
    lookup_method_in_klasses(resolved_method, resolved_klass, method_name, method_signature);
    // calls klass::lookup_method() -> next slide

    if (resolved_method.is_null()) { // not found in the class hierarchy
        // 3. lookup method in all the interfaces implemented by the resolved klass
        lookup_method_in_interfaces(resolved_method, resolved_klass, method_name, method_signature);

        if (resolved_method.is_null()) {
            // JSR 292: see if this is an implicitly generated method MethodHandle.invoke(*...)
            lookup_implicit_method(resolved_method, resolved_klass, method_name, method_signature, current_klass);
        }
    }

    if (resolved_method.is_null()) { // 4. method lookup failed
        // ... throw java_lang_NoSuchMethodError()
    }

    // 5. check if method is concrete
    if (resolved_method->is_abstract() && !resolved_klass->is_abstract()) {
        // ... throw java_lang_AbstractMethodError()
    }

    // 6. access checks, etc.
    }
The method lookup recursively traverses the super class chain:

```cpp
MethodDesc* klass::lookup_method(Symbol* name, Symbol* signature) {
    for (KlassDesc* klas = as_klassOop(); klas != NULL; klas = klass::cast(klas)->super()) {
        MethodDesc* method = klass::cast(klas)->find_method(name, signature);
        if (method != NULL) return method;
    }
    return NULL;
}
```
MethodDesc* klass::find_method(ObjArrayDesc* methods, Symbol* name, Symbol* signature) {
    int len = methods->length();
    // methods are sorted, so do binary search
    int i, l = 0, h = len - 1;
    while (l <= h) {
        int mid = (l + h) >> 1;
        MethodDesc* m = (MethodDesc*)methods->obj_at(mid);
        int res = m->name()->fast_compare(name);
        if (res == 0) {
            // found matching name; do linear search to find matching signature
            // first, quick check for common case
            if (m->signature() == signature) return m;
            // search downwards through overloaded methods
            for (i = mid - 1; i >= l; i--) {
                MethodDesc* m = (MethodDesc*)methods->obj_at(i);
                if (m->name() != name) break;
                if (m->signature() == signature) return m;
            }
            // search upwards
            for (i = mid + 1; i <= h; i++) {
                MethodDesc* m = (MethodDesc*)methods->obj_at(i);
                if (m->name() != name) break;
                if (m->signature() == signature) return m;
            }
            return NULL; // not found
        } else if (res < 0) l = mid + 1;
        else h = mid - 1;
    }
    return NULL;
}
Single-Dispatching: Summary

**Compile Time**

Javac

Matches a method call expression \textit{statically} to the \textit{most specific} method signature via \texttt{matchMethod( ... )}

**Hotspot VM**

Interprets \texttt{invokevirtual} via \texttt{resolve method(...)}, scanning the superclass chain with \texttt{find method(...)} for the \textit{statically fixed} signature
Example: Sets of Natural Numbers

class Natural {
    Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Natural n){
        return n.number == number;
    }
}
...
Set<Natural> set = new HashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);
Example: Sets of Natural Numbers

class Natural {
    Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Natural n){
        return n.number == number;
    }
}
...
Set<Natural> set = new HashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);

>\$ java Natural
[0,0]

⚠️ Why? Is HashSet buggy?
Example: Sets of Natural Numbers

class Natural {
    Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Natural n){
        return n.number == number;
    }
}
...
Set<Natural> set = new HashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);

> $ java Natural
[0,0]

⚠️ Why? Is HashSet buggy?
⇝ Keep attention to exact signature!
class A {
    public static void p (Object o) { System.out.println(o); }
    public void m1 (A a) { p("m1(A) in A"); }
    public void m1 () { m1(new B()); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in A"); }
    public void m2 () { m2(this); }
}

class B extends A {
    public void m1 (B b) { p("m1(B) in B"); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in B"); }
    public void m3 () { super.m1(this); }
}

B b = new B(); A a = b; a.m1(b);
class A {
    public static void p (Object o) { System.out.println(o); }
    public void m1 (A a) { p("m1(A) in A"); }
    public void m1 () { m1(new B()); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in A"); }
    public void m2 () { m2(this); }
}

class B extends A {
    public void m1 (B b) { p("m1(B) in B"); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in B"); }
    public void m3 () { super.m1(this); }
}

B b = new B(); A a = b; a.m1(b);  // m1(A) in A
B b = new B(); B a = b; b.m1(a);
Mini-Quiz: Java Method Dispatching

class A {
    public static void p (Object o) { System.out.println(o); }
    public void m1 (A a) { p("m1(A) in A"); }
    public void m1 () { m1(new B()); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in A"); }
    public void m2 () { m2(this); }
}
class B extends A {
    public void m1 (B b) { p("m1(B) in B"); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in B"); }
    public void m3 () { super.m1(this); }
}

B b = new B(); A a = b; a.m1(b); m1(A) in A
B b = new B(); B a = b; b.m1(a); m1(B) in B
B b = new B(); b.m2();
class A {
    public static void p (Object o) { System.out.println(o); }
    public void m1 (A a) { p("m1(A) in A"); }
    public void m1 () { m1(new B()); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in A"); }
    public void m2 () { m2(this); }
}

class B extends A {
    public void m1 (B b) { p("m1(B) in B"); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in B"); }
    public void m3 () { super.m1(this); }
}

B b = new B(); A a = b; a.m1(b);  // m1(A) in A
B b = new B(); B a = b; b.m1(a);  // m1(B) in B
B b = new B(); b.m2();  // m2(A) in B
B b = new B(); b.m1();
Mini-Quiz: Java Method Dispatching

class A {
    public static void p (Object o) { System.out.println(o); }
    public void m1 (A a) { p("m1(A) in A"); }
    public void m1 () { m1(new B()); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in A"); }
    public void m2 () { m2(this); }
}
class B extends A {
    public void m1 (B b) { p("m1(B) in B"); }
    public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in B"); }
    public void m3 () { super.m1(this); }
}

B b = new B(); A a = b; a.m1(b); m1(A) in A
B b = new B(); B a = b; b.m1(a); m1(B) in B
B b = new B(); b.m2(); m2(A) in B
B b = new B(); b.m1(); m1(A) in A
B b = new B(); b.m3(); m1(A) in A
Mini-Quiz: Java Method Dispatching

class A {
  public static void p (Object o) { System.out.println(o); }
  public void m1 (A a) { p("m1(A) in A"); }
  public void m1 () { m1(new B()); }
  public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in A"); }
  public void m2 () { m2(this); }
}

class B extends A {
  public void m1 (B b) { p("m1(B) in B"); }
  public void m2 (A a) { p("m2(A) in B"); }
  public void m3 () { super.m1(this); }
}

B b = new B(); A a = b; a.m1(b); m1(A) in A
B b = new B(); B a = b; b.m1(a); m1(B) in B
B b = new B(); b.m2(); m2(A) in B
B b = new B(); b.m1(); m1(A) in A
B b = new B(); b.m3(); m1(A) in A
Section 4

Multi-Dispatching
Can we expect more than Single-Dispatching?

Mainstream languages support specialization of first parameter:
C++, Java, C#, Smalltalk, Lisp

So how do we solve the equals() problem?
1 introspection?
2 generic programming?
3 double dispatching?
class Natural {
    Natural(int n) { number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Object n){
        if (!(n instanceof Natural)) return false;
        return ((Natural)n).number == number;
    }
}

Set<Natural> set = new HashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);
class Natural {
    Natural(int n) { number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Object n){
        if (!(n instanceof Natural)) return false;
        return ((Natural)n).number == number;
    }
}
...
Set<Natural> set = new HashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);

$ java Natural
[0]
✓ Works
class Natural {
    Natural(int n) { number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Object n){
        if (!(n instanceof Natural)) return false;
        return ((Natural)n).number == number;
    }
}
...
Set<Natural> set = new HashSet<>();
    set.add(new Natural(0));
    set.add(new Natural(0));
    System.out.println(set);

$ java Natural
[0]

✓ Works ⚠ but burdens programmer with type safety
```java
class Natural {
    Natural(int n) { number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Object n){
        if (!(n instanceof Natural)) return false;
        return ((Natural)n).number == number;
    }
}
...
Set<Natural> set = new HashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);

>$ java Natural
[0]

✓ Works 🔴 but burdens programmer with type safety
⚠ and is only available for languages with type introspection
interface Equalizable<T> {
    boolean equals(T other);
}
class Natural implements Equalizable<Natural> {
    Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Natural n){
        return n.number == number;
    }
}
...
EqualizableAwareSet<Natural> set = new MyHashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);
interface Equalizable<T>{
    boolean equals(T other);
}
class Natural implements Equalizable<Natural> {
    Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Natural n){
        return n.number == number;
    }
}
...
EqualizableAwareSet<Natural> set = new MyHashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);

⚠️ needs another Set implementation and...
```java
interface Equalizable<T>{
    boolean equals(T other);
}
class Natural implements Equalizable<Natural> {
    Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean equals(Natural n){
        return n.number == number;
    }
}
...
EqualizableAwareSet<Natural> set = new MyHashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);
```

⚠️ needs another Set implementation and...

⚠️ only works for one overloaded version in super hierarchy

```bash
$ javac Natural.java
Natural.java:2: error: name clash: equals(T) in Equalizable and equals(Object) in Object have the same erasure, yet neither overrides the other
```
Double Dispatching

abstract class EqualsDispatcher{
    boolean dispatch(Natural) { return false };
    boolean dispatch(Object) { return false };
}

class Natural {
    Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
    int number;
    public boolean doubleDispatch(EqualsDispatcher ed) {
        return ed.dispatch(this);
    }
    public boolean equals(Object n){
        return n.doubleDispatch(
            new EqualsDispatcher(){
                boolean dispatch(Natural nat) {
                    return nat.number==number;
                }; });
    }
}
abstract class EqualsDispatcher{
  boolean dispatch(Natural) { return false };
  boolean dispatch(Object) { return false };
}
class Natural {
  Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
  int number;
  public boolean doubleDispatch(EqualsDispatcher ed) {
    return ed.dispatch(this);
  }
  public boolean equals(Object n){
    return n.doubleDispatch(
      new EqualsDispatcher(){
        boolean dispatch(Natural nat) {
          return nat.number==number;
        }
      });
  }
}
✓ Works
▲▲! but needs Dispatcher to know complete class hierarchies
Double Dispatching

abstract class EqualsDispatcher{
   boolean dispatch(Natural) { return false; }
   boolean dispatch(Object) { return false; }
}

class Natural {
   Natural(int n) { number=Math.abs(n); }
   int number;
   public boolean doubleDispatch(EqualsDispatcher ed) {
      return ed.dispatch(this);
   }
   public boolean equals(Object n){
      return n.doubleDispatch(
         new EqualsDispatcher(){
            boolean dispatch(Natural nat) {
               return nat.number==number;
            }
         });
   }
}

✓ Works but needs Dispatcher to know complete class hierarchies
Formal Model of Multi-Dispatching [7]

Signature

\[ f'(e_1,\ldots,e_n) \]

\[ t_0 \]

\[ f(t_1 p_1,\ldots,t_n p_n) \]

dispatches to

handles
determines

Specializer

specialized by

is applicable to

Idea

Introduce Specializers for all parameters

How it works

1. Specializers as subtype annotations to parameter types
2. Dispatcher selects Most Specific Concrete Method
Formal Model of Multi-Dispatching [7]

**Idea**
Introduce Specializers for all parameters

**Signature**
\( f'(e_1,...,e_n) \)

dispatches to

**Specializer**
\( t_0^*, t_1^* ... t_n^* \)
specialized by

**t_0 \ f(t_1 p_1,\ldots,t_n p_n)\)**
determines

**t_0',..., t_n'**
is applicable to

1. Specializers as subtype annotations to parameter types
2. Dispatcher selects Most Specific Concrete Method
Formal Model of Multi-Dispatching [7]

Idea
Introduce Specializers for all parameters

How it works
1. Specializers as subtype annotations to parameter types
2. Dispatcher selects *Most Specific* Concrete Method
## Implications of the implementation

### Type-Checking

1. Typechecking families of concrete methods introduces checking the existence of unique most specific methods for all *valid visible type tuples*.
2. Multiple-Inheritance or interfaces as specializers introduce ambiguities, and thus induce runtime ambiguity exceptions.

### Code-Generation

1. Specialized methods generated separately
2. Dispatcher method calls specialized methods
3. Order of the dispatch tests determines the most specialized method

### Performance penalty

The runtime-penalty for multi-dispatching is related to the number of parameters of a multi-method many `instanceof` tests.
class Natural {
    public Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
    private int number;
    public boolean equals(Object@Natural n){
        return n.number == number;
    }
}
...
Set<Natural> set = new HashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);
class Natural {
    public Natural(int n){ number=Math.abs(n); }
    private int number;
    public boolean equals(Object@Natural n){
        return n.number == number;
    }
}

Set<Natural> set = new HashSet<>();
set.add(new Natural(0));
set.add(new Natural(0));
System.out.println(set);

>$ java Natural
[0]
✓ Clean Code!
Natural Numbers Behind the Scenes

```java
public boolean equals(java.lang.Object);
Code:
0:   aload_1
1:   instanceof    #2; //class Natural
4:   ifeq    16
7:   aload_0
8:   aload_1
9:   checkcast   #2; //class Natural
12:  invokespecial #28; //Method equals$body3$0:(LNatural;)Z
15:  ireturn
16:  aload_0
17:  aload_1
18:  invokespecial #31; //Method equals$body3$1:(LObject;)Z
21:  ireturn
```

⇝ Redirection to methods equals$body3$1 and equals$body3$0

---

**Code Explanation:**

1. `aload_1`: Loads the argument object onto the stack.
2. `instanceof`: Checks if the object is an instance of `Natural`.
3. `ifeq`: If the object is not an instance of `Natural`, skip to label 16.
4. `aload_0`: Loads the reference to the current instance.
5. `aload_1`: Loads the argument object.
6. `checkcast`: Checks the cast to ensure the object is of the specified class.
7. `invokespecial`: Invokes the special method `equals` to check for equality.
8. Return the result.
Natural Numbers Behind the Scenes

$ javap -c Natural

public boolean equals(java.lang.Object);
Code:
0: aload_1
1: instanceof #2; //class Natural
4: ifeq 16
7: aload_0
8: aload_1
9: checkcast #2; //class Natural
12: invokespecial #28; //Method equals$body3$0:(LNatural;)Z
15: ireturn
16: aload_0
17: aload_1
18: invokespecial #31; //Method equals$body3$1:(LObject;)Z
21: ireturn

⇝ Redirection to methods equals$body3$1 and equals$body3$0
Section 5

Natively multidispatching Languages
my Cool $foo;
my Cool $bar;
multi fun(Cool $one, Cool $two){
    say "Dispatch base"
}
multi fun(Int $one, Str $two){
    say "Dispatch 1"
}
multi fun(Str $one, Int $two){
    say "Dispatch 2"
}
$foo=1;
$bar="blabla";
fun($foo,$bar);
my Cool $foo;
my Cool $bar;
multi fun(Cool $one, Cool $two)
  {say "Dispatch base"}
multi fun(Int $one, Str $two)
  {say "Dispatch 1"}
multi fun(Str $one, Int $two)
  {say "Dispatch 2"}
$foo=1;
$bar="blabla";
fun($foo,$bar);
my Cool $foo;
my Cool $bar;
multi fun(Cool $one, Cool $two){
    say "Dispatch base"
}
multi fun(Int $one,Str $two){
    say "Dispatch 1"
}
multi fun(Str $one,Int $two){
    say "Dispatch 2"
}
$foo=1;
$bar="blabla";
fun($foo,$bar);

foo="bla";
fun($foo,$bar)

Dispatch 1
my Cool $foo;
my Cool $bar;
multi fun(Cool $one, Cool $two){
    say "Dispatch base"
}
multi fun(Int $one, Str $two){
    say "Dispatch 1"
}
multi fun(Str $one, Int $two){
    say "Dispatch 2"
}
$foo=1;
$bar="blabla";
fun($foo,$bar);
$foo="bla";
fun($foo,$bar)
... is a *lisp* dialect for the JVM with:

- Prefix notation
- `()` – Brackets for lists
- `::` – Userdefined keyword constructor ::keyword
- `[]` – Vector constructor
- `fn` – Creates a lambda expression
  
  `(fn [x y] (+ x y))`
- `derive` – Generates hierarchical relationships
  
  `(derive ::child ::parent)`
- `defmulti` – Creates new generic method
  
  `(defmulti name dispatch-fn)`
- `defmethod` – Creates new concrete method
  
  `(defmethod name dispatch-val &fn-tail)`
Principle of Multidispatching in Clojure

(derive ::child ::parent)

(defmulti fun (fn [a b] [a b]))
(defmethod fun [::child ::child] [a b] "child equals")
(defmethod fun [::parent ::parent] [a b] "parent equals")

(pr (fun ::child ::child))
Principle of Multidispatching in Clojure

(derive ::child ::parent)
(defmulti fun (fn [a b] [a b]))
(defmethod fun ::child ::child [a b] "child equals")
(defmethod fun ::parent ::parent [a b] "parent equals")
(pr (fun ::child ::child))

child equals
(defn salary [amount]
  (cond (< amount 600) ::poor
        (>= amount 5000) ::rich
        :else ::average))

(defrecord UniPerson [name wage])

(defmulti print (fn [person] (salary (:wage person)))))

(defmethod print ::poor [person] (str "HiWi " (:name person)))
(defmethod print ::average [person] (str "Dr. " (:name person)))
(defmethod print ::rich [person] (str "Prof. " (:name person)))

(pr (print (UniPerson. "Petter" 2000)))
(pr (print (UniPerson. "Stefan" 200)))
(pr (print (UniPerson. "Seidl" 16000)))
(defn salary [amount]
    (cond (< amount 600) ::poor
          (>= amount 5000) ::rich
          :else ::average))

(defrecord UniPerson [name wage])

(defmulti print (fn [person] (salary (:wage person)) ))
(defmethod print ::poor [person](str "HiWi " (:name person)))
(defmethod print ::average [person](str "Dr. " (:name person)))
(defmethod print ::rich [person](str "Prof. " (:name person)))

(pr (print (UniPerson. "Petter" 2000)))
(pr (print (UniPerson. "Stefan" 200)))
(pr (print (UniPerson. "Seidl" 16000)))

Dr. Petter
HiWi Stefan
Prof. Seidl
Multidisciplining

**Pro**
- Generalization of an established technique
- Directly solves problem
- Eliminates boilerplate code
- Compatible with modular compilation/type checking

**Con**
- Counters privileged 1st parameter
- Runtime overhead
- New exceptions when used with multi-inheritance
- *Most Specific Method* ambiguous

**Other Solutions (extract)**
- Dylan
- Scala
Lessons Learned

1. Dynamically dispatched methods are complex interaction of static and dynamic techniques
2. Single Dispatching as in major OO-Languages
3. Making use of Open Source Compilers
4. Multi Dispatching generalizes single dispatching
5. Multi Dispatching Perl6
6. Multi Dispatching Clojure
Section 6

Further materials
Further reading...

OpenJDK 7 Hotspot JIT VM.  
http://hg.openjdk.java.net/jdk7/jdk7.

OpenJDK 7 Javac.  
http://hg.openjdk.java.net/jdk7/jdk7.

Multijava: Design rationale, compiler implementation, and applications.  
ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS), May 2006.


Programming Clojure.  


Multiple dispatch in practice.  
23rd ACM SIGPLAN conference on Object-oriented programming systems languages and applications (OOPSLA), September 2008.
Programming Languages

Multiple Inheritance

Dr. Michael Petter
Winter term 2019
# Outline

## Inheritance Principles
1. Interface Inheritance
2. Implementation Inheritance
3. Dispatching implementation choices

## C++ Object Heap Layout
1. Basics
2. Single-Inheritance
3. Virtual Methods

## C++ Multiple Parents Heap Layout
1. Multiple-Inheritance
2. Virtual Methods
3. Common Parents
### Outline

#### Inheritance Principles

1. Interface Inheritance
2. Implementation Inheritance
3. Dispatching implementation choices

#### C++ Object Heap Layout

1. Basics
2. Single-Inheritance
3. Virtual Methods

#### C++ Multiple Parents Heap Layout

1. Multiple-Inheritance
2. Virtual Methods
3. Common Parents

#### Excursion: Linearization

1. Ambiguous common parents
2. Principles of Linearization
3. Linearization algorithms
“Wouldn’t it be nice to inherit from several parents?”
Interface vs. Implementation inheritance

The classic motivation for inheritance is implementation inheritance

- **Code reusage**
- Child specializes parents, replacing particular methods with custom ones
- Parent acts as library of common behaviours
- Implemented in languages like C++ or Lisp

Code sharing in interface inheritance inverts this relation

- **Behaviour contract**
- Child provides methods, with signatures predetermined by the parent
- Parent acts as generic code frame with room for customization
- Implemented in languages like Java or C#
Interface Inheritance

- List
  - ...
- CircularGraph
  - insertNodeAt(x,i)
  - removeNodeAt(x,i)
- Queue
  - enqueue(x)
  - dequeue()
- Stack
  - push(x)
  - pop()
Implementation inheritance

Ship
  toot()
  moveTo(x,y)

Airport
  shelter(Plane)

Aircraft Carrier
  strikeAt(x,y)
“So how do we lay out objects in memory anyway?”
Excursion: Brief introduction to LLVM IR

LLVM intermediate representation as reference semantics:

;(recursive) struct definitions

%struct.A = type { i32, %struct.B, i32(i32)* }  
%struct.B = type { i64, [10 x [20 x i32]], i8 }

;(stack-) allocation of objects

%a = alloca %struct.A

;adress computation for selection in structure (pointers):

%1 = getelementptr %struct.A* %a, i64 0, i64 2

;load from memory

%2 = load i32(i32)* %1

;indirect call

%retval = call i32 (i32)* %2(i32 42)

Retrieve the memory layout of a compilation unit with:

clang -cc1 -x c++ -v -fdump-record-layouts -emit-llvm source.cpp

Retrieve the IR Code of a compilation unit with:

clang -O1 -S -emit-llvm source.cpp -o IR.llvm
class A {
    int a; int f(int);
};
class B : public A {
    int b; int g(int);
};
class C : public B {
    int c; int h(int);
};

C c;
c.g(42);

%class.C = type { %class.B, i32 }
%class.B = type { %class.A, i32 }
%class.A = type { i32 }

%c = alloca %class.C
%1 = bitcast %class.C* %c to %class.B*
%2 = call i32 @_g(%class.B* %1, i32 42) ; g is statically known
Translation of a method body

class A {
    int a; int f(int);
};
class B : public A {
    int b; int g(int);
};
class C : public B {
    int c; int h(int);
};
int B::g(int p) {
    return p+b;
};
define i32 _g(%class.B* %this, i32 %p) {
    %1 = getelementptr %class.B* %this, i64 0, i32 1
    %2 = load i32* %1
    %3 = add i32 %2, %p
    ret i32 %3
}
“Now what about polymorphic calls?”
Single-Dispatching implementation choices

Single-Dispatching needs runtime action:

1. Manual search run through the super-chain (Java Interpreter \(\sim\) last talk)

\[
\text{call i32 } \_\_\text{dispatch}(\%class.C* %c, i32 42, i32* "f(int, void)"
\]

2. Caching the dispatch result (\(\sim\) Hotspot/JIT)

; caching the recent result value of the \texttt{\_\_\text{dispatch}} function

\[
\text{call i32 } \_\_\text{dispatch}(\%class.C* %c, i32 42)
\]

assert (%c type %class.D) ; verify objects class presumption

\[
\text{call i32 } \_f\_\_\text{from}_D(\%class.C* %c, i32 42)
\]

3. Precomputing the dispatching result in tables

1. Full 2-dim matrix

2. 1-dim Row Displacement Dispatch Tables

3. Virtual Tables (\(\sim\) LLVM/GNU C++, this talk)
Single-Dispatching implementation choices

Single-Dispatching needs runtime action:

1. Manual search run through the super-chain (Java Interpreter \(\rightsquigarrow\) last talk)
   
   ```
call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c, i32 42, i32* "f(int,void)"
   ```

2. Caching the dispatch result (\(\rightsquigarrow\) Hotspot/JIT)
   
   ```
   call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c, i32 42)
   assert (%c type %class.D); verify objects class presumption
   call i32 @_f_from_D(%class.C* %c, i32 42); directly call f
   ```
Single-Dispatching implementation choices

Single-Dispatching needs runtime action:

1. Manual search run through the super-chain (Java Interpreter → last talk)

   ```
   call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c,i32 42,i32* "f(int,void)")
   ```

2. Caching the dispatch result (→ Hotspot/JIT)

   ```
   ; caching the recent result value of the __dispatch function
   ; call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c,i32 42)
   assert (%c type %class.D) ; verify objects class presumption
   call i32 @_f_from_D(%class.C* %c, i32 42) ; directly call f
   ```

3. Precomputing the dispatching result in tables

   1. Full 2-dim matrix
   2. 1-dim Row Displacement Dispatch Tables
   3. Virtual Tables (→ LLVM/GNU C++, this talk)
Single-Dispatching implementation choices

Single-Dispatching needs runtime action:

1. Manual search run through the super-chain (Java Interpreter ⇾ last talk)

   ```
call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c, i32 42, i32* "f(int,void)")
   ```

2. Caching the dispatch result (⇝ Hotspot/JIT)

   ```
   ; caching the recent result value of the __dispatch function
   ; call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c, i32 42)
   assert (%c type %class.D); verify objects class presumption
   call i32 @_f_from_D(%class.C* %c, i32 42); directly call f
   ```

3. Precomputing the dispatching result in tables

   1. Full 2-dim matrix

   ![2-dim matrix example](image-url)
Single-Dispatching implementation choices

Single-Dispatching needs runtime action:

1. Manual search run through the super-chain (Java Interpreter ⟷ last talk)

```
call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c, i32 42, i32* "f(int,void)")
```

2. Caching the dispatch result (⟷ Hotspot/JIT)

```
; caching the recent result value of the __dispatch function
; call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c, i32 42)
assert (%c type %class.D); verify objects class presumption
```

```
call i32 @_f_from_D(%class.C* %c, i32 42); directly call f
```

3. Precomputing the dispatching result in tables

1. Full 2-dim matrix
2. 1-dim Row Displacement Dispatch Tables
Single-Dispatching implementation choices

Single-Dispatching needs runtime action:

1. Manual search run through the super-chain (Java Interpreter ↦ last talk)

```tof
call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c, i32 42, i32* "f(int, void)"
```

2. Caching the dispatch result (↝ Hotspot/JIT)

```tof
; caching the recent result value of the __dispatch function
; call i32 @__dispatch(%class.C* %c, i32 42)
assert (%c type %class.D) ; verify objects class presumption
call i32 @_f_from_D(%class.C* %c, i32 42) ; directly call f
```

3. Precomputing the dispatching result in tables

   1. Full 2-dim matrix
   2. 1-dim Row Displacement Dispatch Tables
   3. Virtual Tables
      (↝ LLVM/GNU C++, this talk)

```
  f( )  g( )  h( )  i( )  j( )  k( )  l( )  m( )  n( )
  f( )  g( )  h( )  i( )  j( )  k( )  l( )  m( )  n( )
  A  1
  B  1 2
  C  3 4
  D  3 2 4 5
  E  6 7
  F  8 9 7
  1 1 2 ...
  8 9 7
```
class A {
    int a; virtual int f(int);
    virtual int g(int);
    virtual int h(int);
};
class B : public A {
    int b; int g(int);
};
class C : public B {
    int c; int h(int);
};
...
C c;
c.g(42);

%c.vptr = bitcast %class.C* %c to i32 (%class.B*, i32)*** ; vtbl
%1 = load (%class.B*, i32)*** %c.vptr ; dereference vptr
%2 = getelementptr %1, i64 1 ; select g()-entry
%3 = load (%class.B*, i32)** %2 ; dereference g()-entry
%4 = call i32 %3(%class.B* %c, i32 42)

%class.C = type { %class.B, i32, [4 x i8] }
%class.B = type { [12 x i8], i32 }
%class.A = type { i32 (...)**, i32 }
“So how do we include several parent objects?”
Multiple inheritance class diagram

A
  int f(int)
  int a

B
  int g(int)
  int b

C
  int h(int)
  int c
Static Type Casts

class A {
    int a; int f(int);
};
class B {
    int b; int g(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int h(int);
};
...
B* b = new C();

%1 = call i8* @_new(i64 12)
call void @_memset.p0i8.i64(i8* %1, i8 0, i64 12, i32 4, i1 false)
%2 = getelementptr i8* %1, i64 4 ; select B-offset in C
%b = bitcast i8* %2 to %class.B*
class A {
    int a; int f(int);
};
class B {
    int b; int g(int);
};
class C : public A , public B {
    int c; int h(int);
};
...
B* b = new C();

%1 = call i8* @_new(i64 12)
call void @_memset.p0i8.i64(i8* %1, i8 0, i64 12, i32 4, i1 false)
%2 = getelementptr i8* %1, i64 4 ; select B-offset in C
%b = bitcast i8* %2 to %class.B*

⚠️ implicit casts potentially add a constant to the object pointer.
Static Type Casts

class A {
    int a; int f(int);
};
class B {
    int b; int g(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int h(int);
};
...
B* b = new C();

%1 = call i8* @_new(i64 12)
call void @_memset.p0i8.i64(i8* %1, i8 0, i64 12, i32 4, i1 false)
%2 = getelementptr i8* %1, i64 4 ; select B-offset in C
%b = bitcast i8* %2 to %class.B*

⚠️ implicit casts potentially add a constant to the object pointer.
⚠️ getelementptr implements ΔB as 4 · i8!
Keeping Calling Conventions

class A {
    int a; int f(int);
};
class B {
    int b; int g(int);
};
class C : public A , public B {
    int c; int h(int);
};
...
C c;
c.g(42);

%c = alloca %class.C
%1 = bitcast %class.C* %c to i8*
%2 = getelementptr i8* %1, i64 4 ; select B-offset in C
%3 = call i32 @_g(%class.B* %2, i32 42) ; g is statically known
Ambiguities

class A { void f(int); };
class B { void f(int); };
class C : public A, public B {};

C* pc;
pc->f(42);

⚠️ Which method is called?

Solution I: Explicit qualification

c->A::f(42);
c->B::f(42);

Solution II: Automagical resolution

Idea: The Compiler introduces a linear order on the nodes of the inheritance graph
In General:

1. Inheritance is a uniform mechanism, and its searches (→ total order) apply identically for all object fields or methods.

2. In the literature, we also find the set of constraints to create a linearization as Method Resolution Order.

3. Linearization is a best-effort approach at best.
MRO via DFS

Leftmost Preorder Depth-First Search

\[ [A] = ABWC \]

\[ [A] = ABCW \]

\[ [A] = ABCWV \]

Principle 1: inheritance is violated

\[ [A] = ABCW \]

\[ [A] = ABCWV \]

Principle 2: multiplicity not fulfillable

\[ however \ B \rightarrow C =⇒ W \rightarrow V ?? \]

\[ A(B, C) \ B(W) \ C(W) \]
MRO via DFS

**Leftmost Preorder Depth-First Search**

\[ L[A] = ABWC \]

⚠️ Principle 1 *inheritance* is violated

Python: classical python objects (≤ 2.1) use LPDFS!

**LPDFS with Duplicate Cancellation**

⚠️ Principle 2 multiplicity not fulfillable

However \( B \rightarrow C \Rightarrow W \rightarrow V \) ??

```
CB
A
W
A(B, C) B(W) C(W)
```
MRO via DFS

Leftmost Preorder Depth-First Search

\[ L[A] = ABWC \]

⚠️ Principle 1 *inheritance* is violated

Python: classical python objects (≤ 2.1) use LPDFS!

LPDFS with Duplicate Cancellation

\[ L[A] = ABCW \]

✓ Principle 1 *inheritance* is fixed

Python: new python objects (2.2) use LPDFS(DC)!

LPDFS with Duplicate Cancellation
MRO via DFS

Leftmost Preorder Depth-First Search

\[ L[A] = ABWC \]

⚠ Principle 1 *inheritance* is violated

Python: classical python objects (≤ 2.1) use LPDFS!

LPDFS with Duplicate Cancellation

\[ L[A] = ABCW \]

✓ Principle 1 *inheritance* is fixed

Python: new python objects (2.2) use LPDFS(DC)!

LPDFS with Duplicate Cancellation

\[ L[A] = ABCWV \]

⚠ Principle 2 *multiplicity* not fulfillable

⚠ However \( B \rightarrow C \Rightarrow W \rightarrow V \)??
MRO via Refined Postorder DFS

Reverse Postorder Rightmost DFS

\[ A = \text{ABFDCEGHW} \]

Linear extension of inheritance relation

\[ A = \text{ABCDGEF} \]

\[ \text{But principle 2 multiplicity is violated!} \]

CLOS: uses Refined RPDFS

\[ A = \text{ABCDEFG} \]

✓ Refine graph with conflict edge & rerun RPRDFS!

\[ A(B, C) B(F, D) C(E, H) D(G) E(G) F(W) G(W) H(W) \]
MRO via Refined Postorder DFS

Reverse Postorder Rightmost DFS

$L[A] = ABFDCEGHW$
✓ Linear extension of inheritance relation

RPRDFS

\[ A(B, C) B(F, D) C(E, H) \]
\[ D(G) E(G) F(W) G(W) H(W) \]

\[ A(B, C) B(F, G) C(D, E) \]
MRO via Refined Postorder DFS

Reverse Postorder Rightmost DFS

\[ L[A] = ABFDCEGHW \]

✓ Linear extension of inheritance relation

RPRDFS

\[ L[A] = ABCDGEF \]

⚠️ But principle 2 \textit{multiplicity} is violated!
**MRO via Refined Postorder DFS**

**Reverse Postorder Rightmost DFS**

\[ L[A] = ABFDCEGHW \]

✓ Linear extension of inheritance relation

**RPRDFS**

\[ L[A] = ABCDGEF \]

⚠️ But principle 2 *multiplicity* is violated!

**Refined RPRDFS**

\[ L[A] = ABFDCEGHW \]

✓ Linear extension of inheritance relation

\[ A(B, C) \quad B(F, G) \quad C(D, E) \]

\[ D(G) \quad E(G) \quad F(W) \quad G(W) \quad H(W) \]
MRO via Refined Postorder DFS

Reverse Postorder Rightmost DFS

\[ L[A] = ABFDCEGHW \]

✓ Linear extension of inheritance relation

RPRDFS

\[ L[A] = ABCDGEF \]

⚠️ But principle 2 *multiplicity* is violated!

CLOS: uses Refined RPDFS [3]

Refined RPRDFS

\[ L[A] = ABCDEFG \]

✓ Refine graph with conflict edge & rerun RPRDFS!
Extension Principle: Monotonicity

If $C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ in $C$'s linearization, then $C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ for every linearization of $C$'s children.
MRO via Refined Postorder DFS

Refined RPRDFS

⚠️ Monotonicity is not guaranteed!

Extension Principle: Monotonicity

If $C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ in $C$'s linearization, then $C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ for every linearization of $C$'s children.
MRO via Refined Postorder DFS

Refined RPRDFS

⚠️ *Monotonicity* is not guaranteed!

Extension Principle: Monotonicity

If $C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ in $C$'s linearization, then $C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ for every linearization of $C$'s children.

$L[A] = A B C D E F G \implies F \rightarrow G$

$L[C] = C D G E F \implies G \rightarrow F$
A linearization $L$ is an attribute $L[C]$ of a class $C$. Classes $B_1, \ldots, B_n$ are superclasses to child class $C$, defined in the *local precedence order* $C(B_1 \ldots B_n)$. Then

$$L[C] = C \cdot \bigcup_i (L[B_1], \ldots, L[B_n], B_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot B_n) \mid C(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$$

$$L[Object] = Object$$

with

$$\bigcup_i (L_i) = \begin{cases} c \cdot (\bigcup_i (L_i \setminus c)) & \text{if } \exists \min_k \forall_j c = \text{head}(L_k) \notin \text{tail}(L_j) \\ \text{fail} & \text{else} \end{cases}$$
MRO via C3 Linearization

C3 detects and reports a violation of monotonicity with the addition of \( A(B,C) \) to the class set.

C3 linearization \[1\]: is used in Python 3, Perl 6, and Solidity.

\[
\begin{align*}
L[G] & \quad G \\
L[F] & \quad F \\
L[E] & \\
L[D] & \\
L[B] & \\
L[C] & \\
L[A] & 
\end{align*}
\]
C3 detects and reports a violation of monotonicity with the addition of \( A(B, C) \) to the class set.

C3 linearization [1]: is used in Python 3, Perl 6, and Solidity.
MRO via C3 Linearization

\[ L[G] = G \]
\[ L[F] = F \]
\[ L[E] = E \cdot F \]
\[ L[D] = D \cdot G \]
\[ L[B] = B \cdot (L[F] \sqcup L[G] \sqcup (F \cdot G)) \]
\[ L[C] \]
\[ L[A] \]
MRO via C3 Linearization

\[
\begin{align*}
L[G] &= G \\
L[F] &= F \\
L[E] &= E \cdot F \\
L[D] &= D \cdot G \\
L[B] &= B \cdot (F \sqcup G \sqcup (F \cdot G)) \\
L[C] \\
L[A]
\end{align*}
\]

\[ \text{C3 detects and reports a violation of monotonicity with the addition of } A(B, C) \text{ to the class set.} \]

C3 linearization [1] is used in Python 3, Perl 6, and Solidity.

A(B, C) B(F, G) C(D, E) \\
D(G) E(F)
MRO via C3 Linearization

$L[G] = G$
$L[F] = F$
$L[E] = E \cdot F$
$L[D] = D \cdot G$
$L[B] = B \cdot F \cdot G$
$L[C]$
$L[A]$

C3 detects and reports a violation of monotonicity with the addition of $A(B, C)$ to the class set.

C3 linearization [1]: is used in Python 3, Perl 6, and Solidity.

A(B, C) B(F, G) C(D, E)
D(G) E(F)
MRO via C3 Linearization

\[
\begin{align*}
L[G] & \quad G \\
L[F] & \quad F \\
L[E] & \quad E \cdot F \\
L[D] & \quad D \cdot G \\
L[B] & \quad B \cdot F \cdot G \\
L[C] & \quad C \cdot (L[D] \sqcup L[E] \sqcup (D \cdot E)) \\
L[A] &
\end{align*}
\]

A(B, C) B(F, G) C(D, E) 
D(G) E(F)
MRO via C3 Linearization

\[ L[G] \quad G \]
\[ L[F] \quad F \]
\[ L[E] \quad E \cdot F \]
\[ L[D] \quad D \cdot G \]
\[ L[B] \quad B \cdot F \cdot G \]
\[ L[C] \quad C \cdot ((D \cdot G) \sqcup (E \cdot F) \sqcup (D \cdot E)) \]
\[ L[A] \]

C3 detects and reports a violation of monotonicity with the addition of \( A(B, C) \) to the class set.

C3 linearization [1]: is used in Python 3, Perl 6, and Solidity.

\[ A(B, C) \quad B(F, G) \quad C(D, E) \quad D(G) \quad E(F) \]
MRO via C3 Linearization

\[ L[G] \quad G \]
\[ L[F] \quad F \]
\[ L[E] \quad E \cdot F \]
\[ L[D] \quad D \cdot G \]
\[ L[B] \quad B \cdot F \cdot G \]
\[ L[C] \quad C \cdot D \cdot (G \sqcup (E \cdot F) \sqcup E) \]
\[ L[A] \]

A(B, C) B(F, G) C(D, E)
D(G) E(F)
MRO via C3 Linearization

\[
\begin{align*}
L[G] & \quad G \\
L[F] & \quad F \\
L[E] & \quad E \cdot F \\
L[D] & \quad D \cdot G \\
L[B] & \quad B \cdot F \cdot G \\
L[C] & \quad C \cdot D \cdot G \cdot E \cdot F \\
L[A] & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
A(B, C) \quad B(F, G) \quad C(D, E) \\
D(G) \quad E(F)
\]
MRO via C3 Linearization

\[
\begin{align*}
L[G] &= G \\
L[F] &= F \\
L[E] &= E \cdot F \\
L[D] &= D \cdot G \\
L[B] &= B \cdot F \cdot G \\
L[C] &= C \cdot D \cdot G \cdot E \cdot F \\
L[A] &= A \cdot ((B \cdot F \cdot G) \sqcup (C \cdot D \cdot G \cdot E \cdot F) \sqcup (B \cdot C))
\end{align*}
\]
C3 detects and reports a violation of monotonicity with the addition of \( A(B, C) \) to the class set.

C3 linearization \[1\]: is used in Python 3, Perl 6, and Solidity.

\[
\begin{align*}
L[G] &= G \\
L[F] &= F \\
L[E] &= E \cdot F \\
L[D] &= D \cdot G \\
L[B] &= B \cdot F \cdot G \\
L[C] &= C \cdot D \cdot G \cdot E \cdot F \\
L[A] &= A \cdot B \cdot C \cdot D \cdot ((F \cdot G) \sqcup (G \cdot E \cdot F))
\end{align*}
\]
MRO via C3 Linearization

C3 detects and reports a violation of monotonicity with the addition of $A(B, C)$ to the class set.

C3 linearization \[1\] is used in Python 3, Perl 6, and Solidity.

A,B,C,D,E,F,G

\[
\begin{align*}
L[G] & \quad G \\
L[F] & \quad F \\
L[E] & \quad E \cdot F \\
L[D] & \quad D \cdot G \\
L[B] & \quad B \cdot F \cdot G \\
L[C] & \quad C \cdot D \cdot G \cdot E \cdot F \\
L[A] & \quad \triangle \text{ fail}
\end{align*}
\]
C3 detects and reports a violation of *monotonicity* with the addition of A(B,C) to the class set. 

C3 linearization [1]: is used in *Python 3*, *Perl 6*, and *Solidity*
**Linearization vs. explicit qualification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linearization</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No switch/duplexer code necessary</td>
<td>More flexible, fine-grained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No explicit naming of qualifiers</td>
<td>Linearization choices may be awkward or unexpected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique super reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces number of multi-dispatching conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Languages with automatic linearization exist**

- **CLOS** Common Lisp Object System
- **Solidity, Python 3** and **Perl 6** with C3
- Prerequisite for → Mixins
“And what about dynamic dispatching in Multiple Inheritance?”
class A {
    int a; virtual int f(int);
};
class B {
    int b; virtual int f(int);
    virtual int g(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int f(int);
};
...
C c;
B* pb = &c;
pb->f(42);

; B* pb = &c;
%0 = bitcast %class.C* %c to i8*  ; type fumbling
%1 = getelementptr i8* %0, i64 16 ; offset of B in C
%2 = bitcast i8* %1 to %class.B*  ; get typing right
store %class.B* %2, %class.B** %pb ; store to pb
Virtual Tables for Multiple Inheritance

class A {
    int a; virtual int f(int);
};
class B {
    int b; virtual int f(int);
        virtual int g(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int f(int);
};
...
C c;
B* pb = &c;
pb->f(42);

; pb->f(42);
%0 = load %class.B** %pb ;load the b-pointer
%1 = bitcast %class.B* %0 to i32 (%class.B*, i32)*** ;cast to vtable
%2 = load i32(%class.B*, i32)*** %1 ;load vptr
%3 = getelementptr i32 (%class.B*, i32)** %2, i64 0 ;select f() entry
%4 = load i32(%class.B*, i32)** %3
%5 = call i32 %4(%class.B* %0, i32 42) ;load function pointer

%class.C = type { %class.A, [12 x i8], i32 }%class.A = type { i32 (...)**, i32 }
%class.B = type { i32 (...)**, i32 }
Virtual Tables for Multiple Inheritance

class A {
    int a; virtual int f(int);
};
class B {
    int b; virtual int f(int);
    virtual int g(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int f(int);
};
...
C c;
B* pb = &c;
pb->f(42);

%class.C = type { %class.A, [12 x i8], i32 }
%class.A = type { i32 (...)**, i32 }
%class.B = type { i32 (...)**, i32 }
A Basic Virtual Table consists of different parts:

1. **offset to top** of an enclosing object's memory representation
2. **typeid pointer** to a RTTI object (not relevant for us)
3. **virtual function pointers** for resolving virtual methods

- Virtual tables are composed when multiple inheritance is used.
- The `vptr` fields in objects are pointers to their corresponding virtual-subtables.
- Casting preserves the link between an object and its corresponding virtual-subtable.
- `clang -cc1 -fdump-vtable-layouts -emit-llvm code.cpp` yields the vtables of a compilation unit.
Casting Issues

class A { int a; };
class B { virtual int f(int); };
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int f(int);
};
C* c = new C();
c->f(42);
B* b = new C();
b->f(42);
C::f
f
f
RTTI
B
0
RTTI
Casting Issues

class A { int a; };
class B { virtual int f(int); };
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int f(int);
};

C* c = new C();
c->f(42);

B* b = new C();
b->f(42);

⚠️ this-Pointer for C::f is expected to point to C
Casting Issues

class A { int a; };
class B { virtual int f(int); };
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int f(int);
};
C* c = new C();
c->f(42);
B* b = new C();
b->f(42);

⚠️ this-Pointer for C::f is expected to point to C
Thunks

Solution: thunks

...are trampoline methods, delegating the virtual method to its original implementation with an adapted this-reference

```assembly
define i32 @_f(%class.B* %this, i32 %i) {
    %1 = bitcast %class.B* %this to i8*
    %2 = getelementptr i8* %1, i64 -16 ; sizeof(A)=16
    %3 = bitcast i8* %2 to %class.C*
    %4 = call i32 @_f(%class.C* %3, i32 %i)
    ret i32 %4
}
```

⇝ B-in-C-vtable entry for f(int) is the thunk _f(int)
Thunks

Solution: *thunks*

...are trampoline methods, delegating the virtual method to its original implementation with an adapted *this*-reference

```assembly
define i32 @__f(%class.B* %this, i32 %i) {
  %1 = bitcast %class.B* %this to i8*
  %2 = getelementptr i8* %1, i64 -16 ; sizeof(A)=16
  %3 = bitcast i8* %2 to %class.C*
  %4 = call i32 @_f(%class.C* %3, i32 %i)
  ret i32 %4
}
```

⇝ B-in-C-vtable entry for *f*(int) is the thunk `_f`(int)

⇝ `_f`(int) adds a compiletime constant ∆B to *this* before calling *f*(int)
Thunks

Solution: thunks

...are trampoline methods, delegating the virtual method to its original implementation with an adapted this-reference

define i32 @__f(%class.B* %this, i32 %i) {
  %1 = bitcast %class.B* %this to i8*
  %2 = getelementptr i8* %1, i64 -16 ; sizeof(A)=16
  %3 = bitcast i8* %2 to %class.C*
  %4 = call i32 @_f(%class.C* %3, i32 %i)
  ret i32 %4
}

⇝ B-in-C-vtable entry for f(int) is the thunk _f(int)
⇝ _f(int) adds a compiletime constant ∆B to this before calling f(int)
⇝ f(int) addresses its locals relative to what it assumes to be a C pointer
“But what if there are common ancestors?”
Common Bases – Duplicated Bases

Standard C++ multiple inheritance conceptually duplicates representations for common ancestors:

```
A
int f(int)
int a

B
int f(int)
int c
int b
int a

C
int f(int)
int l
```

![Diagram of class inheritance](diagram.png)
Standard C++ multiple inheritance conceptually duplicates representations for common ancestors:
Duplicated Base Classes

class L {
    int l; virtual void f(int);
};
class A : public L {
    int a; void f(int);
};
class B : public L {
    int b; void f(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c;
};
...
C c;
L* pl = &c;
pl->f(42); // where to dispatch?
C* pc = (C*)pl;

⚠️ Ambiguity!
Duplicated Base Classes

class L {
    int l; virtual void f(int);
};
class A : public L {
    int a; void f(int);
};
class B : public L {
    int b; void f(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c;
};

C c;
L* pl = (B*)&c;
pl->f(42); // where to dispatch?
C* pc = (C*)pl;

⚠️ Ambiguity!
Duplicated Base Classes

class L {
    int l; virtual void f(int);
};
class A : public L {
    int a; void f(int);
};
class B : public L {
    int b; void f(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c;
};

C c;
L* pl = (B*)&c;
pl->f(42); // where to dispatch?
C* pc = (C*)(B*)pl;
Common Bases – Shared Base Class

Optionally, C++ multiple inheritance enables a shared representation for common ancestors, creating the *diamond pattern*: 

![Diamond Pattern Diagram]

- **W**
  - int f(int)
  - int g(int)
  - int h(int)
  - int w

- **A**
  - int f(int)
  - int a

- **B**
  - int g(int)
  - int b

- **C**
  - int h(int)
  - int c

- **W** is a virtual base of **A** and **B**.
- **A** and **B** are virtual bases of **C**.

This diagram illustrates the diamond pattern where **C** inherits from both **A** and **B** through **W**, creating potential compile-time errors due to ambiguity in method implementations.
Shared Base Class

class W {
    int w; virtual void f(int);
    virtual void g(int);
    virtual void h(int);
};
class A : public virtual W {
    int a; void f(int);
};
class B : public virtual W {
    int b; void g(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; void h(int);
};
...
C* pc;
pc->f(42);

⚠️ Ambiguities
⇝ e.g. overriding f in A and B
Shared Base Class

class W {
    int w; virtual void f(int);
    virtual void g(int);
    virtual void h(int);
};
class A : public virtual W {
    int a; void f(int);
};
class B : public virtual W {
    int b; void g(int);
};
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; void h(int);
};

C* pc;
pc->B::f(42);
((W*)pc)->h(42);
((B*)pc)->f(42);
Dynamic Type Casts

class A : public virtual W {
  ...
};
class B : public virtual W {
  ...
};
class C : public A, public B {
  ...
};
class D : public C, public B {
  ...
};

C c;
W* pw = &c;
C* pc = (C*)pw; // Compile error

⚠️ No guaranteed *constant* offsets between virtual bases and subclasses ⇝ No static casting!

Dynamic casting makes use of offset-to-top
Dynamic Type Casts

class A : public virtual W {
    ...
};
class B : public virtual W {
    ...
};
class C : public A, public B {
    ...
};
class D : public C, public B {
    ...
};

C c;
W* pw = &c;
C* pc = dynamic_cast<C*>(pw);

⚠️ No guaranteed constant offsets between virtual bases and subclasses ⇝ No static casting!

⚠️ Dynamic casting makes use of offset-to-top
class W { virtual int f(int); }
class A : virtual W { int a; }
class B : virtual W { int b; }
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int f(int);
};
B* b = new C();
b->f(42);
W* w = new C();
w->f(42);
C::f
C::Wf
C::Bf
RTTI
W
RTTI
C::Wf
? {
B
C::Bf
vptr vptr
Again: Casting Issues

class W { virtual int f(int); };
class A : virtual W { int a; };
class B : virtual W { int b; };
class C : public A, public B {
    int c; int f(int);
};
B* b = new C();
b->f(42);

W* w = new C();
w->f(42);

⚠️ In a conventional thunk C::Bf adjusts the this-pointer with a statically known constant to point to C
Virtual Thunks

class W {
    virtual void g(int);
};
class A : public virtual W {...};
class B : public virtual W {
    int b; void g(int i){ }
};
class C : public A, public B{...};
C c;
W* pw = &c;
pw->g(42);

define void @__g(%class.B* %this, i32 %i) { ; virtual thunk to B::g
    %1 = bitcast %class.B* %this to i8*
    %2 = bitcast i8* %1 to i8**
    %3 = load i8** %2 ; load W-vtable ptr
    %4 = getelementptr i8* %3, i64 -32 ; -32 bytes is g-entry in vcalls
    %5 = bitcast i8* %4 to i64*
    %6 = load i64* %5 ; load g's vcall offset
    %7 = getelementptr i8* %6, i64 -32 ; navigate to vcalloffset+ Wtop
    %8 = bitcast i8* %7 to %class.B*
call void @_g(%class.B* %8, i32 %i)
    ret void
}
Virtual Tables for Virtual Bases (⇝ C++-ABI)

A Virtual Table for a Virtual Subclass

gets a **virtual base pointer**

A Virtual Table for a Virtual Base

consists of different parts:

1. **virtual call offsets** per virtual function for adjusting this dynamically
2. **offset to top** of an enclosing objects heap representation
3. **typeinfo pointer** to an RTTI object (not relevant for us)
4. **virtual function pointers** for resolving virtual methods

Virtual Base classes have **virtual thunks** which look up the offset to adjust the this pointer to the correct value in the virtual table!
Compiler and Runtime Collaboration

Compiler generates:

1. . . one code block for each method
2. . . one virtual table for each class-composition, with
   ▶ references to the most recent implementations of methods of a *unique common signature* (⇝ single dispatching)
   ▶ sub-tables for the composed subclasses
   ▶ static top-of-object and virtual bases offsets per sub-table
   ▶ (virtual) thunks as *this*-adapters per method and subclass if needed

Runtime:

1. At program startup virtual tables are globally created
2. Allocation of memory space for each object followed by constructor calls
3. Constructor stores pointers to virtual table (or fragments) in the objects
4. Method calls transparently call methods statically or from virtual tables, *unaware of real class identity*
5. Dynamic casts may use *offset-to-top* field in objects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polemics of Multiple Inheritance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Full Multiple Inheritance (FMI)
- Removes constraints on parents in inheritance
- More convenient and simple in the common cases
- Occurrence of diamond pattern not as frequent as discussions indicate

### Multiple Interface Inheritance (MII)
- Simpler implementation
- Interfaces and aggregation already quite expressive
- Too frequent use of FMI considered as flaw in the class hierarchy design
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Different purposes of inheritance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Heap Layouts of hierarchically constructed objects in C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Virtual Table layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LLVM IR representation of object access code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Linearization as alternative to explicit disambiguation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pitfalls of Multiple Inheritance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the presented approach is implemented in GNU C++ and LLVM

- Microsoft’s MS VC++ approaches multiple inheritance differently
  - splits the virtual table into several smaller tables
  - keeps a vbptr (virtual base pointer) in the object representation, pointing to the virtual base of a subclass.
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1. SC=CC in Multicore Architectures with Cache (Meixner/Sorin 2006/2009)
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8. Templates vs. Inheritance
Programming Languages

Mixins and Traits

Dr. Michael Petter
Winter 2019/20
What modularization techniques are there besides multiple implementation inheritance?
Codesharing in Object Oriented Systems is often inheritance-centric.

Inheritance itself comes in different flavours:
- single inheritance
- multiple inheritance

All flavours of inheritance tackle problems of *decomposition* and *composition*.
The Adventure Game

Door

ShortDoor
  canPass(Person p)

LockedDoor
  canOpen(Person p)

ShortLockedDoor
  canOpen(Person p)
  canPass(Person p)
The Adventure Game

Door
Locked
canOpen(Person p)
Short
canPass(Person p)
ShortLockedDoor
canOpen(Person p)
canPass(Person p)
<interface>Doorlike
canPass(Person p)
canOpen(Person p)

Aggregation & S.-Inheritance

Door must explicitly provide chaining
Doorlike must anticipate wrappers

⇒ Multiple Inheritance ✓
The Wrapper

**FileStream**
- read()
- write()

**SocketStream**
- read()
- write()

**SynchRW**
- acquireLock()
- releaseLock()

⚠️ Unclear relations
⇝ Cannot inherit from both in turn with Multiple Inheritance
(Many-to-One instead of One-to-Many Relation)
The Wrapper – Aggregation Solution

Stream
- read()
- write()

FileStream
- read()
- write()

SocketStream
- read()
- write()

SynchRW
- read()
- write()
- acquireLock()
- releaseLock()

⚠️ Aggregation
- Undoes specialization
- Needs common ancestor
With multiple inheritance, read/write Code is essentially *identical but duplicated for each particular wrapper*
Inappropriate Hierarchies

Implemented methods (acquireLock/releaseLock) to high
(De-)Composition Problems

All the problems of
- Relation
- Duplication
- Hierarchy
are centered around the question

“How do I distribute functionality over a hierarchy”

⇝ functional (de-)composition
Classes and Methods

The building blocks for classes are
- a countable set of method names $\mathcal{N}$
- a countable set of method bodies $\mathbb{B}$

Classes map names to elements from the flat lattice $\mathbb{B}$ (called bindings), consisting of:
- method bodies $\in \mathbb{B}$ or classes $\in \mathcal{C}$
- $\bot$ abstract
- $\top$ in conflict

and the partial order $\bot \sqsubseteq b \sqsubseteq \top$ for each $b \in \mathbb{B}$

**Definition (Abstract Class $\in \mathcal{C}$)**

A general function $c : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is called a class.

**Definition (Interface and Class)**

A class $c$ is called
- **interface** iff $\forall n \in \text{pre}(c). c(n) = \bot$.
- **abstract class** iff $\exists n \in \text{pre}(c). c(n) = \bot$.
- **concrete class** iff $\forall n \in \text{pre}(c). \bot \sqsubseteq c(n) \sqsubseteq \top$. 

Computing with Classes and Methods

Definition (Family of classes $C$)

We call the set of all maps from names to bindings the family of classes $C := \mathcal{N} \mapsto \mathcal{B}$.

Several possibilities for composing maps $C \Box C$:

- the symmetric join $\sqcup$, defined componentwise:

$$
(c_1 \sqcup c_2)(n) = b_1 \sqcup b_2 = \begin{cases} 
  b_2 & \text{if } b_1 = \bot \text{ or } n \notin \text{pre}(c_1) \\
  b_1 & \text{if } b_2 = \bot \text{ or } n \notin \text{pre}(c_2) \\
  b_2 & \text{if } b_1 = b_2 \\
  \top & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$

where $b_i = c_i(n)$.

- in contrast, the asymmetric join $\sqcup$, defined componentwise:

$$
(c_1 \sqcup c_2)(n) = \begin{cases} 
  c_1(n) & \text{if } n \in \text{pre}(c_1) \\
  c_2(n) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$
**Example: Smalltalk-Inheritance**

*Smalltalk* inheritance
- children’s methods dominate parents’ methods
- is the archetype for inheritance in mainstream languages like Java or C#
- inheriting smalltalk-style establishes a reference to the parent

**Definition (Smalltalk inheritance (▹))**

Smalltalk inheritance is the binary operator ▹ : \( C \times C \mapsto C \), defined by

\[
c_1 ▹ c_2 = \{\text{super} \mapsto c_2\} \sqcup (c_1 \sqcup c_2)
\]

**Example: Doors**

\[
\text{Door} = \{\text{canPass} \mapsto \bot, \text{canOpen} \mapsto \bot\}
\]

\[
\text{LockedDoor} = \{\text{canOpen} \mapsto 0x4204711\} ▹ \text{Door}
\]

\[
= \{\text{super} \mapsto \text{Door}\} \sqcup (\{\text{canOpen} \mapsto 0x4204711\} \sqcup \text{Door})
\]

\[
= \{\text{super} \mapsto \text{Door}, \text{canOpen} \mapsto 0x4204711, \text{canPass} \mapsto \bot\}
\]
Excursion: Beta-Inheritance

In Beta-style inheritance
- the design goal is to provide security wrt. replacement of a method by a different method.
- methods in parents dominate methods in subclass
- the keyword inner explicitly delegates control to the subclass

Definition (Beta inheritance (\(\triangleleft\)))

Beta inheritance is the binary operator \(\triangleleft : C \times C \mapsto C\), defined by

\[
c_1 \triangleleft c_2 = \{\text{inner} \mapsto c_1\} \sqcup (c_2 \sqcup c_1)
\]

Example (equivalent syntax):

```java
class Person {
    String name = "Axel Simon";
    public String toString(){ return name+inner.toString();};
};
class Graduate extends Person {
    public extension String toString(){ return ", Ph.D."; }
};
```
So what do we really want?
Adventure Game with Code Duplication

Door

LockedDoor

canOpen(Person p)

ShortDoor

canPass(Person p)

canPass(Person p)

ShortLockedDoor

canOpen(Person p)

canPass(Person p)

canPass(Person p)
Adventure Game with Mixins

<\textit{mixin}>Locked
\texttt{canOpen(Person p)}

<\textit{mixin}>Short
\texttt{canPass(Person p)}

\texttt{compose}

\texttt{Door}
\texttt{canOpen(Person p)}
\texttt{canPass(Person p)}

\texttt{ShortLockedDoor}
\texttt{canOpen(Person p)}
\texttt{canPass(Person p)}
\texttt{compose}
class Door {
    boolean canOpen(Person p) { return true; }
    boolean canPass(Person p) { return p.size() < 210; }
}
mixin Locked {
    boolean canOpen(Person p) {
        if (!p.hasItem(key)) return false; else return super.canOpen(p);
    }
}
mixin Short {
    boolean canPass(Person p) {
        if (p.height()>1) return false; else return super.canPass(p);
    }
}
class ShortDoor = Short(Door);
class LockedDoor = Locked(Door);
mixin ShortLocked = Short o Locked;
class ShortLockedDoor = Short(Locked(Door));
class ShortLockedDoor2 = ShortLocked(Door);
Back to the blackboard!
Abstract model for Mixins

A Mixin is a *unary second order type expression*. In principle it is a curried version of the Smalltalk-style inheritance operator. In certain languages, programmers can create such mixin operators:

**Definition (Mixin)**

The mixin constructor \( \text{mixin} : C \mapsto (C \mapsto C) \) is a unary class function, creating a unary class operator, defined by:

\[
\text{mixin}(c) = \lambda x. c \triangleright x
\]

⚠️ Note: Mixins can also be composed \( \circ \):

**Example: Doors**

\[
\text{Locked} = \{ \text{canOpen} \mapsto 0x1234 \}
\]

\[
\text{Short} = \{ \text{canPass} \mapsto 0x4711 \}
\]

\[
\text{Composed} = \text{mixin}(\text{Short}) \circ (\text{mixin}(\text{Locked})) = \lambda x. \text{Short} \triangleright (\text{Locked} \triangleright x)
\]

\[
= \lambda x. \{ \text{super} \mapsto (\text{Locked} \triangleright x) \} \sqcup (\{ \text{canOpen} \mapsto 0x1234, \text{canPass} \mapsto 0x4711 \}) \triangleright x
\]
Mixins for wrappers

- avoids duplication of read/write code
- keeps specialization
- even compatible to single inheritance systems
Mixins on Implementation Level

class Door {
    boolean canOpen(Person p)...
    boolean canPass(Person p)...
}
mixin Locked {
    boolean canOpen(Person p)...
}
mixin Short {
    boolean canPass(Person p)...
}
class ShortDoor
    = Short(Door);
class ShortLockedDoor
    = Short(Locked(Door));
...
ShortDoor d
    = new ShortLockedDoor();

⚠️ non-static super-References
⇝ dynamic dispatching without precomputed virtual table
Surely multiple inheritance is powerful enough to simulate mixins?
Simulating Mixins in C++

template <class Super>
class SyncRW : public Super {
  public: virtual int read(){
    acquireLock();
    int result = Super::read();
    releaseLock();
    return result;
  }
  virtual void write(int n){
    acquireLock();
    Super::write(n);
    releaseLock();
  }
  // ... acquireLock & releaseLock
};
template <class Super>
class LogOpenClose : public Super {
    public: virtual void open(){
        Super::open();
        log("opened");
    }
    virtual void close(){
        Super::close();
        log("closed");
    }
    protected: virtual void log(char*s) { ... };
};
class MyDocument : public SyncRW<LogOpenClose<Document>> {}
True Mixins vs. C++ Mixins

**True Mixins**
- `super` natively supported
- Composable mixins
- Hassle-free simple alternative to multiple inheritance

**C++ Mixins**
- Mixins reduced to templated superclasses
- Can be seen as coding pattern
- C++ Type system not modular
  ⇝ Mixins have to stay source code

**Common properties of Mixins**
- Linearization is necessary
  ⇝ Exact sequence of Mixins is relevant
Ok, ok, show me a language with native mixins!
```ruby
class Person
  attr_accessor :size
  def initialize
    @size = 160
  end
  def hasKey
    true
  end
end
class Door
  def canOpen (p)
    true
  end
  def canPass(person)
    person.size < 210
  end
end
module Short
  def canPass(p)
    p.size < 160 and super(p)
  end
end
module Locked
  def canOpen(p)
    p.hasKey() and super(p)
  end
end
class ShortLockedDoor < Door
  include Short
  include Locked
end
p = Person.new
d = ShortLockedDoor.new
puts d.canPass(p)
```
```ruby
class Door
  def canOpen(p)
    true
  end
  def canPass(person)
    person.size < 210
  end
end

module Short
  def canPass(p)
    p.size < 160 and super(p)
  end
end

module Locked
  def canOpen(p)
    p.hasKey() and super(p)
  end
end

module ShortLocked
  include Short
  include Locked
end

class Person
  attr_accessor :size
  def initialize
    @size = 160
  end
  def hasKey
    true
  end
end

p = Person.new
d = Door.new
d.extend ShortLocked
puts d.canPass(p)
```
Is Inheritance the Ultimate Principle in Reusability?
Lack of Control

- SpyCamera
  - shoot()

- MountablePlane
  - download(): pics
  - fuel
  - equipment

- CombatPlane
  - reload(Ammunition)

- PrecisionGun
  - shoot()

- CameraPlane
  - equipment

- PoliceDrone

⚠️ Control

- Common base classes are shared or duplicated at class level
Lack of Control

- Common base classes are shared or duplicated at class level
- `super` as ancestor reference vs. qualified specification

~~> No *fine-grained specification* of duplication or sharing
Inappropriate Hierarchies

- High up specified methods *turn obsolete*, but there is no statically safe way to remove them
High up specified methods *turn obsolete*, but there is no statically safe way to remove them.

⚠️ Liskov Substitution Principle!
Is Implementation Inheritance even an *Anti-Pattern*?
Excerpt from the Java 8 API documentation for class Properties:

“Because Properties inherits from Hashtable, the put and putAll methods can be applied to a Properties object. Their use is strongly discouraged as they allow the caller to insert entries whose keys or values are not Strings. The setProperty method should be used instead. If the store or save method is called on a “compromised” Properties object that contains a non-String key or value, the call will fail...”
Excerpt from the Java 8 API documentation for class Properties:

“Because Properties inherits from Hashtable, the put and putAll methods can be applied to a Properties object. Their use is strongly discouraged as they allow the caller to insert entries whose keys or values are not Strings. The setProperty method should be used instead. If the store or save method is called on a “compromised” Properties object that contains a non-String key or value, the call will fail...”

⚠️ Misuse of Implementation Inheritance

Implementation Inheritance itself as a pattern for code reusage is often misused!

→ All that is not explicitly prohibited will eventually be done!
The Idea Behind Traits

- A lot of the problems originate from the coupling of implementation and modelling
- Interfaces seem to be hierarchical
- Functionality seems to be modular

⚠️ Central idea

Separate object *creation* from *modelling* hierarchies and *composing* functionality.

⇝ Use interfaces to design hierarchical signature propagation
⇝ Use *traits* as modules for assembling functionality
⇝ Use classes as frames for entities, which can create objects
Defines (Trait ∈ T)

A class \( t \) is without attributes is called *trait*.

The *trait sum* \( + : T \times T \mapsto T \) is the componentwise least upper bound:

\[
(c_1 + c_2)(n) = b_1 \sqcup b_2 = \begin{cases} 
  b_2 & \text{if } b_1 = \bot \lor n \notin \text{pre}(c_1) \\
  b_1 & \text{if } b_2 = \bot \lor n \notin \text{pre}(c_2) \\
  b_2 & \text{if } b_1 = b_2 \\
  \top & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

with \( b_i = c_i(n) \)

**Trait-Expressions** also comprise:

- *exclusion* \(- : T \times N \mapsto T\):
  \[
  (t - a)(n) = \begin{cases} 
    \text{undef} & \text{if } a = n \\
    t(n) & \text{otherwise}
  \end{cases}
  \]

- *aliasing* \([\rightarrow] : T \times N \times N \mapsto T\):
  \[
  t[a \rightarrow b](n) = \begin{cases} 
    t(n) & \text{if } n \neq a \\
    t(b) & \text{if } n = a
  \end{cases}
  \]

Traits \( t \) can be connected to classes \( c \) by the asymmetric join:

\[
(c \sqcup t)(n) = \begin{cases} 
  c(n) & \text{if } n \in \text{pre}(c) \\
  t(n) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Usually, this connection is reserved for the last composition level.
## Traits – Concepts

### Trait composition principles

| Flat ordering | All traits have the same precedence under $+$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\leadsto$ explicit disambiguation with aliasing and exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precedence</td>
<td>Under asymmetric join $\uplus$, class methods take precedence over trait methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flattening</td>
<td>After asymmetric join $\uplus$: Non-overridden trait methods have the same semantics as class methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conflicts...

⚠️ Conflicts... arise if composed traits map methods with identical names to different bodies

### Conflict treatment

- ✓ Methods can be aliased ($\rightarrow$)
- ✓ Methods can be excluded ($\leftarrow$)
- ✓ Class methods override trait methods and sort out conflicts ($\uplus\uplus$)
Can we augment classical languages by traits?
Central Idea:
Uncouple method definitions from class bodies.

Purpose:
- retrospectively add methods to complex types
  ➞ *external definition*
- especially provide definitions of *interface methods*
  ➞ *poor man’s multiple inheritance!*

Syntax:
1. Declare a static class with definitions of static methods
2. Explicitly declare first parameter as receiver with modifier `this`
3. Import the carrier class into scope (if needed)
4. Call extension method in *infix form* with emphasis on the receiver
public class Person{
    public int size = 160;
    public bool hasKey() { return true;}
}

public interface Short {}
public interface Locked {}

public static class DoorExtensions {
    public static bool canOpen(this Locked leftHand, Person p){
        return p.hasKey();
    }

    public static bool canPass(this Short leftHand, Person p){
        return p.size<160;
    }
}

public class ShortLockedDoor : Locked, Short {
    public static void Main() {
        ShortLockedDoor d = new ShortLockedDoor();
        Console.WriteLine(d.canOpen(new Person()));
    }
}
**Extension Methods as Traits**

**Extension Methods**
- transparently extend arbitrary types externally
- provide quick relief for plagued programmers

**...but not traits**
- Interface declarations empty, thus kind of purposeless
- Flattening not implemented
- Static scope only

Static scope of extension methods causes unexpected errors:

```csharp
public interface Locked {
    public bool canOpen(Person p);
}
public static class DoorExtensions {
    public static bool canOpen(this Locked leftHand, Person p) {
        return p.hasKey();
    }
}
```
Extension Methods as Traits

**Extension Methods**

- transparently extend arbitrary types externally
- provide quick relief for plagued programmers

**...but not traits**

- Interface declarations empty, thus kind of purposeless
- Flattening not implemented
- Static scope only

Static scope of extension methods causes unexpected errors:

```csharp
public interface Locked {
    public bool canOpen(Person p);
}

public static class DoorExtensions {
    public static bool canOpen(this Locked leftHand, Person p) {
        return p.hasKey();
    }
}
```
Virtual Extension Methods (Java 8)

Java 8 advances one step further:

```java
interface Door {
    boolean canOpen(Person p);
    boolean canPass(Person p);
}
interface Locked {
    default boolean canOpen(Person p) { return p.hasKey(); }
}
interface Short {
    default boolean canPass(Person p) { return p.size<160; }
}
public class ShortLockedDoor implements Short, Locked, Door {
}
```

Implementation

...consists in adding an interface phase to invokevirtual's name resolution

⚠️ Precedence

Still, default methods do not override methods from abstract classes when composed
Traits as General Composition Mechanism

Central Idea
Separate class generation from hierarchy specification and functional modelling

1. model hierarchical relations with interfaces
2. compose functionality with traits
3. adapt functionality to interfaces and add state via glue code in classes

Simplified multiple Inheritance without adverse effects
So let’s do the language with real traits?!
Squeak is a smalltalk implementation, extended with a system for traits.

Syntax:

- `name: param1 and: param2`
  declares method `name` with `param1` and `param2`
- `| ident1 ident2 |`
  declares Variables `ident1` and `ident2`
- `ident := expr`
  assignment
- `object name:content`
  sends message `name` with `content` to `object` (≡ `call: object.name(content)`)
Trait named: #TRStream uses: TPositionableStream

on: aCollection
  self collection: aCollection.
  self setToStart.
next
  self atEnd
  ifTrue: [nil]
  ifFalse: [self collection at: self nextPosition].

Trait named: #TSynch uses: {}

acquireLock
  self semaphore wait.
releaseLock
  self semaphore signal.

Trait named: #TSyncRStream uses: TSynch+(TRStream@(#readNext -> #next))

next
  | read |
  self acquireLock.
  read := self readNext.
  self releaseLock.
^ read.
Disambiguation

Traits vs. Mixins vs. Class-Inheritance

All different kinds of type expressions:

- Definition of curried second order type operators + Linearization

Explicitly: Traits differ from Mixins

- Traits are applied to a class in parallel, Mixins sequentially
- Trait composition is unordered, avoiding linearization effects
- Traits do not contain attributes, avoiding state conflicts
- With traits, glue code is concentrated in single classes
Disambiguation

Traits vs. Mixins vs. Class-Inheritance

All different kinds of type expressions:

- Definition of curried *second order type operators* + Linearization
- Finegrained flat-ordered *composition of modules*

*Explicitly:* Traits differ from Mixins

- Traits are applied to a class *in parallel*, Mixins *sequentially*
- Trait *composition is unordered*, avoiding linearization effects
- Traits do *not contain attributes*, avoiding state conflicts
- With traits, *glue code* is concentrated in single classes
Disambiguation

Traits vs. Mixins vs. Class-Inheritance

All different kinds of type expressions:

- Definition of curried *second order type operators* + Linearization
- Finegrained flat-ordered *composition of modules*
- Definition of (local) partial order on precedence of types wrt. MRO

Explicitly: Traits differ from Mixins

- Traits are applied to a class *in parallel*, Mixins *sequentially*
- Trait *composition is unordered*, avoiding linearization effects
- Traits do *not contain attributes*, avoiding state conflicts
- With traits, *glue code* is concentrated in single classes
# Disambiguation

## Traits vs. Mixins vs. Class-Inheritance

All different kinds of type expressions:
- Definition of curried *second order type operators* + Linearization
- Finegrained flat-ordered *composition of modules*
- Definition of (local) partial order on precedence of types wrt. MRO
- Combination of principles

**Explicitly:** Traits differ from Mixins
- Traits are applied to a class *in parallel*, Mixins *sequentially*
- Trait *composition is unordered*, avoiding linearization effects
- Traits do *not contain attributes*, avoiding state conflicts
- With traits, *glue code* is concentrated in single classes
### Lessons learned

**Mixins**
- Mixins as *low-effort* alternative to multiple inheritance
- Mixins lift type expressions to *second order type expressions*

**Traits**
- Implementation Inheritance based approaches leave room for improvement in modularity in real world situations
- Traits offer *fine-grained control* of composition of functionality
- Native trait languages offer *separation of composition* of functionality from *specification* of interfaces
Further reading...


Stéphane Ducasse, Oscar Nierstrasz, Nathanael Schärli, Roel Wuyts, and Andrew P. Black. Traits: A mechanism for fine-grained reuse. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)*, 2006.


Nathanael Schärli, Stéphane Ducasse, Oscar Nierstrasz, and Andrew P. Black. Traits: Composable units of behaviour. *European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP)*, 2003.
Programming Languages

Prototypes

Dr. Michael Petter
Winter 2019/20
“Why bother with modelling types for my quick hack?”
Motivation – Polemic

Bothersome features
- Specifying types for singletons
- Getting generic types right inspite of co- and contra-variance
- Subjugate language-imposed inheritance to (mostly) avoid redundancy

Prototype based programming
- Start by creating examples
- Only very basic concepts
- Introduce complexity only by need
- Shape language features yourself!
“Let’s go back to basic concepts – Lua”
Basic Language Features

- Chunks being sequences of statements.
- Global variables implicitly defined

```plaintext
s = 0;
i = 1 -- Single line comment
p = i+s p=42 --[[ Multiline comment --]]
s = 1
```
Basic Types and Values

- Dynamical types – no type definitions
- Each value carries its type
- `type()` returns a string representation of a value's type

```plaintext
a = true

type(a) -- boolean

type("42"+0) -- number

type("Petter "..1) -- string

type(type) -- function

type(nil) -- nil

type([[[<html><body>pretty long string</body></html>]]) -- string

a = 42

type(a) -- number
```
First class citizens

```lua
function prettyprint(title, name, age)
    return title.." "..name..", born in "..(2018-age)
end

a = prettyprint
a("Dr.","Petter",42)

prettyprint = function (title, name, age)
    return name..", ", title
end
```
Introducing Structure

- only one complex data type
- indexing via arbitrary values except nil (⇝ Runtime Error)
- arbitrary large and dynamically growing/shrinking

```plaintext
a = {}                          -- create empty table
k = 42
a[k] = 3.14159                 -- entry 3.14159 at key 42
a["k"] = k                    -- entry 42 at key "k"
a[k] = nil                      -- deleted entry at key 42
print(a.k)                      -- syntactic sugar for a["k"]
```
Table Lifecycle

- created from scratch
- modification is persistent
- assignment with reference-semantics
- garbage collection

```lua
a = {}             -- create empty table
a.k = 42
b = a              -- b refers to same as a
b["k"] = "k"      -- entry "k" at key "k"
print(a.k)         -- yields "k"
a = nil
print(b.k)         -- still "k"
b = nil
print(b.k)         -- nil now
```
“So far nothing special – let’s compose types”
Metatables

- are *ordinary tables*, used as collections of special functions
- Naming conventions for special functions
- Connect to a table via `setmetatable`, retrieve via `getmetatable`
- Changes behaviour of tables

```lua
meta = {} -- create as plain empty table
function meta.__tostring(person)
  return person.prefix .. " " .. person.name
end
a = { prefix="Dr.", name="Petter"} -- create Michael
setmetatable(a, meta) -- install metatable for a
print(a) -- print "Dr. Petter"
```

- Overload operators like `__add, __mul, __sub, __div, __pow, __concat, __unm`
- Overload comparators like `__eq, __lt, __le`
Delegation

- ▲ reserved key `__index` determines handling of failed name lookups
- convention for signature: receiver table and key as parameters
- if dispatching to another table ⇝ *Delegation*

```lua
meta = {}
function meta.__tostring(person)
    return person.prefix .. " " .. person.name
end
function meta.__index(tbl, key)
    return tbl.prototype[key]
end
job = { prefix="Dr." }
person = { name="Petter",prototype=job } -- create Michael
setmetatable(person,meta) -- install metatable
print(person) -- print "Dr. Petter"
```
function meta.__tostring(person) -- 0x7816
  return person.prefix .. " " .. person.name
end
function meta.__index(tbl, key) -- 0x7832
  return tbl.prototype[key]
end
Conveniently, \_\_index does not need to be a function

```lua
meta = {}
function meta.__tostring(person)
    return person.prefix .. " " .. person.name
end
job = { prefix="Dr." }
meta.__index = job -- delegate to job
person = { name="Petter" } -- create Michael
setmetatable(person,meta) -- install metatable
print(person) -- print "Dr. Petter"
```
Delegation 2

```
function meta.__tostring(person) -- 0x7816
    return person.prefix .. " " .. person.name
end
```
Delegation 3

- `__newindex` handles unresolved updates
- frequently used to implement protection of objects

```lua
meta = {}
function meta.__newindex(abl,key,val)
    if (key == "title" and tbl.name=="Guttenberg") then
        error("No title for You, sir!"
    else
        tbl.data[key]=val
    end
end
function meta.__tostring(tbl)
    return (tbl.title or ") .. table.name
end
person={ data={} } -- create person's data
meta.__index = person.data
setmetatable(person,meta)
person.name = "Guttenberg" -- name KT
person.title = "Dr." -- try to give him Dr.
```
so far no concept for multiple *objects*

```lua
Account = { balance=0 }
function Account.withdraw (val)
    Account.balance=Account.balance-val
end
function Account.__tostring()
    return ".Balance is ..Account.balance"
end
setmetatable(Account,Account)
Account.withdraw(10)
print(Account)
```
Introducing Identity

- Concept of an object's *own identity* via parameter
- Programming aware of multiple instances
- Share code between instances

```plaintext
function Account.withdraw (acc, val)
    acc.balance = acc.balance - val
end

function Account.tostring(acc)
    return "Balance is ":.acc.balance
end

Account.__index=Account -- share Account's functions
mikes = { balance = 0 }
daves = { balance = 0 }
setmetatable(mikes,Account) -- delegate from mikes to Account
setmetatable(daves,Account) -- del. from daves to Account
Account.withdraw(mikes,10)
mikes.withdraw(mikes,10) -- withdraw independently
mikes:withdraw(10)
print(daves:tostring() .. " ", mikes:tostring())
```
function Account.withdraw (acc, val)
    acc.balance=acc.balance-val
end
function Account.tostring(acc)
    return "Balance is ".acc.balance
end
Introducing “Classes”

- Particular tables *used* like classes
- *self* table for accessing object-relative attributes
- connection via creator function *new* (like a constructor)

```lua
function Account:withdraw (val)
    self.balance=self.balance-val
end

function Account:tostring()
    return "Balance is ".self.balance
end

function Account:new(template)
    template = template or {balance=0} -- initialize
    setmetatable(template,{__index=self})-- delegate to Account
    getmetatable(template).__tostring = Account.tostring
    return template
end

giro = Account:new({balance=10}) -- create instance
    giro:withdraw(10)
print(giro)
```
Inheriting Functionality

- Differential description possible in child class style
- Easily creating particular singletons

```
LimitedAccount = {}  
setmetatable(LimitedAccount,{__index=Account})

function LimitedAccount:new()
    instance = { balance=0,limit=100 }
    setmetatable(instance,{__index=self})
end

function LimitedAccount:withdraw(val)
    if (self.balance+self.limit < val) then
        error("Limit exceeded")
    end
    Account.withdraw(self,val)
end

specialgiro = LimitedAccount:new()
print(specialgiro:withdraw(90))
print(specialgiro)
```
Multiple Inheritance

⇝ Delegation leads to chain-like inheritance

```lua
function createClass (parent1, parent2)
    local c = {}
    setmetatable(c, {__index =
        function (t, k)
            local v = parent1[k]  -- in both parents
            if v then return v end
            return parent2[k]
        end})
    c.__index = c  -- c is prototype of instances
    function c:new (o)
        o = o or {}
        setmetatable(o, c)  -- c is also metatable
        return o
    end
    return c  -- finally return c
end
```
Multiple Inheritance

Doctor = { postfix="Dr. "}
Researcher = { prefix=" ,Ph.D."}

ResearchingDoctor = createClass(Doctor, Researcher)
axel = ResearchingDoctor:new( { name="Michael Petter" } )
print(axel.prefix..axel.name..axel.postfix)

⇝ The special case of dual-inheritance can be extended to comprise multiple inheritance
Datatypes are simple values (Type+union of different flavours)

Tables at low-level fork into Hashmaps with pairs and an integer-indexed array part

typedef struct {
    int type_id;
    Value v;
} TObject;

typedef union {
    void *p;
    int b;
    lua_number n;
    GCObject *gc;
} Value;
Further Topics in Lua

- Coroutines
- Closures
- Bytecode & Lua-VM
Lessons Learned

1. Abandoning fixed inheritance yields ease/speed in development
2. Also leads to horrible runtime errors
3. Object-orientation and multiple-inheritance as special cases of delegation
4. Minimal featureset eases implementation of compiler/interpreter
5. Room for static analyses to find bugs ahead of time
Further Reading...
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Learning outcomes
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Aspect Oriented Programming

- Express a system’s aspects of concerns cross-cutting modules
- Automatically combine separate Aspects with a Weaver into a program
Aspect Oriented Programming

Introduction

Functional decomposition

Compiler

Aspect oriented decomposition

Aspect Weaver
System Decomposition in Aspects

Example concerns:
- Security
- Logging
- Error Handling
- Validation
- Profiling
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Static Crosscutting
Adding External Definitions

inter-type declaration

class Expr {}
class Const extends Expr {
   public int val;
   public Const(int val) {
      this.val=val;
   }
}
class Add extends Expr {
   public Expr l,r;
   public Add(Expr l, Expr r) {
      this.l=l;this.r=r;
   }
}

aspect ExprEval {
   abstract int Expr.eval();
   int Const.eval(){ return val; };
   int Add.eval() { return l.eval() + r.eval(); }
}

equivalent code

// aspectj-patched code
abstract class Expr {
   abstract int eval();
}
class Const extends Expr {
   public int val;
   public int eval(){ return val; };
   public Const(int val) {
      this.val=val;
   }
}
class Add extends Expr {
   public Expr l,r;
   public int eval() { return l.eval() + r.eval(); }
   public Add(Expr l, Expr r) {
      this.l=l;this.r=r;
   }
}
Dynamic Crosscutting
### Join Points

Well-defined points in the control flow of a program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Join Point</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>method/constr. call</td>
<td>executing the actual method-call statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>method/constr. execution</td>
<td>the individual method is executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field get</td>
<td>a field is read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field set</td>
<td>a field is set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exception handler execution</td>
<td>an exception handler is invoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class initialization</td>
<td>static initializers are run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object initialization</td>
<td>dynamic initializers are run</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pointcuts and Designators

Definition (Pointcut)

A pointcut is a set of join points and optionally some of the runtime values when program execution reaches a referred join point.

Pointcut designators can be defined and named by the programmer:

\[
\langle \text{userdef} \rangle ::= \text{\textquote{pointcut} } \langle \text{id} \rangle \ (\langle \text{idlist} \rangle ? \langle \text{expr} \rangle )
\]

\[
\langle \text{idlist} \rangle ::= \langle \text{id} \rangle \ (\langle \text{id} \rangle ,\langle \text{id} \rangle )^*
\]

\[
\langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \text{\textquote{!} } \langle \text{expr} \rangle
\]

| \langle \text{expr} \rangle \text{\&\&} \langle \text{expr} \rangle |
| \langle \text{expr} \rangle \text{\|} \langle \text{expr} \rangle |
| \langle \text{expr} \rangle \text{\textquote{('}} \langle \text{expr} \rangle \text{\textquote{')}} |
| \langle \text{primitive} \rangle |

Example:

```java
pointcut dfs(): execution (void Tree.dfs()) ||
execution (void Leaf.dfs()) ;
```
Advice

... are method-like constructs, used to define additional behaviour at joinpoints:

- `before(formal)`
- `after(formal)`
- `after(formal) returning (formal)`
- `after(formal) throwing (formal)`

For example:

```java
aspect Doubler {
  before(): call(int C.foo(int)) {
    System.out.println("About to call foo");
  }
}
```
Certain pointcut primitives add dependencies on the context:

- `args(arglist)`

This binds identifiers to parameter values for use in advices.

```java
aspect Doubler {
    before(int i): call(int C.foo(int)) && args(i) {
        i = i*2;
    }
}
```

`arglist` actually is a flexible expression:

\[
\langle \text{arglist} \rangle := ( \langle \text{arg} \rangle (`,` \langle \text{arg} \rangle ^* )^? \]

- `\langle \text{arg} \rangle` binds a value to this identifier
- `\langle \text{typename} \rangle` filters only this type
- `'.'` matches all types
- `'*'` matches several arguments
Unusual treatment is necessary for

- type around(formal)

⚠️ Here, we need to pinpoint, where the advice is wrapped around the join point – this is achieved via proceed():

```java
aspect Doubler {
    int around(int i): call(int C.foo(Object, int)) && args(i) {
        int newi = proceed(i*2);
        return newi/2;
    }
}
```
Pointcut Designator Primitives
Method Related Designators

- **call**(signature)
- **execution**(signature)

Matches call/execution join points at which the method or constructor called matches the given *signature*. The syntax of a method/constructor *signature* is:

```
ResultTypeName RecvrTypeName.meth_id(ParamTypeName, ...)
NewObjectTypeNam.e.new(ParamTypeName, ...)
```
class MyClass{
    public String toString() {
        return "silly me ";
    }
    public static void main(String[] args){
        MyClass c = new MyClass();
        System.out.println(c + c.toString());
    }
}

aspect CallAspect {
    pointcut calltostring() : call (String MyClass.toString());
    pointcut executostring() : execution(String MyClass.toString());
    before() : calltostring() || executostring() {
        System.out.println("advice!");
    }
}
class MyClass {
    public String toString() {
        return "silly me ";
    }
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        MyClass c = new MyClass();
        System.out.println(c + c.toString());
    }
}

aspect CallAspect {
    pointcut calltostring() : call (String MyClass.toString());
    pointcut exectostring() : execution(String MyClass.toString());
    before() : calltostring() || exectostring() {
        System.out.println("advice!");
    }
}

advice!
advice!
advice!
silly me silly me
Field Related Designators

- `get(fieldqualifier)`
- `set(fieldqualifier)`

Matches field get/set join points at which the field accessed matches the signature. The syntax of a field qualifier is:

```
FieldTypeName ObjectTypeName.field_id
```

⚠️: However, set has an argument which is bound via `args`:

```java
aspect GuardedSetter {
    before(int newval): set(static int MyClass.x) && args(newval) {
        if (Math.abs(newval - MyClass.x) > 100)
            throw new RuntimeException();
    }
}
```
Type based

- `target(typeorid)`
- `within(typepattern)`
- `withincode(methodpattern)`

Matches join points of any kind which
- are referring to the receiver of type `typeorid`
- is contained in the class body of type `typepattern`
- is contained within the method defined by `methodpattern`
Flow and State Based

- `cflow(arbitrary_pointcut)`
  Matches join points of *any kind* that occur strictly between entry and exit of each join point matched by `arbitrary_pointcut`.

- `if(boolean_expression)`
  Picks join points based on a dynamic property:

```java
aspect GuardedSetter {
    before(): if(thisJoinPoint.getKind().equals(METHOD_CALL)) && within(MyClass) {
        System.out.println("What an inefficient way to match calls");
    } }
```
Which advice is served first?

Advices are defined in different aspects

- If statement `declare precedence: A, B;` exists, then advice in aspect A has precedence over advice in aspect B for the same join point.
- Otherwise, if aspect A is a subaspect of aspect B, then advice defined in A has precedence over advice defined in B.
- Otherwise, (i.e. if two pieces of advice are defined in two different aspects), it is `undefined` which one has precedence.

Advices are defined in the same aspect

- If either are `after advice`, then the one that appears `later` in the aspect has precedence over the one that appears earlier.
- Otherwise, then the one that appears `earlier` in the aspect has precedence over the one that appears later.
Implementation
Aspect Weaving:
- Pre-processor
- During compilation
- Post-compile-processor
- During Runtime in the Virtual Machine
- A combination of the above methods
Woven JVM Code

```java
aspect MyAspect {
    pointcut settingconst(): set(int Const.val);
    before (): settingconst() {
        System.out.println("setter");
    }
}
```

Expr one = new Const(1);
one.val = 42;

...
Woven JVM Code

```
Expr one = new Const(1);
Expr e = new Add(one,one);
String s = e.toString();
System.out.println(s);
```
Poincut Parameters and Around/Proceed

Around clauses often refer to parameters and `proceed()` – sometimes across different contexts!

```java
class C {
    int foo(int i) { return 42+i; }
}
aspect Doubler {
    int around(int i): call(int *.foo(Object, int)) && args(i) {
        int newi = proceed(i*2);
        return newi/2;
    }
}
```

⚠️ Now, imagine code like:

```java
public static void main(String[] args){
    new C().foo(42);
}
```
✓ inlining advices in main – all of it in JVM, disassembled to equivalent:

```java
// aspectj patched code
public static void main(String[] args){
    C c = new C();
    foo_aroundBody1Advice(c,42,Doubler.aspectOf(),42,null);
}
private static final int foo_aroundBody0(C c, int i){
    return c.foo(i);
}
private static final int foo_aroundBody1Advice(C c, int i, Doubler d, int j, AroundClosure a){
    int temp = 2*i;
    int ret = foo_aroundBody0(c,temp);
    return ret / 2;
}
```
However, instead of being used for a direct call, `proceed()` and its parameters may *escape the calling context*:
Pointcut parameters and Scope

⚠️ proceed() might not even be in the same scope as the original method!
⚠️ even worse, the scope of the exposed parameters might have expired!

class C {
    int foo(int i) { return 42+i; }
    public static void main(String[] str){ new C().foo(42); }
}

aspect Doubler {
    Executor executor;
    Future<Integer> f;
    int around(int i): call(int *.foo(Object, int)) && args(i) {
        Callable<Integer> c = () -> proceed(i*2)/2;
        f = executor.submit(c);
        return i/2;
    }
    public int getCachedValue() throws Exception {
        return f.get();
    }
}
Shadow Classes and Closures

✓ creates a shadow, carrying the advice
✓ creates a closure, carrying the context/parameters

// aspectj patched code
public static void main(String[] str){
    int itemp = 42;
    Doubler shadow = Doubler.aspectOf();
    Object[] params = new Object[] {
        new C(), Conversions.intObject(itemp)
    };
    C_AjcClosure1 closure = new C_AjcClosure1(params);
    shadow.ajc$around$Doubler$1$9158ff14(itemp,closure);
}
Shadow Classes and Closures

// aspectj patched code
class Doubler { // shadow class, holding the fields for the advice
    Future<Integer> f;
    ExecutorService executor;
    ...
    public int ajc$around$Doubler$1$9158ff14(int i, AroundClosure c){
        Callable<Integer> c = lambda$0(i,c);
        f = executor.submit(c);
        return i/2;
    }
    public static int ajc$around$Doubler$1$9158ff14proceed(int i, AroundClosure c)
            throws Throwable{
        Object[] params = new Object[] { Conversions.intObject(i) };
        return Conversions.intValue(c.run(params));
    }
    static Integer lambda$0(int i, AroundClosure c) throws Exception{
        return Integer.valueOf(ajc$around$Doubler$1$9158ff14proceed(i*2, c)/2);
    }
}
class C_AjcClosure1 extends AroundClosure{ // closure class for poincut params
    C_AjcClosure1(Object[] params){ super(params); }
    Object run(Object[] params) {
        C c = (C) params[0];
        int i = Conversions.intValue(params[1]);
        return Conversions.intObject(C.foo_aroundBody0(c, i));
    }
}
Property Based Crosscutting

Idea 1: Stack based
- At each `call`-match, check runtime stack for `cflow`-match
- Only modify stack at `cflow`-relevant pointcuts
- Naive implementation
- Poor runtime performance

Idea 2: State based
- Keep separate stack of states
- Only modify stack at `cflow`-relevant pointcuts
- Check stack for emptiness

Even more optimizations in practice
- state-sharing,
- counters,
- static analysis
Translation scheme implications:

**before/after Advice**  ... ranges from *inlined code* to distribution into *several methods and closures*

**Joinpoints**  ... in the original program that have advices may get *explicitly dispatching wrappers*

**Dynamic dispatching**  ... can require a *runtime test* to correctly interpret certain joinpoint designators

**Flow sensitive pointcuts**  ... runtime penalty for the naive implementation, optimized version still *costly*
Aspect Orientation

**Pro**
- Un-tangling of concerns
- Late extension across boundaries of hierarchies
- Aspects provide another level of abstraction

**Contra**
- Weaving generates runtime overhead
- Nontransparent control flow and interactions between aspects
- Debugging and Development needs IDE Support
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⇝ Metaprogramming

Metaprogramming

- Treat programs as data
- Read, analyse or transform (other) programs
- Program modifies itself during runtime
Codegeneration Tools
In Compiler Construction, there are a lot of codegeneration tools, that compile DSLs to target source code. Common examples are `lex` and `bison`.

Example: `lex`:

`lex` generates a table lookup based implementation of a finite automaton corresponding to the specified disjunction of regular expressions.

```c
 %{ #include <stdio.h> %}

%%% /* Lexical Patterns */
[0-9]+ { printf("integer: %s\n", yytext); }
\. { /* ignore */ }

%%

int main(void) {
    yylex();
    return 0;
}
```
Codegeneration via Preprocessor
A Text Rewriting System provides a set of grammar-like rules (→ *Macros*) which are meant to be applied to the target text.

Example: *C Preprocessor* (CPP)

```c
#define min(X,Y) (( X < Y )? (X) : (Y))
x = min(5,x); // (( 5 < x )? (5) : (x))
x = min(++x,y+5); // (( ++x < y+5 )? (++x) : (y+5))
```
A Text Rewriting System provides a set of grammar-like rules \( \rightarrow \text{Macros} \) which are meant to be applied to the target text.

Example: \textit{C Preprocessor} (CPP)

\begin{verbatim}
#define min(X,Y) (( X < Y )? (X) : (Y))
x = min(5,x);    // (( 5 < x )? (5) : (x))
x = min(++x,y+5); // (( ++x < y+5 )? (++x) : (y+5))
\end{verbatim}

⚠️ Nesting, Precedence, Binding, Side effects, Recursion, …

- Parts of Macro parameters can bind to context operators depending on the precedence and binding behaviour
- Side effects are recomputed for every occurrence of the Macro parameter
- Any (indirect) recursive replacement stops the rewriting process
- Name spaces are not separated, identifiers duplicated
Example application: Language constructs [3]:

```c
ATOMIC {
  i--;  // Decrement
  i++;  // Increment
}
#define ATOMIC \
    acquire(&globallock);\ 
{ /* user code */ } \ 
release(&globallock);
```

How can we bind the block, following the `ATOMIC` to the user code fragment? Particularly in a situation like this?

```c
if (i>0) ATOMIC {
  i--;  // Decrement
  i++;  // Increment
}
```
Example application: Language constructs [3]:

```c
ATOMIC {
    i--;  
    i++; 
}
```

```c
#define ATOMIC  
 acquire(&globallock);\  
 { /* user code */ } \  
 release(&globallock);
```

⚠️ How can we bind the block, following the ATOMIC to the usercode fragment?
Particularly in a situation like this?

```c
if (i>0)  
    ATOMIC {  
        i--;  
        i++;  
    }
```
Prepend code to usercode

```c
if (1)
  /* prepended code */
  goto body;
else
  body:
  {/* block following the macro */}
```

Append code to usercode

```c
if (1)
  goto body;
else
  while (1)
    if (1) {
      /* appended code */
      break;
    }
  else body:
    {/* block following the macro */}
```
All in one

```c
if (1) {
    /* prepended code */
    goto body;
} else
    while (1)
        if (1) {
            /* appended code */
            break;
        }
    else body:
    { /* block following the expanded macro */ }
```
#define concat_(a, b) a##b
#define label(prefix, lnum) concat_(prefix,lnum)
#define ATOMIC
if (1) {
    acquire(&globallock);
    goto label(body, __LINE__);  
} else
while (1)
    if (1) {
        release(&globallock);
        break;
    }
else
    label(body, __LINE__):

⚠️ Reusability

labels have to be created dynamically in order for the macro to be reusable (→ __LINE__)
Homoiconic Metaprogramming
Homoiconic Programming

Homoiconicity

In a homoiconic language, the primary representation of programs is also a data structure in a primitive type of the language itself.

- Metaclasses and Metaobject Protocol
- (Hygienic) Macros

Data is code
Code is data
Reflection
Type introspection

A language with *Type introspection* enables to examine the type of an object at runtime.

**Example:** Java `instanceof`

```java
public boolean equals(Object o) {
    if (!(o instanceof Natural)) return false;
    return ((Natural)o).value == this.value;
}
```
Reflective Metaprogramming

Metaclasses (→ code is data)

Example: Java Reflection / Metaclass `java.lang.Class`

```java
static void fun(String param){
    Object incognito = Class.forName(param).newInstance();
    Class meta = incognito.getClass(); // obtain Metaobject
    Field[] fields = meta.getDeclaredFields();
    for(Field f : fields){
        Class t = f.getType();
        Object v = f.get(o);
        if(t == boolean.class && Boolean.FALSE.equals(v))
            // found default value
        else if(t.isPrimitive() && ((Number) v).doubleValue() == 0)
            // found default value
        else if(!t.isPrimitive() && v == null)
            // found default value
    }
}
```
Metaobject Protocol
Metaobject Protocol

Metaobject Protocol (MOP \cite{1})

Example: Lisp’s CLOS metaobject protocol

... offers an interface to manipulate the underlying implementation of CLOS to adapt the system to the programmer’s liking in aspects of

- creation of classes and objects
- creation of new properties and methods
- causing inheritance relations between classes
- creation generic method definitions
- creation of method implementations
- creation of specializers (→ overwriting, multimethods)
- configuration of standard method combination (→ before, after, around, call-next-method)
- simple or custom method combinators (→ +, append, max, . . .)
- addition of documentation
Hygienic Macros
Clojure programs are represented after parsing in form of symbolic expressions (S-Expressions), consisting of nested trees:

### S-Expressions

S-Expressions are either

- an atom
- an expression of the form \((x.y)\) with \(x, y\) being S-Expressions

**Remark:** Established shortcut notation for lists:

\[
(x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3) \equiv (x_1 \ . \ (x_2 \ . \ (x_3 \ . \ ())))
\]
Homoiconic Runtime-Metaprogramming

Special Forms

Special forms differ in the way that they are interpreted by the clojure runtime from the standard evaluation rules.

Language Implementation Idea: reduce every expression to special forms:

```clojure
(def symbol doc? init?)
(do expr*)
(if test then else?)
(let [binding*] expr*)
(eval form) ; evaluates the datastructure form
(quote form) ; yields the unevaluated form
(var symbol)
(fn name? ([params*] expr*)+)
(loop [binding*] expr*)
(recur expr*) ; rebinds and jumps to loop or fn
;...
```
Homoiconic Runtime-Metaprogramming

**Macros**

Macros are configurable syntax/parse tree transformations.

Language Implementation Idea: define advanced language features in macros, based very few *special forms* or other macros.

Example: While loop:

```
(macroexpand '(while a b))
; => (loop* [] (clojure.core/when a b (recur)))

(macroexpand '(when a b))
; => (if a (do b))
```
Homoiconic Runtime-Metaprogramming

Macros can be written by the programmer in form of S-Expressions:

```lisp
(defmacro infix
  "converting infix to prefix"
  [infixed]
  (list (second infixed) (first infixed) (last infixed)))
```

...producing

```lisp
(infix (1 + 1))
; => 2
(macroexpand '(infix (a + b)))
; => (+ a b)
```

⚠️ Quoting

Macros and functions are directly interpreted, if not quoted via

```lisp
(quote keyword) ; or equivalently:
'keyword
; => keyword
```
Homoiconic Runtime-Metaprogramming

(defmacro fac1 [n]
 (if (= n 0)
   1
   (list '* n (list 'fac1 (- n 1)))))

(fac1 4)
; => 24

...produces

(macroexpand '(fac1 4))
; => (* 4 (fac1 3))

(macroexpand-all '(fac1 4))
; => (* 4 (* 3 (* 2 (* 1 1))))

(defn fac2 [n]
 (if (= n 0)
   1
   (* n (fac2 (- n 1)))))

(fac2 4)
; => 24

⇝ why bother?
Macros vs. Functions

- Macros as static AST Transformations, vs. Functions as runtime control flow manipulations
- Macros replicate parameter forms, vs. Functions evaluate parameters once
- Macro parameters are uninterpreted, not necessarily valid expressions, vs. Functions parameters need to be valid expressions
Macro Hygiene

Shadowing of variables may be an issue in macros, and can be avoided by generated symbols!

```lisp
(def variable 42)
(macro mac [&stufftodo] `(let [variable 4711] ~@stufftodo))
(mac (println variable))
; => can't let qualified name: variable
```

```lisp
(macro mac [&stufftodo] `(let [variable# 4711] ~@stufftodo))
```

⇝ Symbol generation to avoid namespace collisions!
Further reading...
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