

Dynamic Rebinding for Marshalling and Update, with Destruct-time λ

Gavin Bierman[†] Michael Hicks[‡] Peter Sewell[†]
Gareth Stoye[†] Keith Wansbrough[†]

[†] University of Cambridge

`{First.Last}@cl.cam.ac.uk`

[‡] University of Maryland

`mwh@cs.umd.edu`

Dynamic Binding – Why?

Static binding good, dynamic binding bad. But, need:

- Dynamic Linking
- Dynamic *Rebinding* for marshalled values
- Dynamic *Update* for long-running systems (*c.f.* Erlang)

going to show some core mechanisms, with clean reduction semantics.

View as steps towards design of ML-like languages for distributed computation.

Dynamic Rebinding – Marshalling Scenarios

Consider sending a value (a thunk) between machines.

It may contain identifiers for:

1. ubiquitous standard library functions – should be rebound
2. application-specific location-dependent libraries – should be rebound
3. other let-bound application values – which should be sent with it

Further, may want to rebound to non-standard definitions, to securely encapsulate (sandbox) untrusted code.

Starting Point: Standard CBV λ -calculus. It's No Good

The usual CBV strategy

$$\text{(app)} \quad (\lambda z:T.e')v \quad \longrightarrow \quad \{v/z\}e'$$

$$\text{(let)} \quad \mathbf{let} \ z = v \ \mathbf{in} \ e \quad \longrightarrow \quad \{v/z\}e$$

loses too much information, eg in (let) if

- e sends a value mentioning z to another machine, and we want z to be rebound to a local resource; or
- we dynamically update the z binding after the (let) step.

So first explore refined strategies with *delayed instantiation* – but stay ‘essentially’ CBV. Then add dynamic rebinding and update.

Three CBV λ -calculi

- λ_c *construct-time* (the standard one) – instantiate identifiers as soon as they are bound to values
- λ_r *redex-time* – instantiate identifiers when they appear in redex position
- λ_d *destruct-time* – instantiate identifiers only when under destructors

Examples (1), (2)

Construct-time λ_c	Redex-time λ_r	Destruct-time λ_d
$(\lambda z.7)8$ 7	$(\lambda z.7)8$ let $z = 8$ in 7	$(\lambda z.7)8$ let $z = 8$ in 7
$\text{let } x = 5 \text{ in } \pi_1(x, x)$ $\pi_1(5, 5)$ 5	let $x = 5$ in $\pi_1(x, x)$ let $x = 5$ in $\pi_1(5, x)$ let $x = 5$ in $\pi_1(5, 5)$ let $x = 5$ in 5	let $x = 5$ in $\pi_1(x, x)$ let $x = 5$ in x

Redex-time Semantics

Reduction contexts: Reduce under standard evaluation contexts, but also under value-lets **let** $z = u$ **in** $_$

Values include **let** $z = u$ **in** u

value-let binding contexts E_2

mixed value-let and evaluation contexts E_3

(proj) $\pi_r(E_2.(u_1, u_2)) \longrightarrow E_2.u_r$

(app) $(E_2.(\lambda z:T.e))u \longrightarrow E_2.\mathbf{let} z = u \mathbf{in} e$ if ...

(inst) $\mathbf{let} z = u \mathbf{in} E_3.z \longrightarrow \mathbf{let} z = u \mathbf{in} E_3.u$ if ...

Don't substitute, instead instantiate single occurrences

Destruct-time Semantics

similar, except (1) values include x , and (2) instantiate only variables under *destruct contexts*

$$R ::= \pi_{r-} \mid -u$$

Properties

- Sanity
- Redex- and Destruct time are still CBV

Dynamic Rebinding: λ_{marsh} Constructs

(Ultimately want distributed comms, but λ is enough)

Take λ_d and add constructs to *mark* contexts

$$e ::= \dots \mid \mathbf{mark} \ M \ \mathbf{in} \ e$$

where M is a mark name (this is not a binder), and to *package* and *unpackage* values

$$e ::= \dots \mid \mathbf{marshal} \ M \ e \mid \mathbf{unmarshal} \ M \ e$$

which are both with respect to a mark.

λ_{marsh} : Example

Marks are used to specify which variables get rebound

let $y_1:\text{int} = 6$ **in**

mark M **in**

let $x_1:\text{Marsh} (\text{int} * \text{int}) = ($

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

marshal $M (y_1, z_1))$ **in**

let $y_2:\text{int} = 7$ **in**

mark M' **in**

unmarshal $M' x_1$

let $y_1:\text{int} = 6$ **in**
mark M **in**
let $x_1:\text{Marsh} (\text{int} * \text{int}) = (
 let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**
 marshal $M (y_1, z_1))$ **in**
let $y_2:\text{int} = 7$ **in**
mark M' **in**
unmarshal $M' x_1$$

→

let $y_1:\text{int} = 6$ **in**
mark M **in**
let $x_1:T = (
 let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**
 marshalled $(y_0:\text{int}) (
 let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**
 (y_0, z_1))$) **in**
let $y_2:\text{int} = 7$ **in**
mark M' **in**
unmarshal $M' x_1$$

let $y_1:\text{int} = 6$ **in**

mark M **in**

let $x_1:T = ($

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

marshalled ($y_0:\text{int}$) ($($

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

$(y_0, z_1)))$ **in**

let $y_2:\text{int} = 7$ **in**

mark M' **in**

unmarshal M' $(x_1$

let $y_1:\text{int} = 6$ **in**

mark M **in**

let $x_1:T = ($

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

marshalled ($y_0:\text{int}$) ($($

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

$(y_0, z_1)))$ **in**

let $y_2:\text{int} = 7$ **in**

mark M' **in**

unmarshal M' ($($

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

marshalled ($y_0:\text{int}$) ($($

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

→

let $y_1:\text{int} = 6$ **in**

mark M **in**

let $x_1:\text{Marsh} (\text{int} * \text{int}) = \dots$ **in**

let $y_2:\text{int} = 7$ **in**

mark M' **in**

unmarshal M' (

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

marshalled ($y_0:\text{int}$) (

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

(y_0, z_1)))

let $y_1:\text{int} = 6$ **in**

mark M **in**

let $x_1:\text{Marsh} (\text{int} * \text{int}) = \dots$ **in**

let $y_2:\text{int} = 7$ **in**

mark M' **in**

let $z_1:\text{int} = 3$ **in**

(y_2, z_1)

λ_{marsh} : **Semantics**

Use destruct-time lambda, plus rules for **marshal** and **unmarshal**.

Dynamic Update: Scenarios

Consider systems that must provide uninterrupted service. They must be *dynamically updated* to fix bugs and add new functionality.

Many forms of update are possible. Several systems have been built, but there is little semantics.

Here, show how a simple (but already expressive) form of update to CBV functional programs can be based on λ_d .

λ_{update} : Example

let $x_1 = 5$ in	$\xrightarrow{\{y \leftarrow (x_1, 6)\}}$	let $x_1 = 5$ in
let $y_1 = (4, 6)$ in		let $y_1 = (x_1, 6)$ in
let $z_1 = \text{update}$ in		let $z_1 = ()$ in
$\pi_1 y_1$		$\pi_1 y_1$

Update is synchronous – when **update** appears in a reduction context.

Any identifier in scope at the update point (here x or y) can be rebound, to an expression that may mention any identifiers in scope at its binding point.

λ_{update} : **Semantics**

Use destruct-time lambda, plus one rule for **update** .

Conclusion

Reasonably nice primitives for often-fudged problems.

Future Directions

Many other issues, in both

- Marshalling
- Update

Paper at <http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/users/pes20>

The End