Parameter Passing

Programming Language Features (cont.)

- Names & binding
  - Namespaces
  - Static (lexical) scopes
  - Dynamic scopes

- Parameter passing
  - Call by value
  - Call by reference
  - Call by name
    - Eager vs. lazy evaluation

- Polymorphism
  - Parametric
  - Subtype
  - Ad-hoc

- Parallelism
  - Multithreading
  - Message passing
Parameter Passing in OCaml

Quiz: What value is bound to $z$?

```
let add x y = x + y
let z = add 3 4
```

7

```
let add x y = x + y
let z = add (add 3 1) (add 4 1)
```

9

```
let r = ref 0
let add x y = (!r) + x + y
let set_r () = r := 3; 1
let z = add (set_r ()) 2
```

Actuals evaluated before call

Call-by-Value

- In call-by-value (cbv), arguments to functions are fully evaluated before the function is invoked
- Also in OCaml, in `let x = e1 in e2`, the expression $e_1$ is fully evaluated before $e_2$ is evaluated
- C, C++, and Java also use call-by-value

```
int r = 0;
int add(int x, int y) { return r + x + y; }
int set_r(void) {
    r = 3;
    return 1;
}
add(set_r(), 2);
```
Call-by-Value in Imperative Languages

- In C, C++, and Java, call-by-value has another feature
  - What does this program print? 0

```c
void f(int x) {
    x = 3;
}

int main() {
    int x = 0;
    f(x);
    printf("%d\n", x);
}
```

- Cbv protects function arguments against modifications

---

Call-by-Value (cont.)

- Actual parameter is copied to stack location of formal parameter

```c
void f(int x) {
    x = 3;
}

int main() {
    int x = 0;
    f(x);
    printf("%d\n", x);
}
```
Call-by-Reference

Alternative idea
- Implicitly pass a pointer or reference to actual parameter
- If the function writes to it the actual parameter is modified

```c
void f(int x) {
    x = 3;
}

int main() {
    int x = 0;
    f(x);
    printf("%d\n", x);
}
```

Call-by-Reference (cont.)

Advantages
- Allows multiple return values
- Avoid copying entire argument to called function
  - More efficient when passing large (multi-word) arguments
  - Can do this without explicit pointer manipulation

Disadvantages
- More work to pass non-variable arguments
  - Examples: constant, function result
- May be hard to tell if function modifies arguments
- Introduces aliasing
Aliasing

- We say that two names are aliased if they refer to the same object in memory
  - C examples (this is what makes optimizing C hard)

```c
int x;
int *p, *q; /*Note that C uses pointers to simulate call by reference*/
p = &x; /* *p and x are aliased */
q = p; /* *q, *p, and x are aliased */
```

```c
struct list { int x; struct list *next; }
struct list *p, *q;
...
q = p; /* *q and *p are aliased */
/* so are p->x and q->x */
/* and p->next->x and q->next->x... */
```

Call-by-Reference (cont.)

- Call-by-reference is still around (e.g., C++)

```c
int x = 0; // C++
void f(int &y) { y = 1; } // y = reference var
f(x); printf("%d\n", x); // prints 1
f(2); // error
```

- Seems to be less popular in newer languages
  - Older languages still use it
    - Examples: Fortran, Ada, C with pointers
  - Possible efficiency gains not worth the confusion
  - The “hardware” is basically call-by-value
    - Although call by reference is not hard to implement and there may be some support for it
Call-by-Value Discussion

- Cbv is standard for languages with side effects
  - When we have side effects, we need to know the order in which things are evaluated
    - Otherwise programs have unpredictable behavior
  - Call-by-value specifies the order at function calls
  - Call-by-reference can sometimes give different results
- Differences blurred for languages like Java
  - Language is call by value
  - But most parameters are object references anyway
    - Still have aliasing, parameter modifications at object level

Call-by-Name

- Call-by-name (cbn)
  - First described in description of Algol (1960)
  - Generalization of Lambda expressions (to be discussed later)
  - Idea: In a function:
    
    | Let add x y = x+y |
    | add (a*b) (c*d) |
    
    Then each use of x and y in the function definition is just a literal substitution of the actual arguments, (a*b) and (c*d), respectively
  - Implementation: Highly complex, inefficient, and provides little improvement over other mechanisms
Call-by-Name (cont.)

In call-by-name (cbn), arguments to functions are evaluated at the last possible moment, just before they're needed.

```
let add x y = x + y
let z = add (add 3 1) (add 4 1)
```

Haskell; cbn; arguments evaluated here

OCaml; cbv; arguments evaluated here

What would be an example where this difference matters?

```
let cond p x y = if p then x else y
let rec loop n = loop n
let z = cond true 42 (loop 0)
```

OCaml; cbv; infinite recursion at call

Haskell; cbn; never evaluated because parameter is never used
Call by Name Examples

- P(x) \{ x = x + x; \}
  - What is: \( Y = 2 \);
  - \( \text{P}(Y) \);
  - \( \text{write}(Y) \)
  - \( \text{becomes } Y = Y + Y = 4 \)

- F(m) \{ m = m + 1; \text{return } m; \}
  - What is: \( \text{int } A[10]; \)
  - \( m = 1; \)
  - \( \text{P}(A[F(m)]) \)
  - becomes \( \text{P}(A[F(m)]) \)
    - \( A[F(m)] = A[F(m)] + A[F(m)] \)
    - \( A[m++] = A[m++] + A[m++] \)

Call by Name Anomalies

- Write a function to exchange values of X and Y
  - Usual way - swap(x, y) \{ t=x; x=y; y=t; \}
    - Cannot do it with call by name!
  - Reason
    - Cannot handle both of following
      - swap(A[m], m)
      - swap(m, A[m])
    - One of these must fail
      - swap(A[m], m) \( \rightarrow t = A[m]; A[m] = m; m = t; \)
      - swap(m, A[m]) \( \rightarrow t = m; m = A[m]; A[m] = t; \) // fails!
Two Cool Things to Do with CBN

- CBN is also called lazy evaluation
  - CBV is also known as eager evaluation

- Build control structures with functions
  ```
  let cond p x y = if p then x else y
  ```

- Build “infinite” data structures
  ```
  integers n = n::(integers (n+1))
  take 10 (integers 0) (* infinite loop in cbv *)
  ```

Simulating CBN with CBV

- Thunk
  - A function with no arguments

- Algorithm
  1. Replace arguments $a_1$…$a_k$ by thunks $t_1$…$t_k$
     - When called, $t_i$ evaluates and returns $a_i$
  2. Within body of the function
     - Replace formal argument with thunk invocations
  ```
  let add1 x = x + 1 in add1 (2+3)
  ```
  ```
  let add1 x = x() + 1 in add1 (fun () -> (2+3))
  ```
Simulating CBN with CBV (cont.)

\[
\text{let cond } p \ x \ y = \text{if } p \ \text{then } x \ \text{else } y \\
\text{let rec loop } n = \text{loop } n \\
\text{let } z = \text{cond true } 42 \ (\text{loop } 0)
\]

• becomes...

\[
\text{let cond } p \ x \ y = \text{if } (p ()) \ \text{then } (x ()) \ \text{else } (y ()) \\
\text{let rec loop } n = \text{loop } n \ (* \text{didn’t transform... } *) \\
\text{let } z = \text{cond } (\text{fun } () \rightarrow \text{true}) \ (\text{fun } () \rightarrow 42) \ (\text{fun } () \rightarrow \text{loop } 0)
\]

Get 1st arg
Return 2nd arg
Never invoked

Parameters are now thunks

Three-Way Comparison

- Consider the following program under the three calling conventions

  - For each, determine i's value and which a[i] (if any) is modified

```c
int i = 1;

void p(int f, int g) {
    g++;
    f = 5 * i;
}

int main() {
    int a[] = {0, 1, 2};
    p(a[i], i);
    printf("%d %d %d %d\n", i, a[0], a[1], a[2]);
}
```
Example: Call-by-Value

```c
int i = 1;
void p(int f, int g) {
    g++;
    f = 5 * i;
}
int main() {
    int a[] = {0, 1, 2};
p(a[i], i);
    printf("%d %d %d %d\n", i, a[0], a[1], a[2]);
}
```

Example: Call-by-Reference

```c
int i = 1;
void p(int f, int g) {
    g++;
    f = 5 * i;
}
int main() {
    int a[] = {0, 1, 2};
p(a[i], i);
    printf("%d %d %d %d\n", i, a[0], a[1], a[2]);
}
```
Example: Call-by-Name

```c
int i = 1;
void p(int f, int g) {
  g++;
  f = 5 * i;
  i++;
  a[i] = 5*i;
}
int main() {
  int a[] = {0, 1, 2};
  p(a[i], i);
  printf("%d %d %d %d
", i, a[0], a[1], a[2]);
}
```

The expression `a[i]` isn't evaluated until needed, in this case after `i` has changed.

Other Calling Mechanisms

- **Call-by-result**
  - Actual argument passed by reference, but not initialized
  - Written to in function body (and since passed by reference, affects actual argument)

- **Call-by-value-result**
  - Actual argument copied in on call (like cbv)
  - Mutated within function, but does not affect actual yet
  - At end of function body, copied back out to actual

- **These calling mechanisms didn't really catch on**
  - They can be confusing in cases
  - Recent languages don’t use them
How Function Calls Really Work

- Function calls are important
  - Usually have direct instruction support in hardware
  - Detail important for assembly language programming
    - See CMSC 212, 311, 412, or 430

- Will just provide quick overview here

- Key point to remember
  - Function calls generally require allocating stack frames

Stack Frame / Activation Record

- Machine-dependent data structure containing state information for each function invocation
  - Allocated on stack at function invocation
  - Freed upon function return (by popping stack)

- Contents may include
  - Local variables
  - Return address
  - Actual parameters
  - Return value
  - Address of frame of calling function
  - Address of frame of lexically enclosing function
Tail Calls

- A tail call is a function call that is the last thing a function does before it returns
  - Not just function call in last line of code in function

```ocaml
let add x y = x + y
let f z = add z z (* tail call *)

let rec len = function
  | [] -> 0
  | (_::t) -> 1 + (len t) (* not tail call, performs +1 *)

let rec len a = function
  | [] -> a
  | (_::t) -> len (a + 1) t (* tail call *)
```

Tail Recursion

- Recall that in OCaml, all looping is via recursion
  - Seems very inefficient
  - Needs one stack frame for each recursive call

- A function is tail recursive
  - If it is recursive
  - And recursive call is a tail call

- If function is tail recursive
  - Can reuse stack frame for each recursive call
Tail Recursion (cont.)

Let rec len l = match l with
  | [] -> 0
  | (_::t) -> 1 + (len t)

len [1; 2]

- Function is not tail recursive
  - Use stack frame store return value
  - Add 1 to return value, use as new return value

Tail Recursion (cont.)

Let rec len a l = match l with
  | [] -> a
  | (_::t) -> (len (a + 1) t)

len 0 [1; 2]

- Function is tail recursive
  - Same stack frame can be reused for the next call
  - Since we’d just pop it off and return anyway
Short Circuiting

> Will OCaml raise a **Division_by_zero** exception?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>let x = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>if x != 0 &amp;&amp; (y / x) &gt; 100 then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>print_string &quot;OCaml sure is fun&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if x == 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>print_string &quot;OCaml sure is fun&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **No**: && and || are short-circuiting in OCaml
  - e1 && e2 evaluates e1. If false, it returns false. Otherwise, it returns the result of evaluating e2
  - e1 || e2 evaluates e1. If true, it returns true. Otherwise, it returns the result of evaluating e2

Short Circuiting (cont.)

> C, C++, Java, and Ruby all short-circuit &&, ||

> But some languages don’t, like Pascal (although Turbo Pascal has an option for this):

```
x := 0;
...
if (x <> 0) and (y / x > 100) then
  writeln('Sure OCaml is fun');
```

- So this would need to be written as

```
x := 0;
...
if x <> 0 then
  if y / x > 100 then
    writeln('Sure OCaml is fun');
```