

CMSC 430, Feb 18th 2020

# Extort

# First things first

# First things first

- Assignment #2

# First things first

- Assignment #2
  - Thanks to those of you that turned it in!

# First things first

- Assignment #2
  - Thanks to those of you that turned it in!
  - Hoping to get grading done by the end of the week.

# First things first

- Assignment #2
  - Thanks to those of you that turned it in!
  - Hoping to get grading done by the end of the week.
- Two issues:

# First things first

- Assignment #2
  - Thanks to those of you that turned it in!
  - Hoping to get grading done by the end of the week.
- Two issues:
  - One of my TAs is going to disambiguate github ID <-> UID. If you have concerns about that, contact me ASAP

# First things first

- Assignment #2
  - Thanks to those of you that turned it in!
  - Hoping to get grading done by the end of the week.
- Two issues:
  - One of my TAs is going to disambiguate github ID <-> UID. If you have concerns about that, contact me ASAP
  - Without ELMS/Canvas, how can I best communicate grades?



We've been Duped

# We've been Duped

- On Thursday we saw that even though we have two types and a semantics for our programs, there's all sorts of undefined behaviour.

# We've been Duped

- On Thursday we saw that even though we have two types and a semantics for our programs, there's all sorts of undefined behaviour.
- One strange consequence of this was that our interpreter and compiler behaved differently!

# We've been Duped

- On Thursday we saw that even though we have two types and a semantics for our programs, there's all sorts of undefined behaviour.
- One strange consequence of this was that our interpreter and compiler behaved differently!
  - Why?

# Addressing the error of our ways

# Addressing the error of our ways

- Recap from last time:

# Addressing the error of our ways

- Recap from last time:

**(add1 #f)**

# Addressing the error of our ways

- Recap from last time:



# Addressing the error of our ways

- Recap from last time:

( zero? #f )

# Addressing the error of our ways

- Recap from last time:

# Addressing the error of our ways

- Recap from last time:

```
(if (zero? #f) 1 2)
```

# Addressing the error of our ways

- Recap from last time:

```
(if (zero? #f) 1 2)
```

- Previously, these were undefined

# Addressing the error of our ways

- Recap from last time:

```
(if (zero? #f) 1 2)
```

- Previously, these were undefined
  - In our interpreter we would get a failure because of the errors from the underlying Racket execution

# Addressing the error of our ways

- Recap from last time:

```
(if (zero? #f) 1 2)
```

- Previously, these were undefined
  - In our interpreter we would get a failure because of the errors from the underlying Racket execution
  - In our compiler we'd get junk

# Extort

# Extort

- Our language **extort** the same as **dupe** *except* we address errors explicitly



# Extort's AST

# Extort's AST

- No changes:

# Extort's AST

- No changes:

- **$e ::= \dots \mid \text{if } e \ e \ e \mid \text{zero? } e$**

# Extort's AST

- No changes:
  - **$e ::= \dots \mid \text{if } e \ e \ e \mid \text{zero? } e$**
  - Why don't we need to change the AST?

C'est man-tick

# C'est man-tick

- Type mismatches in **dupe** were undefined behavior

# C'est man-tick

- Type mismatches in **dupe** were undefined behavior
  - Do we have to make them defined?

# C'est man-tick

- Type mismatches in **dupe** were undefined behavior
  - Do we have to make them defined?
  - What are the pros/cons?



# Errors Rule

# Errors Rule

- Let's add some, knowing that it's not strictly necessary

# Errors Rule

- Let's add some, knowing that it's not strictly necessary
- Our semantics now relate programs to *answers* instead of values

# Errors Rule

- Let's add some, knowing that it's not strictly necessary
- Our semantics now relate programs to *answers* instead of values
  - *answers* are either *values* (as before), or *errors*

# Errors Rule

- Let's add some, knowing that it's not strictly necessary
- Our semantics now relate programs to *answers* instead of values
  - *answers* are either *values* (as before), or *errors*
- We'll just show the new rules, none of the others have changed.

C'est man-tick

# C'est man-tick

- Where can errors occur (currently)?

# C'est man-tick

- Where can errors occur (currently)?

$$\overline{E[(\text{add1 } b), \text{err}]}$$



# C'est man-tick

- Where can errors occur (currently)?

$$\overline{E[(\text{add1 } b), \text{err}]}$$

$$\overline{E[(\text{sub1 } b), \text{err}]}$$

# C'est man-tick

- Where can errors occur (currently)?

$$\overline{E[(\text{add1 } b), \text{err}]}$$
$$\overline{E[(\text{sub1 } b), \text{err}]}$$
$$\overline{E[(\text{zero? } b), \text{err}]}$$

C'est man-tick

# C'est man-tick

- Is that it?

# C'est man-tick

- Is that it?

```
(if (zero? #f) 1 2)
```

C'est man-tick

# C'est man-tick

- We also need to propagate errors 'upward'

# C'est man-tick

- We also need to propagate errors 'upward'

$$\frac{E[e, \text{err}]}{E[(\text{zero? } e), \text{err}]}$$



# C'est man-tick

- We also need to propagate errors 'upward'

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[e, \text{err}]}{\mathbf{E}[(\text{zero? } e), \text{err}]}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[e, \text{err}]}{\mathbf{E}[(\text{add1 } e), \text{err}]}$$

# C'est man-tick

- We also need to propagate errors 'upward'

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[e, \text{err}]}{\mathbf{E}[(\text{zero? } e), \text{err}]}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[e, \text{err}]}{\mathbf{E}[(\text{add1 } e), \text{err}]}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[e, \text{err}]}{\mathbf{E}[(\text{sub1 } e), \text{err}]}$$

# C'est man-tick

- We also need to propagate errors 'upward'

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[e, \text{err}]}{\mathbf{E}[(\text{zero? } e), \text{err}]}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[e, \text{err}]}{\mathbf{E}[(\text{add1 } e), \text{err}]}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[e, \text{err}]}{\mathbf{E}[(\text{sub1 } e), \text{err}]}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}[e, \text{err}]}{\mathbf{E}[(\text{if } e e_0 e_1), \text{err}]}$$

Rules are the easy part

# Rules are the easy part

- How can our implementations match these rules?

# Let's look at the interpreter

We'll do that in the terminal, as it's starting to get a bit too cumbersome

Let's experiment

```
extort> (require "extort_interp.rkt")
```

Now the compiler.



# Now the compiler.

- What needs to change, if anything?

# Now the compiler.

- What needs to change, if anything?
- What should the error message be?

# Runtime errors

# Runtime errors

- Things need to happen in the RTS and compiler.

# Runtime errors

- Things need to happen in the RTS and compiler.
  - Runtime system?

# Runtime errors

- Things need to happen in the RTS and compiler.
  - Runtime system?
  - Compiler?

Let's take a look at the RTS and compiler

# Assignment 3

- Is live



# Assignment 3

- Is live
- Due next Tuesday.

# Assignment 3

- Is live
- Due next Tuesday.
  - Please tell your fellow students to check the webpage periodically
  - If there are any issues that might make you unable to do the assignment on time, *talk to me*