

Whatever happened to meta-programming? (Invited talk)

Gallagher, John Patrick

Published in:
AGP-2002, Madrid, 17-20 September 2002

Publication date:
2002

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Gallagher, J. P. (2002). Whatever happened to meta-programming? (Invited talk). In *AGP-2002, Madrid, 17-20 September 2002* Universidad Politécnica de Madrid.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Whatever Happened to Meta-Programming?

John Gallagher
University of Bristol

AGP'02, Madrid

1

Youthful Expectations

*10-15 years ago

- * Meta-interpreters + partial evaluation
- * Meta-interpreters “for real” -- to realise language implementation and extensions
- * Compiling control, clever *and* efficient program control
- * Self-applicable partial evaluation for generating compilers and compiler-compilers
- * Inventing abstract machines
- * Reflection (demo, holds, etc) for knowledge management and problem solving
- * Conferences for meta-programming (META, Programs as Data,..)

* Progress and continued activity, but.....

AGP'02, Madrid

2

Middle-age realism


*The dreams live on - the problems are becoming better understood

- *how to express semantics
- *how to make more powerful partial evaluators
- *the essential role of static analysis
- *how to design good object program representation

AGP'02, Madrid

3

Object Language and Meta Language



Object program
P written in
language L

Meta program
Q written in
language M
(possibly L=M)

AGP'02, Madrid

4

The real target for tools

- * We usually talk of developing *language-specific* tools, e.g.
 - * an analyser for C
 - * a transformer for Prolog
 - * a verifier for VHDL
- * Each tool is complex and hard to develop
- * We should analyse, transform, prove etc. in the meta-language
- * One meta-language can serve many object languages

Language Semantics as a Parameter

- * A systematic method for developing object language processors
- * Explicit object language definitions, written down in a meta-language
 - * syntax and semantics definitions
- * Construct language independent tools, parameterised by semantics

One program executing another

- * An interpreter for language L, Int_L
- * Takes a (representation of) a program in L and some input data, and computes some output data
 - $\text{Int}_L : \text{Prog}_L \times \text{Input} \rightarrow \text{Output}$
- * The familiar partial evaluation equations (Futamura projections) show that we can “compile” a program
 - $\text{PE}(\text{Int}_L, p) = \text{“}p \text{ compiled into the language of } \text{Int}_L \text{”}$

One more generalisation

- * A universal interpreter U
- * Takes a language definition (syntax and semantics) as parameter
- * Parses and executes a program according to the given syntax and semantics
 - $U : \text{LangDefs} \times \text{Progs} \times \text{Input} \rightarrow \text{Output}$
- * PE wrt a fixed language definition
 - $\text{PE}(U, \text{Def}_L) = \text{Int}_L$

Object language definition

- * Syntax
 - * abstract syntax = terms, parse trees
 - * utilities (tokenizers and parsers) to convert concrete programs (e.g. strings, flowcharts) to abstract syntax
- * Semantics
 - * transitions
 - * derivations
 - * abstract machine states
 - * denotations

Transition Systems

- * Operational semantics
- * Define abstract machine
 - * Computation states
 - * Transitions - binary relation on states
 - * Derivations
- * Transitions can be **Big-step** or **Small-step**

Big-step vs. small-step

- * Big-step
 - * the total effect of each program construct is expressed
 - * initial state \Rightarrow final state
- * Small-step
 - * the immediate effect of each statement is expressed
 - * initial state \Rightarrow next state

Small-step semantics


- * Operational semantics (small-step or structural)
 - * a set of computation states Q (configurations) including terminal states F
 - * a set of transitions - a relation \Rightarrow in $Q \times Q$
 - * each transition describes a basic computation step
 - * derivations (computations)
 - * $q_0 \Rightarrow q_1 \Rightarrow q_2 \Rightarrow \dots$
 - * terminating derivation if $q_n \in F$

Big-step semantics

- * Operational semantics (big-step or natural)
 - * a set of computation states Q (configurations) including terminal states F
 - * a set of transitions - a relation \Rightarrow in $Q \times Q$
 - * each transition describes a complete computation for some program construct
 - * derivations and transitions are not distinguished

Interpreter for small-step semantics

- * a predicate $\text{transition}(S1,S2)$ to represent $S1 \Rightarrow S2$
- * a predicate $\text{derivation}(D)$ where $D=[q_0,q_1,q_2,\dots]$



Example - simple imperative language

(Peralta, Gallagher, Saglam, SAS'98, Peralta, PhD 2000)

- * Computation state is a pair $\langle \text{Code}, \text{Store} \rangle$
- * In a terminal state, the **Code** is empty (ϵ)

$\langle x := \text{expr}, t \rangle$	$\Rightarrow \langle \epsilon, t[x/\text{val}(\text{expr},t)] \rangle$
$\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } s1 \text{ else } s2, t \rangle$	$\Rightarrow \langle s1, t \rangle$ if $\text{val}(b,t) = \text{true}$
$\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } s1 \text{ else } s2, t \rangle$	$\Rightarrow \langle s2, t \rangle$ if $\text{val}(b,t) = \text{false}$
$\langle s1; s2, t \rangle$	$\Rightarrow \langle s11, s2, t1 \rangle$ if $\langle s1, t \rangle \Rightarrow \langle s11, t1 \rangle$ ($s11 \neq \epsilon$)
$\langle s1; s2, t \rangle$	$\Rightarrow \langle s2, t1 \rangle$ if $\langle s1, t \rangle \Rightarrow \langle s11, t1 \rangle$ ($s11 = \epsilon$)
$\langle \text{while } b \text{ do } s, t \rangle$	$\Rightarrow \langle \text{if } b \text{ then } (s; \text{while } b \text{ do } s) \text{ else skip}, t \rangle$
$\langle \text{skip}, t \rangle$	$\Rightarrow \langle \epsilon, t \rangle$

Syntax representation

$x := \text{expr}$	$\text{assign}(X, \text{Expr})$
$\text{if } b \text{ then } s1 \text{ else } s2$	$\text{ifte}(B, S1, S2)$
$s1; s2$	$\text{compose}(S1, S2)$
$\text{while } b \text{ do } s$	$\text{while}(B, S)$
skip	skip

<pre> i := 2; j := 0; while (n*n > 1) do {if (n*n = 2) then i := i+4; else i := i+2; j := j+1; } </pre>	<pre> compose(assign(i,2), compose(assign(j,0), while(n*n > 1, ifte(n*n=2, assign(i, i+4), compose(assign(i,i+2), assign(j,j+1))))) </pre>
--	---

Representation of transitions

Represent configuration $\langle \text{stmt}, t \rangle$ as $c(\text{Stmt}, T)$

```

transition(c(assign(X, Expr), T), c(empty, T1)) :-
    val(Expr, T, V),
    update(T, T1, X, V).
transition(c(ifte(B, S1, S2), T), c(S1, T1)) :-
    val(Expr, T, true).
transition(c(ifte(B, S1, S2), T), c(S2, T1)) :-
    val(Expr, T, false).
transition(c(while(B, S), T), c(compose(ifte(B, while(B, S), skip)), T)).
transition(c(compose(S1, S2), T), c(compose(S11, S2), T1)) :-
    transition(c(S1, T), c(S11, T1)), S11 ≠ empty.
transition(c(compose(S1, S2), T), c(S2, T1)) :-
    transition(c(S1, T), c(S11, T1)), S11 = empty.
    
```

Program Specialization

- * $PE(P, \text{input}_1) = P_{\text{input}_1}$
 - * $P(\text{input}_1, \text{input}_2) = P_{\text{input}_1}(\text{input}_2)$
- * when applied to language interpreters, can be regarded as generalised compilation
 - * $PE(\text{Int}, P) = \text{Int}_P$
 - * Int_P is a translation of P into the language of Int
- * self application yields compiler
 - * $PE(PE, \text{Int}) = PE_{\text{Int}}$, and $PE_{\text{Int}}(P) = \text{Int}_P$

Specialization of Transition Semantics

```

derivation(I, J, N) :-
    d1(I, J, N).
d1(I, J, N) :-
    d2(J, N).
d2(J, N) :-
    d3(0, 2, N).
d3(I, J, N) :-
    {Y = N*N},
    gt_test1(Y, R).
d4(I, J, N, R).
    
```

```

d4(I, J, N, false).
d4(I, J, N, true) :-
    d5(I, J, N).
d5(I, J, N) :-
    {Y = N*N},
    eq_test1(Y, R).
d6(I, J, N, R).
d6(I, J, N, true) :-
    d7(I, J, N).
d6(I, J, N, false) :-
    d8(I, J, N).
    
```

```

d7(I, J, N) :-
    {I1 = I+4},
    d3(I1, J, N).
d8(I, J, N) :-
    {I1 = I+2},
    d9(I1, J, N).
d9(I, J, N) :-
    {J1 = J+1},
    d3(I, J1, N).
    
```

Specialization of derivation semantics w.r.t. example program

Analysing at Meta-Level

The program above was submitted to a convex-hull analyser for CLP. Analysis returns a set of linear constraints associated to each predicate call. E.g. (partial result).

```

d7_query(I, J, N) :- J >= 0, J - 0.5*I <= -1.0
d9_query(I, J, N) :- J >= 0, J - 0.5*I <= -2.0
    
```

Each predicate $d1, d2$, etc. corresponds to an imperative program point. Thus the results can be interpreted back to the object level easily.

Big-step semantics

- * The total effect of a complete language construct is specified
- * Often specified in compositional style
- * $\langle \text{Statement, Init, Final} \rangle$

$$\frac{}{\langle x := \text{expr}, t, t[\text{x}/\text{val}(\text{x},t)] \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle s1, t, t1 \rangle \quad \langle s2, t1, t2 \rangle}{\langle s1 ; s2, t, t2 \rangle}$$

$$\frac{\text{val}(\text{b},t) = \text{true}, \langle s1, t, t1 \rangle}{\langle \text{if b then s1 else s2, t, t1} \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle \text{if b then (s;while b do s) else skip, t, t1} \rangle}{\langle \text{while b do s, t, t1} \rangle}$$

$$\frac{\text{val}(\text{b},t) = \text{false}, \langle s2, t, t1 \rangle}{\langle \text{if b then s1 else s2, t, t1} \rangle}$$

Big-step interpreter

- * The big-step transition relation functions also as a derivation relation.
- * $\text{transition}(\text{S, Init, Final})$ can be specialized w.r.t. a given program S.
- * The resulting program differs from the small-step semantics
 - * intermediate states are visible.
 - * program is not tail recursive

Specialized Big-step interpreter

```
i := 2;
j := 0;
while (n*n > 1) do
  {if (n*n = 2) then
   i := i+4;
  else
   i := i+2; j := j+1;
  }
```

```
d(I,J,N, I',J',N') :-
  d1(I,2,I1),
  d2(J,0,J1),
  d3(I1,J1,N,I',J',N'). % while
etc.
```

More complex analysis?

Variables are duplicated

Answers must be propagated during analysis

Labelled Transition Semantics

- * A compositional style of small-step semantics
- * Used extensively for process algebras
- * Process language with constructs $a.P, P1+P2, P|Q, P \setminus L, P[f]$ (Milner)
- * (Labelled) transitions, and derivations, are defined similarly to the imperative language
- * Specialized meta-programs have been “model checked” using static analysis techniques (e.g. Leuschel et al.)

$$\frac{}{a.P \Rightarrow^a P} \quad \frac{P \Rightarrow^a P1}{P|Q \Rightarrow^a P1|Q} \quad \frac{Q \Rightarrow^a Q1}{P|Q \Rightarrow^a P|Q1} \quad \text{etc.}$$

“Low-level” meta-language

- * We can use a low-level meta-language to represent the semantics of a high-level object-language
- * E.g. proof mechanism for full first order logic realised by Horn clause program
- * Search space of prover pruned using analysis of Horn clause meta-program.

Requirements of meta-language

- * convenient representation of syntax
 - * important only for readability
- * representation of transitions
 - * relational style fits better with traditional style of semantic specification
 - * non-determinism
- * fixpoint semantics
 - * framework for abstract interpretation

Static Analysis of Term Structure

Aim of set-based analysis (a.k.a. type inference- to find a safe approximation of the set of values that can appear at a given program point (work goes back to [Reynolds, 1968]))

```
q([], X, X) .
q([c(X1) | Y], Acc, X) :-
    integer(X1), q(Y, c(X1, Acc), X) .
q([d(X1) | Y], Acc, X) :-
    integer(X1), q(Y, d(X1, Acc), X) .
p(X, Y) :- q(X, 0, Y) .
```

$S_Y ::= 0 \mid c(\text{Int}, S_Y) \mid d(\text{Int}, S_Y)$
(S_Y is an infinite regular set of terms)

Uses of Set-based Analysis

For imperative program analysis the **environment stack** is modelled as a component of the state.

The stack can be unbounded in the presence of recursive procedures (hence, stack must be approximated)

Over approximation means that control is undefined at procedure exit.

Details - Gallagher-Peralta (HOSC, 2001)

Current and Future Work

- * Using set-based analysis of meta-programs
- * Verification experiments
 - * infinite state model checking [Charatonik & Podelski]
 - * cryptographic protocols [Abadi & Blanchet]
 - * using meta-language representation of protocol
 - * Shape analysis in imperative language

Related Research

- * The Boyer-Moore prover (ACL2) (and other provers) is essentially a meta-level approach
 - * First, systematically translate the object program/system to a LISP-like functional program
 - * Verify the functional program
 - * Interpret the results back to the object program
- * The Supercompiler project (Turchin et al.)
 - * target Java - execute Java via meta-level interpreter, and optimise at that level

Powerful tools for the meta-language

- * Generally, analysis, proof, and transformation tools are better developed for declarative languages.
- * Transport these advantages to other languages, by using declarative languages as a meta-language

Some day....

- * Programming will cease to be an error-prone and time-consuming handcraft
- * Most programs will be generated, verified by other programs
- * Meta-programming is one of the unifying principles of computing
- * Systematic meta-programming is key