

# Fundamental Constructs in Programming Languages (Submitted Draft)

Peter D. Mosses<sup>1,2</sup>[0000-0002-5826-7520]

<sup>1</sup> Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup> Swansea University, United Kingdom

p.d.mosses@swansea.ac.uk

**Abstract.** Specifying the semantics of a programming language formally can have many benefits. However, it can also require a huge effort. The effort can be significantly reduced by translating language syntax to so-called fundamental constructs (funcons). A translation to funcons is easy to update when the language evolves, and it exposes relationships between individual language constructs.

The PPlanCompS project has developed an initial collection of funcons (primarily for translation of functional and imperative languages). The behaviour of each funcon is defined, once and for all, using a modular variant of structural operational semantics. The definitions are available online.

This paper introduces and motivates funcons. It illustrates translation of language constructs to funcons, and how funcons are defined. It also relates funcons to notation used in previous frameworks, including monadic semantics and action semantics.

**Keywords:** Funcons · Programming constructs · Formal specification

## 1 Introduction

Many constructs found in (high-level) programming languages combine several behavioural features. For example, call-by-value parameter passing in an imperative language involves order of evaluation, allocating storage and initialising its contents, local name binding, and lexical scoping. Such language constructs generally provide conciseness and clarity in programs, and may support efficient implementation techniques (e.g., stack-based storage); but their behaviour can be quite difficult to understand, and tedious to specify directly.

Moreover, constructs in different languages may look the same but have very different behaviour (e.g., the notorious ‘`x=y`’), or look different but have exactly the same behaviour (e.g., ‘`while...do...`’ and ‘`while(...){...}`’). Relatively minor differences between similar language constructs in different languages include order of evaluation in expressions, and the effect of arithmetic overflow. The evolution of programming languages has resulted in a huge diversity of language constructs and their variants. Some of the constructs are quite simple, but no programming lingua franca has emerged.

The PPlanCompS project<sup>3</sup> is aiming to isolate a collection of *fundamental constructs* (‘funcons’) from which the behaviour of all existing high-level programming language constructs can be composed. Funcons should be significantly simpler than typical language constructs, in general:

- Each funcon should affect only a single behavioural feature.
- Variants of funcon behaviour (e.g., evaluating their arguments in a different order) should be obtainable by composition.
- Funcons should abstract from details related to implementation efficiency.

The definition of a funcon determines its name, its signature, and its behaviour. Each funcon name should have a *unique* definition, so that it always refers to the same signature and behaviour, regardless of where the reference occurs. To support reuse, funcon definitions need to be *fixed* and *permanent*: changing or removing funcons would undermine the validity of translations that use them. In particular, adding a new funcon to a collection must never require changes to the previous definitions.

Version control is superfluous for funcons; translations of language constructs to funcons, in contrast, may need to change when the specified language evolves. For example, the illustrative language IMP includes a plain old while-loop with a Boolean-valued condition; the following rule translates its execution to the funcon **while-true**, which has exactly the required behaviour:

$$\text{Rule } \text{execute}[\text{‘while’} \text{ ‘(’ } BExp \text{ ‘)’ } Block] = \\ \text{while-true}(\text{eval-bool}[ BExp ], \text{execute}[ Block ])$$

The behaviour of the funcon **while-true** is fixed. But suppose the IMP language evolves, and a *Block* can now execute a statement **break;**, which is supposed to terminate the closest-enclosing loop. We can extend the translation with the following rule:

$$\text{Rule } \text{execute}[\text{‘break’} \text{ ‘;’}] = \text{abrupt}(\text{broken})$$

The funcon **abrupt**(*V*) terminates execution abruptly, signalling its argument value *V* as the reason for termination. The translation of **while(true){break;}** is now the funcon term **while-true(true, abrupt(broken))**. However, the behaviour of **while-true(true, X)** is to terminate abruptly when *X* does – so this translation would lead to abrupt termination of *all* enclosing while-loops! We cannot change the definition of **while-true**, so we are forced to change the translation rule. The following updated translation rule reflects the extension of the behaviour of while-loops with handling of abrupt termination due to break-statements (and specifies that abrupt termination for any other reason is propagated):

$$\text{Rule } \text{execute}[\text{‘while’} \text{ ‘(’ } BExp \text{ ‘)’ } Block] = \\ \text{handle-abrupt}( \\ \text{while-true}(\text{eval-bool}[ BExp ], \text{execute}[ Block ]), \\ \text{if-true-else}(\text{is-equal}(\text{given}, \text{broken}), \text{null-value}, \text{abrupt}(\text{given})))$$


---

<sup>3</sup> <https://plancomps.github.io>

Handling abrupt termination of the current iteration due to continue-statements is similar. (The specialised funcons `handle-break(X)` and `handle-continue(X)` can be used to express the same behaviour more concisely.)

The PPlanCompS project has developed an initial collection of funcons [23, Funcons-beta], and demonstrated their use in some language specifications [23, Languages-beta]. The collection aims to combine simplicity with expressiveness: the funcons are simple enough to understand and define, yet translation of many language constructs<sup>4</sup> to funcons is also reasonably simple. Funcon behaviour is defined using a modular variant [16,20] of structural operational semantics [24], based on value-computation transition systems [5].

*Contributions.* The reader is assumed to be interested in programming languages, and familiar with their main concepts. The research on which this paper is based has been published elsewhere [2,5,6,16,18,19,20]. The main aims here are to motivate the general idea of funcons, and illustrate how they can be used to explain the behaviour of programming language constructs:

- We explain some general features of funcons (Sect. 2).
- We consider how to manage collections of several hundred funcons (Sect. 3).
- We analyse various facets of funcon behaviour (Sect. 4).
- We illustrate translation of language constructs to funcons and explain how to validate such translations (Sect. 5).
- We illustrate how to define a funcon independently, once and for all (Sect. 6).
- We relate funcons to auxiliary operations defined in denotational semantics, to monads, and to the combinators used in action semantics (Sect. 7).
- We conclude with plans for future development of funcons (Sect. 8),

Appendix A gives an informal summary of the funcons defined in Funcons-beta.<sup>5</sup>

The rest of this paper is structured as responses to questions that readers might ask about funcons. The author welcomes further questions, as well as comments on the given responses.

## 2 The Nature of Funcons

Let us start by trying to clarify some general features of funcons.

- *What aspects of behaviour do funcons represent?*

Funcons abstract from details related to implementation efficiency, such as storage allocation algorithms and communication protocols. They express implementation independent behaviour that arises when programs are executed. They also express linguistic features on which that behaviour depends, such as scopes of bindings.

---

<sup>4</sup> Funcons for declarative and graphical languages have not yet been developed.

<sup>5</sup> Appendix A is to be omitted in the final version, and made available on arXiv.

– *Can funcons be implemented efficiently?*

Funcons need to be executable, to support validation of language translations. Their current implementation uses Haskell generated directly from their definitions [3]. The efficiency of executing funcon terms is adequate for running unit tests and typical test programs, but not applications.

– *How complicated are funcons ?*

One might expect that funcons should be as simple as possible. In fact the aim is for funcons to be not too complicated, not too simple – just right!

In the physical sciences, molecules are characterised and understood primarily in terms of chemical bonds between their constituent atoms, and atoms are formed from protons, neutrons, and electrons; protons and neutrons are themselves composed from sub-atomic particles, such as quarks. To explain a molecule in terms of sub-atomic particles might be possible, but unhelpful. Language constructs are analogous to molecules, and funcons to atoms.

Introducing a funcon that corresponds directly to a complicated language construct would make the funcon analysis of that language construct trivial, but a direct definition of the funcon behaviour would then become complicated. At the other extreme, taking pure function abstraction and application as the only funcons would make analysis and specification of language constructs as complicated as in (pre-monadic) denotational semantics.

– *Can funcons have alternative behaviours?*

No, never. The behaviour of common language constructs, such as assignment expressions and procedure calls, often varies significantly between different language. For example, the order of evaluation of the two sides of an assignment expression is left to right in some languages, right to left in others, or may even be implementation-dependent; and the result may be the target variable or the assigned value. The funcon for assignment needs to have a behaviour from which all those variations can be obtained by composition with other funcons.

– *Are funcons independent?*

Funcons are often independent, but not always. For instance, the definition of the funcon **while-true** specifies the reduction of **while-true**( $B, X$ ) to a term involving the funcons **if-true-else** and **sequential**:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Funcon } \mathbf{while-true}(B : \Rightarrow \mathbf{booleans}, X : \Rightarrow \mathbf{null-type}) : \Rightarrow \mathbf{null-type} \\ \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{if-true-else}(B, \mathbf{sequential}(X, \mathbf{while-true}(B, X)), \mathbf{null-value}) \end{aligned}$$

Duplication of  $B$  before starting to evaluate it is essential, in case it needs to be re-evaluated after the execution of  $X$ . We could introduce an auxiliary term constructor for that, but it is simpler to make use of **if-true-else** and **sequential**.

– *Do features of funcons interact?*

No. Feature interactions in software development tend to arise when requirements are incomplete. An often cited example involves a flood prevention system that turns off the water supply, and a sprinkler system that depends on that water; the requirements regarding flood prevention should include checking the safety of turning the water off. . .

The complete requirement for each funcon is to provide the behaviour specified in its definition. The behaviour of its arguments is required to be consistent with its signature, but there are no implicit requirements on the behaviour of combined funcons.

– *Can funcons be used as a programming language?*

Composing funcons is similar to the original idea of Unix: plugging simple commands together to produce complex behaviour.<sup>6</sup> Not-so-fundamental constructs could be defined as abbreviations for frequently-needed funcon compositions; a coating of ‘syntactic sugar’ would be needed to avoid an unwelcome plethora of parentheses in larger funcon compositions. The main drawback would be the comparatively low implementation efficiency.

– *Can funcons be higher-order?*

Funcons can represent higher-order functions as values, but funcons are not themselves higher-order: they require funcon terms as arguments. However, it is easy to define funcons for common idioms of higher-order programming (maps, filters, folds, etc.).

– *Do funcons have algebraic properties?*

Yes: many binary funcons are associative, with left and right units; some are also commutative. These properties hold for a notion of bisimulation for value-computation transition systems [5], which provide the foundations for funcon definitions. This bisimulation is preserved when new funcons are added. Funcon terms are written as applicative expressions, and associativity allows binary funcons to be extended to longer sequences of arguments.

– *Can I use my favourite proof assistant to prove properties of funcons?*

Some years ago, the modular variant [16] of structural operational semantics used to define funcons was implemented in the Coq proof assistant, and modular proofs of some properties were carried out [11]. In a related line of work [30], a different method for modular proofs in Coq has been developed. Modular proofs depend only on the definitions of the funcons involved, and remain sound when funcon definitions are combined, so in principle, they could be archived together with the collection of funcons.

<sup>6</sup> Nowadays, a Unix command often has a multitude of obscure options, documented in a manual ‘page’ that fills many screens.

### 3 Collections of Funcons

The Funcons-beta collection includes several hundred funcons. Management of such a collection is non-trivial.

– *How can we classify funcons?*

Most high-level programming languages distinguish syntactically between commands (a.k.a. statements), declarations, and expressions. When executed, commands generally have effects; declarations bind names to values; and expressions compute values. However, such syntactic distinctions are not universal: for instance, expressions sometimes subsume commands, and sequences of commands may include declarations. Grammars for programming language syntax (abstract as well as concrete) typically introduce many further syntactic distinctions. A universal set of syntactic sorts that encompasses all programming languages is not available.

For funcons, we have a single syntactic sort of terms. Funcon terms are similar to expressions in functional programming languages: they compute values of any type. A funcon term corresponding to a command computes a fixed null value, and a term corresponding to a declaration computes a value environment, mapping names to values.

We classify individual funcons according to their contribution to the behaviour of enclosing funcon terms. The behaviour of some funcons involves auxiliary entities, representing various kinds of effects. For instance, funcons for name binding use an auxiliary environment entity to represent the current bindings.

– *How do we refer to a particular funcon in a collection?*

A collection of funcons is like an open package: the names of the funcons are visible externally. Neither the classification of funcons nor the paths to their definitions affects references to funcon names.

The name of each funcon should clearly suggest its behaviour, to support casual reading of funcon terms and the potential use of funcons as a controlled vocabulary for informal discussion and comparison of programming languages. We can use plural words (e.g., **lists**) to distinguish type names from other value names. When a funcon corresponds directly to a familiar concept, a single well-chosen word can be adequate, but otherwise several words may be needed. Moreover, different datatypes may have closely related operations, yet the names for the corresponding funcons have to be distinct, due to the absence of overloading: the name of the datatype can be added as a prefix of the name, e.g., **integer-add**.<sup>7</sup>

Suggestive names can be quite long, and abbreviations may be needed in some situations (e.g., classrooms, examinations, presentations). Abbreviations can be defined as explicit aliases for funcons, For instance, **alloc-init** is defined as an alias for **allocate-initialised-variable**.

<sup>7</sup> Currently, Funcons-beta does not support namespaces in collections of funcons.

– *Do funcons evolve?*

After a collection of funcons has been released, the behaviour of all the funcons in it needs to be fixed and permanent, since changes could affect or break their external uses. All uses of a particular funcon name thus refer to the same behaviour.

However, the collection itself can evolve: by extension with new funcons. This must not require changes to the definitions of the previous funcons. New funcons need to be carefully checked and tested before they are added, since their definitions cannot be revoked.

Names of funcons always refer implicitly to the current version of a collection. Evolving collections of funcons have no need for version numbers, since once a name has been defined, adding names for new funcons (or even new aliases for the same funcon) cannot invalidate references to names.

– *Will the Funcons-beta collection of funcons ever be finalised?*

Funcons-beta is a release candidate. After further polishing, review, and experimental use, the collection of funcons and their documentation are to be released for general use. However, it will always be possible to add new funcons to the collection, to support new concepts, or to provide alternative ways of expressing existing concepts.

## 4 Facets of Funcons

When funcon terms are executed, their behaviour may have many facets: apart from computing results, funcon behaviour can involve name bindings, imperative variables, abrupt termination, interaction, etc. Facets that are not needed for a particular term can be ignored.

In this section, we introduce the main facets of the Funcons-beta collection. Appendix A provides an informal summary of the funcons; their definitions are available online [23, Funcons-beta].

– *How are funcon terms executed?*

Funcon terms compute values whenever their computations terminate normally. A funcon takes a sequence of argument terms, and may compute a sequence of values. Its signature specifies how many arguments it takes, the type of values to be computed by each argument, and the types of the values that the funcon computes. Individual arguments may be required to be pre-computed values; the funcon definition specifies how its behaviour combines the computations of any remaining arguments.

– *Does each funcon take a fixed number of arguments?*

Not necessarily: a funcon signature can specify that an argument at some position is optional, or that it can be a sequence. Sequence arguments are often used to extend associative binary funcons to longer argument sequences. They are also used for funcons that correspond directly to conventional notation for (finite) lists and sets, e.g., `list( $V_1, \dots, V_n$ )` for  $[V_1, \dots, V_n]$ .

– *How do funcons represent data?*

Data that programs process when executed is represented by funcon terms classified as values. Some funcons are value constructors: they are inert, and have no computational behaviour themselves. Values are classified as primitive values, composite values, or abstractions.

Conceptually, primitive values are atomic, and not constructed from other values. Booleans, numbers, characters, and a null value are all classified as primitive. For large (or infinite) types of primitive values, however, it is infeasible to declare a separate constructor for each value. So in practice, funcons used to construct primitive values usually take other values as arguments.

Composite values are constructed from finite sequences of argument values. The types of composite values include parametrised algebraic data types, with a generic representation. Various algebraic datatypes are defined, and new ones can be introduced. Composite values include also built-in parametrised types of sets, maps, multi-sets, and graphs.

Abstractions are values formed by a value constructor `abstraction(X)` with an unevaluated argument  $X$ . Values are called ground when they are constructed entirely from primitive and composite values, without abstractions.

Appendix A.1 summarises the funcons for representing data.

– *What kind of behaviour do funcons for data operations have?*

Data operations in programs are generally represented by funcons whose only behaviour is to evaluate their arguments and compute a value. Partial data operations (e.g., integer division, or selecting the head of a list) compute the empty sequence when their arguments are not in their domain of definition.

Value types are themselves values, so funcons can take types as arguments and give them as results. Apart from supporting dependent types, this generality is needed to represent ordinary type constructors as funcons.

– *How do funcons express flow of control?*

Funcons intended purely for specifying normal control flow generally determine the order of execution of their arguments. They include sequential or interleaved command execution and expression evaluation, deterministic and non-deterministic choice between computations, and command iteration. These funcons do not contribute otherwise to behaviour.

Funcons that represent data operations always evaluate all their arguments, allowing interleaving.

Appendix A.2 summarises the funcons for representing control flow.

– *How do funcons express flow of data?*

A computation may involve multiple uses of the same data, e.g., so as to assign it to a variable as well as provide it as a result. It may also involve execution of the same computation with different data. The funcons for specifying such data flow involve a `given-value(V)` entity that can be set to a computed value  $V$ , and subsequently referenced as `given`.

Appendix A.3 summarises the funcons for representing data flow.



– *How do funcons specify scopes of bindings?*

An occurrence of a name in a program either binds the name, or refers to whatever is currently bound to the name. Binding occurrences are usually found in declarations, parameter specifications, and patterns; references to names are ubiquitous. Sequences of declarations have the effect of successively extending (or perhaps overriding) the current bindings with the bindings due to the individual declarations.

Funcons use conventional environments  $\rho$  (mapping names to values) to represent both the current bindings and the bindings computed by declarations. The `environment`( $\rho$ ) entity represents the current bindings, and the binding for an individual name  $I$  can be inspected using the funcon `bound-value`( $I$ ); the environment representing the computed bindings is an ordinary composite value.

Some languages include various constructs for composing declarations, and these are represented directly by funcons that compute environments. However, the funcons corresponding to recursive declarations represent circularity by creating cut-points called links, which involves a separate entity.

Appendix A.4 summarises the funcons for representing name binding.

– *Do funcons have static scopes for bindings?*

The difference between static and dynamic scopes concerns procedural abstraction. A value that represents an abstraction is constructed from an unevaluated argument  $X$  by the funcon `abstraction`( $X$ ). The abstraction value can be subsequently enacted, which evaluates the argument  $X$  – potentially in a different context from that where the abstraction value was constructed.

Constructed abstraction values thus naturally have dynamic scopes for bindings. To obtain static scopes, the funcon `closure`( $X$ ) computes a closure value: an abstraction whose argument evaluation starts by ignoring the current bindings and restoring the abstraction-time bindings.

– *How do funcons distinguish between constant and mutable variables?*

In programming languages, imperative variables usually have names. It may be tempting to regard variable names as bound directly to values: bindings become mutable, and assignment to a variable name updates its binding. Constants then correspond to single-assignment variables. However, such a simplistic conceptual analysis does not easily extend to concepts such as aliasing and call by reference.

A more satisfactory conceptual basis for imperative variables is to regard them as independent storage locations.<sup>8</sup> The declaration of a named variable involves the allocation of storage (optionally with an initial value) together with binding the name of the variable to the storage location. Assignment to a named variable then affects what value is stored at the location, but leaves the bindings unchanged. Aliasing can now be understood simply as the simultaneous binding of different names to the same location.

<sup>8</sup> Funcons have not yet been developed for ‘relaxed’ memory models or data marshalling.

The funcons for imperative variables involve a mutable `store( $\sigma$ )` entity, mapping locations to their current values. The store supports allocation (and recycling) of locations for values of any type, and their initialisation, assignment, and inspection. It is completely independent of the `environment( $\rho$ )` entity used for name bindings.

In mathematical logic, a ‘variable’ corresponds to a name, and ‘assignment’ to binding. Imperative variables in programming languages are often called ‘L-values’, with ‘R-values’ being those that can be assigned to variables.<sup>9</sup> With funcons, all values can be assigned to variables, including variables themselves.

- *Can funcons represent structured variables with mixtures of constant and mutable fields?*

A simple variable consists of a location together with the type of values that it can store; assignment checks that the value to be assigned to the variable is in its type.<sup>10</sup> Simple variables may store primitive values (e.g., numbers) or composite values (e.g., tuples), but assignment to a simple variable is always monolithic: the current value is replaced entirely by the new value.

Structured variables are composite values where some components are simple variables. These include hybrids having both mutable and immutable components. Assignment to a selected component variable corresponds to an in-place update; assignment of a composite value to an entire structured variable updates all the component simple variables with the matching values, and checks that the immutable components are the same.

Appendix A.5 summarises the funcons for representing imperative variables.

- *How about abrupt termination?*

Various language constructs may cause abrupt termination when executed: throwing/raising an exception, returning the value of a function, breaking out of a loop, etc. Enclosing constructs can detect particular kinds of abrupt termination, and handle them appropriately. For example, a language construct may inspect an exception value, and conditionally handle it; a function application handles an abruptly returned value by giving it as the result; and a loop handles a break by terminating normally.

Funcons express abrupt termination and handlers uniformly. Abrupt termination leads to a stuck term, emitting an `abrupted( $V$ )` signal that carries a value  $V$ . The closest enclosing funcon that notices the emission of such a signal can inspect its value, and determine whether to handle it or not.

Appendix A.6 summarises the funcons for representing data flow.

- *Is it possible to express delimited control operators as funcons?*

Somewhat surprisingly, yes: see [27]. Funcons for expressing delimited control operators are defined at [23, Funcons-beta/Computations/Abnormal/Controlling].

<sup>9</sup> ‘L’ and ‘R’ refer to the left and right sides of typical assignment commands [29].

<sup>10</sup> Funcons for using un-typed locations as variables would be slightly simpler.

– *Can non-terminating funcons have observable behaviour?*

In many languages, programs correspond to commands, rather than declarations or expressions. Their behaviour may depend on, and affect, data stored in files. Conceptually, files can be regarded as (complicated) structured variables: input from a file inspects the value at its current position, and advances the position; output to a file appends a value to it. Changes to a file system during program execution correspond to updating values stored in locations; they can be observed, but they may also be overwritten. Programming languages typically relegate effects on files to library functions, and corresponding funcons would not be directly relevant to analysis of language constructs.

Interactive input and output, in contrast, cannot be regarded as effects on mutable storage. Acceptance of input data from a stream during program execution is irrevocable, as is output of data to a stream. Interaction may also involve inter-dependence between input and output. And a program that never terminates can have infinitely long streams of input and output.

Thus funcons for expressing communication involve kinds of entities that differ fundamentally from those we previously introduced. The `standard-in(V*)` entity represents the (finite) sequence of values input at each step of a computation, where the empty sequence `()` represents that no values are input. The value `null-value` indicates the end of the input. The `standard-out(V*)` entity represents the (finite) sequence of values output at a particular step, where the empty sequence `()` represents the lack of output. Computations concatenate the input sequences of each step, and similarly for output, potentially resulting in infinite sequences for non-terminating computations. To support multiple streams, further entities and funcons would need to be added.

Appendix A.7 summarises the funcons for representing interaction.

– *Do funcons currently support specification of any other language features?*

Tentative funcons for multithreading have been developed. They have not yet been rigorously unit-tested, nor used much in language definitions. These funcons are not included in Funcons-beta, but in an unstable collection that extends Funcons-beta [23, Unstable-Funcons-beta].

The multithreading funcons involve multiple mutable entities, representing the collection of threads, the set of active threads, the thread being executed, the values computed by terminated threads, and (abstract) scheduling information. Funcons that combine effects on multiple entities are undesirable, and their definitions are quite verbose. It is currently unclear whether simpler funcons for multithreading can be developed.

Multithreading also involves synchronisation. The funcons for synchronising involve only the store entity. To inhibit preemption during synchronisation, multiple assignments need to be executed atomically, in a single transition.

Funcons for distributed processes have not yet been developed. They are expected to be based on asynchronous execution and message passing.

Funcons for specifying meta-programming constructs have been defined [1]; they also enable a straightforward specification of call-by-need parameter-passing.

## 5 Translation of Language Constructs to Funcons

In this section, we illustrate how a simple programming language construct can be analysed by translation to funcons. Specifying such a translation for all constructs of a language defines a semantics for the language, based on the semantics of the funcons used in the translation. The P<sub>L</sub>anCompS project has developed some examples [23, Languages-beta] and made them available for browsing on a website. We conclude this section with an overview of the examples, and indicate how they have been developed and tested.

– *How is call-by-value translated to funcons?*

The following language specification fragments illustrate how call-by-value parameter passing in an imperative programming language can be analysed by translation to funcons. The fragments originate from the complete specification of the SIMPLE language [23, Languages-beta/SIMPLE]; for brevity, we restrict functions here to a single parameter.

The translation specification in Fig. 1 declares `exp` as a phrase sort, with the meta-variable `Exp` (possibly with subscripts and/or primes) ranging over phrases of that sort. The BNF-like production shows two language constructs of sort `exp`: an identifier of sort `id` (lexical tokens, here assumed to be specified elsewhere with meta-variable `Id`) and a function application written ‘`Exp1 (Exp2)`’.

```
Syntax  Exp : exp ::= ... | id | exp ' ( exp ) ' | ...

Semantics  rval[ _ : exp ] : ⇒ values
          Rule  rval[ Id ] = assigned-value(bound-value(id[ Id ]))
          Rule  rval[ Exp1 ' ( Exp2 ) ' ] = apply(rval[ Exp1 ], rval[ Exp2 ])
```

**Fig. 1.** Translation of identifiers and function applications in SIMPLE to funcons

The translation function `rval` maps `exp` phrases to funcon terms that compute elements of type `values`. Translation is compositional: the funcon term for a phrase combines the translations of its sub-phrases. We assume the translation function `id` maps lexical tokens of sort `id` to funcon values of type `identifiers`.

In this illustrative language, the only values that can be bound to identifiers are simple imperative variables. For languages where identifiers can be bound directly to other values, we would use `current-value` instead of `assigned-value`.

For call-by-value parameters in an imperative language, the argument value can be passed to the called function, which then has to allocate a variable to store the value. For call-by-reference, the argument would have to evaluate to a variable; for call-by-name, the evaluation of the argument would be deferred, which can be expressed constructing a thunk abstraction value from it. When

the mode of parameter-passing in function applications depends on the function, argument evaluation needs to be incorporated in the value that represents the function.

The translation specification for function declarations in Fig. 2 assumes a translation function `exec` for phrases `Block` of sort `block`. A block is a command, which normally computes a null value; but, as in many languages, a block can return an expression value by executing a return statement, which terminates the execution of the block abruptly.

*Syntax* `Decl: decl ::= ... | 'function' id '(' id ')' block`

*Semantics* `declare[ _ : decl ] : => environments`

*Rule* `declare[ 'function' Id1 '(' Id2 ')' Block ] =`  
`bind-value(id[ Id1 ],`  
`allocate-initialised-variable(functions(values, values),`  
`function(closure(`  
`scope(`  
`bind-value(id[ Id2 ],`  
`allocate-initialised-variable(values, given)),`  
`handle-return(exec[ Block ]))))))`

**Fig. 2.** Translation of function declarations in SIMPLE to funcons

The use of `closure` ensures static (lexical) bindings for references to names in the function body. To change to dynamic bindings, we would replace `closure` by `abstraction`. The construction of a function value from the closure is needed so that `apply` can be used to give the argument value to the body of the abstraction.

The `scope` funcon adds the bindings computed by its first argument to the current bindings for the execution of its second argument. In this simplified illustration, functions have only one formal parameter, which is bound to a freshly allocated variable containing the given argument value; for multiple parameters, the given value would be a tuple of the same length, matched by a pattern tuple.

The `handle-return` funcon concisely handles abrupt termination of the function body arising from execution of the `return` funcon. It has no effect on normal termination, nor on abrupt termination for other reasons.

In languages where function identifiers can be bound directly to function closures, the first `allocate-initialised-variable` in the translation rule could be eliminated. However, the possibility of recursive function calls would then need to be expressed directly, using the `recursive` funcon.

The call-by-value example illustrates how directly the behaviour of a language construct can be specified by translation to funcons.

– *Which other language constructs have been translated to funcons?*

The P<sub>Plan</sub>CompS project has developed the following funcon-based language specifications and made them available for browsing online [23, Languages-beta].

**IMP:** a very small imperative language. Its funcon-based specification illustrates only the basic features of the framework.

**SIMPLE:** a somewhat larger imperative language than IMP. Its funcon-based specification illustrates many features of the framework, but omits language constructs for process spawning, synchronisation, and locks.

**MiniJava:** a very simple subset of Java. Its specification illustrates the use of funcons for classes and objects.

**SL:** a dynamic language. Its specification illustrates how dynamic bindings can be translated to funcons.

**OCaml Light:** a core sublanguage of OCaml, corresponding closely to Caml Light. Its specification illustrates scaling up to a medium-sized language.

Further examples of funcon-based language specifications have been developed, but not sufficiently tested [23, Unstable-Languages-beta]:

**IMP++:** extends IMP with multithreading and other features.

**SIMPLE-Threads:** adds the previously-omitted concurrency constructs.

**LangDev-2019:** demonstrates extensibility of language specifications.

A funcon-based specification of C# has yet to be completed.

– *How can we check translations of language constructs to funcons?*

Consider our translation of function declarations with call-by-value parameters. Potential mistakes include spelling errors in names (primarily funcons, but also syntax sorts, translation functions, and meta-variables) and misplaced parentheses. The syntax of the language construct in the translation rule might not be consistent with the specified grammar. A less obvious mistake is when the arguments of a funcon could compute values that are not in the types required by the funcon signature. We might also have used a funcon that does not have the intended behaviour (e.g., using **abstraction** instead of **closure**).

Clearly, tool support for checking is essential. A workbench for specifying translations of languages to funcons is being developed [18]. Tools for executing funcon terms [3] allow us to check whether they have the expected behaviour.

The workbench checks references to names, term formation, and the syntax in translation rules. It checks that funcons have the right number of arguments, but not that the arguments compute values of the required types; we rely on testing to check for that.

The workbench also supports parsing complete programs and translating them to funcon terms, using parsers and translators generated from the specified grammar and translation rules. It is based on the Spoofax language workbench [9], and implemented using the declarative domain-specific meta-languages SDF3, NaBL2, and Stratego. See [18] for further details. The tools for executing funcon terms [3] are implemented in Haskell, and can be called directly from the workbench.

## 6 Defining and Implementing Funcons

In this section, we illustrate how to define the behaviour of a funcon, once and for all, using a modular variant [16,20] of structural operational semantics [24].

– *How are funcons defined?*

The funcon signature in Fig. 3 specifies that `scope` takes two arguments. The first argument is required to be pre-evaluated to a value of type `environments`; the second argument should be unevaluated. Values computed by `scope`( $\rho_1, X$ ) are to have the same type ( $T$ ) as the values computed by  $X$ .

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Funcon } \text{scope}(\_ : \text{environments}, \_ : \Rightarrow T) : \Rightarrow T \\
 \text{Rule } \frac{\text{environment}(\text{map-override}(\rho_1, \rho_0)) \vdash X \longrightarrow X'}{\text{environment}(\rho_0) \vdash \text{scope}(\rho_1 : \text{environments}, X) \longrightarrow \text{scope}(\rho_1, X')} \\
 \text{Rule } \text{scope}(\_ : \text{environments}, V : T) \rightsquigarrow V
 \end{array}$$

**Fig. 3.** Definition of the funcon for expressing scopes of local declarations

The rules define how execution of `scope`( $\rho_1, X$ ) can proceed when the current bindings are represented by  $\rho_0$ . The premise of the first rule holds if  $X$  can make a transition to  $X'$  when  $\rho_1$  overrides the current bindings  $\rho_0$ . Whether  $X'$  is a computed value or an intermediate term is irrelevant. When the premise holds, the conclusion is that `scope`( $\rho_1, X$ ) can make a transition to `scope`( $\rho_1, X'$ ).

If  $X$  can terminate abruptly, or continue making transitions forever, then `scope`( $\rho_1, X$ ) can do the same. The last rule allows execution of `scope`( $\rho_1, V$ ) to terminate when  $V$  is a value. Transitions written with ‘ $\rightsquigarrow$ ’ correspond to term rewriting [5], and never depend on entities such as the current environment.

– *How can funcon definitions remain fixed when new funcons are added?*

The use of the entity `environment`( $\rho_0$ ) in the definition of `scope` restricts transitions to states that include it, but states might still include other entities, such as `store`( $\sigma$ ) or `given-value`( $V$ ). If a transition  $X \longrightarrow X'$  updates  $\sigma$  to  $\sigma'$ , so does the transition `scope`( $\rho_1, X$ )  $\longrightarrow$  `scope`( $\rho_1, X'$ ); the transitions in the premise and conclusion are given the same value  $V$ ; and if  $X \longrightarrow X'$  emits a signal on abrupt termination, so does the corresponding transition for `scope`( $\rho_1, X$ ).

Entities used in transitions are classified according to how they flow during program execution:

**Contextual:** A contextual entity remains fixed for successive steps in the computation of a term, but can be different for the computations of sub-terms.

**Mutable:** Changes to a mutable entity are threaded sequentially through the computation of a term and its sub-terms.

**Input:** An input entity is a sequence of values, and the sequences input by successive steps are independent.

**Output:** An output entity is a sequence of values, and the sequences output by successive steps are independent.

**Control:** A control entity is a value that can optionally be signalled by a step. The corresponding step of an enclosing term may inspect the value, and signal the same value, signal a different value, or not signal.

The notation used for entities in transitions determines their classification.

- *Can static semantics for funcons be defined in the same way as dynamic semantics?*

The modular structural operational semantics rules for funcon execution are in the small-step style, where each rule has at most one transition premise. A static semantics for funcons would naturally use big-step rules, with a premise for each sub-term. It is currently unclear whether the same classification of entities can be used for static and dynamic semantics; the static semantics of abstractions generally requires making latent effects explicit, in contrast to dynamic semantics.

- *How have funcons been implemented?*

The initial implementation of funcons was in Prolog. Funcon definitions were translated to Prolog clauses defining transitions,<sup>11</sup> based on the original implementation of MSOS in Prolog.<sup>12</sup> Funcons have also been implemented in Maude.<sup>13</sup> The Prolog implementation of MSOS was subsequently enhanced to support the rewriting relation used in value-computation transition systems [5]. The Funcon Tools package [3] supports parsing funcon definitions and generating a funcon interpreter in Haskell, as described in [2].

- *Could funcons be used for language specification in other frameworks?*

The K-framework [25] has a high degree of modularity. For an experiment with using the K-framework to define funcons, see [21]. The distinction between pre-evaluated and unevaluated arguments in funcon signatures is represented by strictness annotations in K. However, rules in K are unconditional, so funcons such as `scope` cannot be defined straightforwardly. The specification of the structure of states is monolithic, and may need updating when adding new funcons.

Redex [10] is a popular domain-specific metalanguage for operational semantics, embedded in the Racket programming language. It is based on reduction rules and evaluation contexts. The reduction rules are highly modular, and grammars for language constructs and evaluation contexts can be specified incrementally. However, evaluation context grammars associated with control operators appear to be inherently global. It should be possible to define a particular collection of funcons in Redex, but not independently: adding a new funcon would generally require updating the evaluation contexts for existing funcons.

<sup>11</sup> <https://pdmosses.github.io/prolog-msos-tool>

<sup>12</sup> <https://pdmosses.github.io/msos-in-prolog>

<sup>13</sup> <https://github.com/fcbr/mmt>



## 7 Related Work

Many funcons are closely related to notation used in several previously developed language specification frameworks: denotational semantics, monads, abstract semantic algebras, and action semantics.

*Denotational Semantics.* The funcons for flowing, binding, and storing are directly based on Christopher Strachey’s original conceptual analysis of imperative programming languages. Strachey initiated the development of denotational semantics at the IFIP Working Conference on Formal Language Description Languages in 1964 [28]. At the time, he was working on the design and implementation of the high-level CPL programming language, and aiming to specify its semantics formally. In the paper, he focuses on representing imperative features of programming languages as pure mathematical functions, avoiding the introduction of abstract machines. For assignment commands, he distinguishes between L-values and R-values of expressions, with locations in stores  $\sigma$  being a special case of L-values. He defines the operation  $C$  to get the current content of a location, and  $U$  to update the content. For flow of control, he uses composition of functions from stores to stores, and the fixed-point operation  $Y$ . In his widely-circulated 1967 lecture notes [29], he also introduces environments that map names to values, and represents procedures as closures.

Strachey’s original operation  $C$  on stores is renamed *Contents* in [26], and  $U$  is renamed *Assign*. Many subsequent denotational specifications define a large number of such auxiliary operations (e.g., [13] defines about 80). However, the definitions are ad hoc, and they are based on the domains defined for the specified language. Even the way lambda-expressions are written, and the notation used for modifying environments and stores, vary between denotational specifications. The VDM metalanguage for denotational semantics, developed from 1974 [8], introduced fixed notation for operations expressing basic mathematical and computational concepts. The notation for data flow, control flow, storing, and exception handling looks rather like a programming language, but it is interpreted as pure mathematical functions (the interpretation depends on whether exceptions are used).

*Monads.* The types of the mathematical functions used in denotational semantics can be quite complicated. In 1989, Eugenio Moggi suggested that each feature should be seen as a monad, where the elements represent computations of values in arbitrary domains [12]; moreover, the required domains could be defined modularly, by applying a series of monad constructors. Monads have a binary operation for composing a computation with a function that takes its computed value,<sup>14</sup> corresponding to the funcon `give(X, Y)`, and a unary operation for giving a value as the result of a computation (not needed with funcons). Each monad constructor adds further structure to the domain of computations, together with associated operations. For example, the monad constructor for stores in a domain  $S$  makes computations of values in  $T$  take an argument in  $S$  and return

<sup>14</sup> See [17] for discussion of earlier uses of similar operations in denotational semantics.

both a value in  $T$  and a store in  $S$ . The associated operations are  $lookup(l)$ , to return the value at location  $l$  in the argument store and the unchanged store, and  $update(l, v)$ , to return a null value and a store where the value at  $l$  is  $v$ . The funcons `assigned(Var)` and `assign(Var, V)` correspond to (a typed variant of) the operations defined by the store monad constructor. Other funcons correspond closely to the operations associated with monad constructors for a wide range of notions of computation. Monad constructors also need to lift definitions of operations to the resulting domains, which is non-trivial. Notation for monad constructors and operations varies (also between the various functional programming languages and proof assistants that support monads).

*Abstract Semantic Algebras and Action Semantics.* In a series of papers in the 1980s, the present author proposed various sets of combinators, together with algebraic laws that they were supposed to obey, giving so-called *abstract semantic algebras*. The elements of abstract semantic algebras were intended to have a clear operational interpretation; they were referred to as ‘actions’ from 1985.

The action notation used in the action semantics framework [14,15] was developed in collaboration with David Watt [22]. It was defined [14, App. C] using a novel (but non-modular) variant of structural operational semantics, and use of action semantics was supported by tools implemented in the ASF+SDF Meta-Environment [4,7].

Action notation involves actions, data, and yielders. The performance of an action represents information processing behaviour. Yielders used in actions may access, but not change, the current information. The evaluation of a yielder always results in a data entity. Many funcons correspond closely to the combinators of action notation. The crucial difference is that action notation could not be extended with new features, due to the non-modularity of its operational definition. The development of modular structural operational semantics [16] was directly motivated by the aim of making the definition of action notation extensible, and avoiding reduction of the many facets of action behaviour to pure functions in monads [31].

## 8 Conclusion

The PPlanCompS project has defined the behaviour of a substantial collection of funcons, and illustrated translation of functional and imperative language constructs to funcons [23]. It has also developed their theoretical foundations [5]. Specifying language semantics by translation to funcons appears to be significantly less effort than with other frameworks. Funcon definitions and translations have been validated by testing using generated interpreters; web pages and PDFs are generated from the same source files, with hyperlinks from names to definitions to support browsing and navigation.

Much remains to be done. Current and future work includes: completion and release of the CBS IDE and the initial collection of funcons; demonstration of scaling up to translation of a major language such as C#; improvement of the

definitions of funcons for multithreading; defining the static semantics of funcons; defining funcons for expressing static semantics of language constructs; proving algebraic laws for funcons; and investigating whether funcons can be used also for specifying the semantics of declarative and domain-specific programming languages The PPlanCompS project welcomes new participants!

**Acknowledgement.** The author is grateful to colleagues for helpful comments and suggestions for improvement on a previous draft. The initial development of funcons was supported by EPSRC grant (EP/I032495/1) to Swansea University for the PPlanCompS project. The author is currently a visitor at TU Delft.

## References

1. van Binsbergen, L.T.: Funcons for HGMP: the fundamental constructs of homogeneous generative meta-programming (short paper). In: Wyk, E.V., Rompf, T. (eds.) GPCE 2018. pp. 168–174. ACM (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3278122.3278132>
2. van Binsbergen, L.T., Mosses, P.D., Sculthorpe, N.: Executable component-based semantics. *J. Log. Algebr. Meth. Program.* **103**, 184–212 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlamp.2018.12.004>
3. van Binsbergen, L.T., Sculthorpe, N.: funcons-tools: A modular interpreter for executing funcons, <https://hackage.haskell.org/package/funcons-tools>, Hackage package, accessed 2021-06-02
4. van den Brand, M., Iversen, J., Mosses, P.D.: An action environment. *Sci. Comput. Program.* **61**(3), 245–264 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2006.04.005>
5. Churchill, M., Mosses, P.D.: Modular bisimulation theory for computations and values. In: Pfenning, F. (ed.) FOSSACS 2013. LNCS, vol. 7794, pp. 97–112. Springer (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-37075-5>
6. Churchill, M., Mosses, P.D., Sculthorpe, N., Torrini, P.: Reusable components of semantic specifications. *LNCS Trans. Aspect Oriented Softw. Dev.* **12**, 132–179 (2015). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46734-3\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46734-3_4)
7. van Deursen, A., Mosses, P.D.: ASD: the action semantic description tools. In: Wirsing, M., Nivat, M. (eds.) AMAST '96. LNCS, vol. 1101, pp. 579–582. Springer (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0014346>
8. Jones, C.B.: The transition from VDL to VDM. *J. Univers. Comput. Sci.* **7**(8), 631–640 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.3217/jucs-007-08-0631>
9. Kats, L.C.L., Visser, E.: The Spoofox language workbench: Rules for declarative specification of languages and IDEs. In: Cook, W.R., Clarke, S., Rinard, M.C. (eds.) OOPSLA 2010. p. 444–463. ACM (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1869459.1869497>
10. Klein, C., Clements, J., Dimoulas, C., Eastlund, C., Felleisen, M., Flatt, M., McCarthy, J.A., Raskind, J., Tobin-Hochstadt, S., Findler, R.B.: Run your research: on the effectiveness of lightweight mechanization. In: Field, J., Hicks, M. (eds.) POPL 2012. pp. 285–296. ACM (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2103656.2103691>
11. Madlener, K., Smetsers, S., van Eekelen, M.C.J.D.: Formal component-based semantics. In: Reniers, M.A., Sobocinski, P. (eds.) SOS 2011. EPTCS, vol. 62, pp. 17–29 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.62.2>
12. Moggi, E.: An abstract view of programming languages. Tech. Rep. ECS-LFCS-90-113, Edinburgh Univ. (1989)

13. Mosses, P.D.: The mathematical semantics of Algol 60. Tech. Mono. PRG-12, Oxford Univ. Comp. Lab. (1974)
14. Mosses, P.D.: Action semantics, Cambridge Tracts in TCS, vol. 26. Cambridge Univ. Press (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511569869>
15. Mosses, P.D.: Theory and practice of action semantics. In: Penczek, W., Szalas, A. (eds.) MFCS'96. LNCS, vol. 1113, pp. 37–61. Springer (1996). [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-61550-4\\_139](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-61550-4_139)
16. Mosses, P.D.: Modular structural operational semantics. *J. Log. Algebr. Program.* **60-61**, 195–228 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlap.2004.03.008>
17. Mosses, P.D.: VDM semantics of programming languages: combinators and monads. *Formal Aspects Comput.* **23**(2), 221–238 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00165-009-0145-4>
18. Mosses, P.D.: A component-based formal language workbench. In: Monahan, R., Prevosto, V., Proença, J. (eds.) F-IDE@FM. EPTCS, vol. 310, pp. 29–34 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.310.4>
19. Mosses, P.D.: Software meta-language engineering and CBS. *J. Comput. Lang.* **50**, 39–48 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvlc.2018.11.003>
20. Mosses, P.D., New, M.J.: Implicit propagation in structural operational semantics. *ENTCS* **229**(4), 49–66 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2009.07.073>
21. Mosses, P.D., Vesely, F.: FunKons: Component-based semantics in K. In: Escobar, S. (ed.) WRLA 2014. LNCS, vol. 8663, pp. 213–229. Springer (2014). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12904-4\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12904-4_12)
22. Mosses, P.D., Watt, D.A.: The use of action semantics. In: Wirsing, M. (ed.) *Formal Description of Programming Concepts III*. pp. 135–166. North-Holland (1987)
23. PPlanCompS Project: CBS: A framework for component-based specification of programming languages, <https://plancomps.github.io/CBS-beta>, accessed 2021-06-02
24. Plotkin, G.D.: A structural approach to operational semantics. *J. Log. Algebr. Program.* **60-61**, 17–139 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlap.2004.05.001>
25. Rosu, G.: K: A semantic framework for programming languages and formal analysis tools. In: Pretschner, A., Peled, D., Hutzelmann, T. (eds.) *Dependable Software Systems Engineering*, pp. 186–206. IOS Press (2017). <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-810-5-186>
26. Scott, D.S., Strachey, C.: Toward a mathematical semantics for computer languages. In: Fox, J. (ed.) *Proc. Symp. on Computers and Automata*. Microwave Research Inst. Symposia, vol. 21, pp. 19–46. Polytechnic Inst. of Brooklyn (1971), also Tech. Mono. PRG-6, Oxford Univ. Comput. Lab
27. Sculthorpe, N., Torrini, P., Mosses, P.D.: A modular structural operational semantics for delimited continuations. In: Danvy, O., de'Liguoro, U. (eds.) *WoC 2016*. EPTCS, vol. 212, pp. 63–80 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.212.5>
28. Strachey, C.: Towards a formal semantics. In: *Formal Language Description Languages for Computer Programming*. p. 198–216. North-Holland (1966)
29. Strachey, C.S.: Fundamental concepts in programming languages. *High. Order Symb. Comput.* **13**(1/2), 11–49 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010000313106>, lecture notes, Int. Summer School in Comput. Prog., Copenhagen, 1967
30. Torrini, P., Schrijvers, T.: Reasoning about modular datatypes with Mendler induction. In: Matthes, R., Mio, M. (eds.) *FICS 2015*. EPTCS, vol. 191, pp. 143–157 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.191.13>
31. Wansbrough, K., Hamer, J.: A modular monadic action semantics. In: Ramming, C. (ed.) *DSL'97*. USENIX (1997), <http://www.usenix.org/publications/library/proceedings/dsl97/wansbrough.html>

## A Funcons-beta Summary

This appendix is intended for inclusion only in the extended version of the paper.

### A.1 Data

#### Datatypes.

*Primitive values.* Conceptually, primitive values are atomic, and not formed from other values. For large (or infinite) types of primitive values, however, it is infeasible to declare a separate constant for each value. So in practice, funcons used to construct primitive values usually take other values as arguments.

- **booleans** are the values **true**, **false**, and funcons corresponding to the usual Boolean operations are defined.
- **integers** is the built-in type of unbounded integers, with funcons for the usual mathematical operations. Funcons corresponding to associative binary operations are extended to arbitrary numbers of arguments. Subtypes include **naturals** and **bounded**( $M, N$ ); compositions with casts to such subtypes correspond to partial operations representing computer arithmetic.
- **floats** is the built-in type of IEEE floating point numbers.
- **characters** is the built-in type of all Unicode characters. Its subtypes include **ascii-characters** and **iso-latin-1-characters**. The UTF-8, UTF-16, and UTF-32 encodings of characters as byte sequences are provided.
- **null-type** has the single value **null-value**, alias **null**.

*Composite values.* Conceptually, composite values are constructed from finite sequences of argument values. The types of composite values include parametrised algebraic data types, with a generic representation. Various algebraic datatypes are defined, and new ones can be introduced. Composite values include also built-in parametrised types of sets, maps, multi-sets, and graphs.

Algebraic datatypes:

- **datatype-values** are generic representations for all algebraic datatype values.
- **tuples**( $T_1, \dots, T_n$ ) are grouped sequences of values with the specified types.
- **lists**( $T$ ) are grouped sequences of values with the same type, with the usual operations; **strings** are lists of characters.
- **vectors**( $T$ ) are grouped sequences of values with the same type.
- **trees**( $T$ ) are finitely branching, with values of type  $T$  at nodes and leaves.
- **references**( $T$ ) are values that represent values of type  $T$ . **pointers**( $T$ ) are references or a single null value.
- **records**( $T$ ) are unordered aggregate values, indexed by identifiers.
- **variants**( $T$ ), are pairs of identifiers and values of type  $T$ .
- **classes** are collections of features, allowing multiple superclasses, used to create objects.

- **objects** are classified collections of features.
- **bit-vectors**( $N$ ) has instantiations for **bits** and **bytes**.

Built-in datatypes:

- **sets**( $GT$ ) are finite sets of ground values.
- **maps**( $GT, T^?$ ) are finite maps from values of type  $GT$  to values of type  $T^?$ .
- **multisets**( $GT$ ) are finite multisets of ground values.
- **directed-graphs**( $GT$ ) have ground values as vertices.

See [23, Funcons-beta/Values] for funcons on the above types.

### Abstractions.

*Generic Abstractions.* These values are used in thunks, functions, and patterns.

- **abstractions**( $CT$ ) are procedural abstractions of computation type  $CT$ .
- **abstraction**( $X$ ) constructs values from terms with dynamic bindings.
- **closure**( $X$ ) computes closed abstractions from terms with static bindings.
- **enact**( $A$ ) evaluates the terms of abstractions  $A$ .

*Thunks.* The abstractions of thunks do not reference a given value.

- **thunks**( $T$ ) are constructed from abstractions with bodies of type  $() \Rightarrow T'$ .
- **force**( $V$ ) enacts the abstraction of the thunk  $V$ .

*Functions.* The abstractions of functions reference a given value.

- **functions**( $T, T'$ ) are constructed from abstractions with bodies of type  $T \Rightarrow T'$ .
- **function**(**abstraction**( $X$ )) constructs a function with dynamic bindings.
- **function**(**closure**( $X$ )) computes a function with static bindings.
- **apply**( $F, V$ ) applies the function  $F$  to the argument value  $V$ .
- **supply**( $F, V$ ) determines the argument value of a function application, but returns a thunk that defers executing the body of the function.
- **compose**( $F_2, F_1$ ) returns the function that applies  $F_1$  then  $F_2$ .
- **curry**( $F$ ) takes a function  $F$  that takes a pair of arguments, and returns the corresponding ‘curried’ function.
- **uncurry**( $F$ ) takes a curried function  $F$  and returns a function that takes a pair of arguments.
- **partial-apply**( $F, V$ ) takes a function  $F$  that takes a pair of arguments, and determines the first argument, returning a function of the second argument.

*Patterns.* The abstractions of patterns match a given value.

- **pattern**( $A$ ) constructs values of type **patterns** from abstractions  $A$ .
- **match**( $X, \text{pattern}(A)$ ) enacts the abstraction  $A$ , giving it the value of the argument  $X$ .

A pattern abstraction either computes an environment or fails. Various funcons express common primitive and composite patterns. The arguments of the funcon **match**( $\_$ ,  $\_$ ) can also be structured values: then the match computes the union of the environments computed by matching the corresponding components, provided that the structures themselves match.

## A.2 Flow of Control

- `left-to-right`( $\dots$ ) executes its arguments sequentially, and concatenates the computed value sequences. Composing it with a funcon having pre-computed arguments prevents interleaving; e.g., `integer-add(left-to-right( $X, Y$ ))` always executes  $X$  before  $Y$ . `right-to-left`( $\dots$ ) is analogous.
- `sequential`( $X, \dots$ ) executes the command  $X$ , then any remaining arguments, giving the same value(s) as the last argument.
- `effect`( $\dots$ ) interleaves the executions of its arguments, discarding their computed values, and giving `null-value`.
- `choice`( $Y, \dots$ ) selects one of its arguments, then executes it.
- `if-true-else`( $B, X, Y$ ) evaluates  $B$  to a Boolean value, then executes either  $X$  or  $Y$  (which may correspond to commands or expressions).
- `while-true`( $B, X$ ) evaluates  $B$  to a Boolean value, then either executes  $X$  (which has to correspond to a command) and iterates, or terminates.
- `interleave`( $\dots$ ) executes its arguments in any order, possibly with interleaving, and concatenates the computed value sequences.

## A.3 Flow of Data

- `given` evaluates to the current value of the `given-value` entity.
- `give`( $X, Y$ ) executes  $X$  to compute a value. It then executes  $Y$  with that value as the `given-value`.
- `left-to-right-map`( $F, V^*$ ) computes  $F$  given each value in the sequence  $V^*$ , returning the sequence of resulting values.
- `interleave-map`( $F, V^*$ ) is similar.
- `left-to-right-repeat`( $F, M, N$ ) computes  $F$  given each integer from  $M$  to  $N$  sequentially, returning the sequence of resulting values.
- `interleave-repeat`( $F, M, N$ ) is similar.
- `left-to-right-filter`( $P, V^*$ ) computes  $P$  for each value in  $V^*$ , returning the sequence of argument values for which the computed value is true.
- `interleave-filter`( $P, V^*$ ) is similar.
- `fold-left`( $F, A, V^*$ ) reduces a sequence  $V^*$  to a single value by folding it from the left, using  $A$  as the initial accumulator value, and iteratively updating the accumulator by giving  $F$  the pair of the accumulator value and the first of the remaining arguments.
- `fold-right`( $F, A, V^*$ ) is similar.

For any list  $L$ , the funcon term `list-elements`( $L$ ) evaluates to the sequence  $V^*$  of elements in  $L$ , and `list`( $V^*$ ) reconstructs  $L$ . Composition with these funcons allows the above funcons on sequences to be used with lists; similarly for vectors, sets, multisets, and the datatype of maps.

#### A.4 Name Binding

- **bind-value**( $I, X$ ) computes the singleton environment mapping  $I$  to the value computed by  $X$ .
- **unbind**( $I$ ) computes an environment that hides the binding of  $I$ .
- **bound-value**( $I$ ) computes the value to which  $I$  is currently bound (possibly recursively, via a link), if any, and otherwise fails.
- **scope**( $D, X$ ) first executes  $D$  to compute an environment  $\rho$ . It then extends the current environment entity with  $\rho$  for the execution of  $X$ .
- **closed**( $X$ ) prevents references to non-local bindings while executing  $X$ .
- **accumulate**( $D_1, D_2$ ) first executes  $D_1$ , to compute an environment  $\rho_1$ . It then extends the current environment entity by  $\rho_1$  for the execution of  $D_2$ , to compute an environment  $\rho_2$ . The result is  $\rho_1$  extended by  $\rho_2$ .
- **collateral**( $D_1, \dots$ ) executes its arguments to compute environments. It gives their union as result, failing if their domains are not pairwise disjoint.
- **bind-recursively**( $I, X$ ) makes **bind-value**( $I, X$ ) recursive. It first computes a singleton environment  $\rho$  mapping  $I$  to a fresh link  $L$ . It then extends the current environment entity by  $\rho$  for the execution of  $X$ , to compute a value  $V$ . Finally, it sets  $L$  to refer to  $V$ , and gives  $\rho$  as the computed result.
- **recursive**( $SI, D$ ) makes  $D$  recursive on the identifiers in the set  $SI$ . It first computes an environment  $\rho$  mapping all  $I$  in  $SI$  to fresh links. It then extends the current environment entity by  $\rho$  for the execution of  $D$ , to compute an environment  $\rho'$ . Finally, it sets the link for each  $I$  to refer to the value of  $I$  in  $\rho'$ , and gives  $\rho'$  as the computed result.

References to recursively-bound names generally need to be inside procedural abstractions, to avoid inspection of links before they have been set.

#### A.5 Imperative Variables

- **allocate-variable**( $T$ ) constructs a simple variable for storing values of type  $T$  from a location not in the current store.
- **recycle-variables**( $Var, \dots$ ) removes locations allocated to variables from the current store.
- **initialise-variable**( $Var, V$ ) assigns  $V$  as the initial value of  $Var$ .
- **allocate-initialised-variable**( $T, V$ ) is a composition of **allocate-variable**( $T$ ) and **initialise-variable**( $-, V$ ).
- **assign**( $Var, V$ ) stores  $V$  at the location of  $Var$  when the type contains  $V$ .
- **assigned**( $Var$ ) gives the value last assigned to  $Var$ .
- **current-value**( $V$ ) gives the same result as **assigned**( $V$ ) when  $V$  is a simple variable, otherwise  $V$ .
- **un-assign**( $Var$ ) makes  $Var$  uninitialised.
- **structural-assign**( $V_1, V_2$ ) assigns to all the simple variables in  $V_1$  the corresponding values in  $V_2$ , provided that the structure and all non-variable values in  $V_1$  match the structure and corresponding values of  $V_2$ .
- **structural-assigned**( $V$ ) computes  $V$  with all simple variables replaced by their assigned values. When  $V$  is a simple variable or a value with no component variables, **structural-assigned**( $V$ ) gives the same result as **current-value**( $V$ ).



## A.6 Abrupt Termination

- **abrupt**( $V$ ) terminates abruptly for reason  $V$ .
- **handle-abrupt**( $X, Y$ ) first executes  $X$ . If  $X$  terminates normally,  $Y$  is ignored. If  $X$  terminates abruptly for any reason,  $Y$  is executed, with the reason as the given value.
- **finally**( $X, Y$ ) first executes  $X$ . On normal or abrupt termination of  $X$ , it executes  $Y$ . If  $Y$  terminates normally, its computed value is ignored, and the funcon terminates in the same way as  $X$ ; otherwise it terminates in the same way as  $Y$ .
- **fail** abruptly terminates for reason **failed**.
- **else**( $X_1, X_2, \dots$ ) executes the arguments in turn until either some  $X_i$  does *not* fail, or all arguments  $X_i$  have been executed. The last argument executed determines the result.
- **else-choice**( $X_1, X_2, \dots$ ) is similar, but executes the arguments sequentially in any order.
- **check-true**( $X$ ) terminates normally if the value computed by  $X$  is **true**, and fails if it is **false**.
- **checked**( $X$ ) fails when  $X$  computes the empty sequence of values ( ), representing that a value has not been computed. It otherwise computes the same as  $X$ .
- **throw**( $V$ ) abruptly terminates for reason **thrown**( $V$ ).
- **handle-thrown**( $X, Y$ ) handles abrupt termination of  $X$  for reason **thrown**( $V$ ) with  $Y$ .
- **handle-recursively**( $X, Y$ ) is similar to **handle-thrown**( $X, Y$ ), except that another copy of the handler attempts to handle any values thrown by  $Y$ .
- **return**( $V$ ) abruptly terminates for reason **returned**( $V$ ).
- **handle-return**( $X$ ) evaluates  $X$ . If  $X$  either terminates abruptly for reason **returned**( $V$ ), or terminates normally with value  $V$ , it terminates normally giving  $V$ .
- **break** abruptly terminates for reason **broken**.
- **handle-break**( $X$ ) terminates normally when  $X$  terminates abruptly for reason **broken**.
- **continue** abruptly terminates for reason **continued**.
- **handle-continue**( $X$ ) terminates normally when  $X$  terminates abruptly for reason **continued**.

Further funcons are provided for expressing delimited continuations [23, Funcons-beta/Computations/Abnormal/Controlling], see also [27].

## A.7 Communication

- **read** inputs a single non-null value from the **standard-in** entity, and gives it as the result.
- **print**( $V^*$ ) outputs the sequence of values  $V^*$  to the **standard-out** entity.