

# Continuations

CS242

Lecture 8

# Today's Variant of Lambda Calculus ...

$e \rightarrow x \mid \lambda x.e \mid e e \mid i \mid e + e$

# Start Simple

- How do we evaluate  $e + e'$  ?
- First evaluate  $e$  to a value  $x$
- Second evaluate  $e'$  to a value  $y$
- Third compute  $x + y$
- Note that this description fixes an order of evaluation
  - Could evaluate  $e'$  and then  $e$  instead

# Explicit Order of Evaluation

We can rewrite the expression to make the order of evaluation explicit:

$(\lambda x. x + e') e$

Going one step further:

$(\lambda x. ((\lambda y. x + y) e')) e$

# Explicit Order of Evaluation

We can rewrite  $e + e'$  to make the order of evaluation explicit:

$(\lambda x. x + e') e$

Going one step further:

$(\lambda x. ((\lambda y. x + y) e')) e$

And one more step:

$(\lambda x. ((\lambda y. (\lambda z. z) (x + y)) e')) e$

# A More Readable Version

Recall

$(\lambda x.e) e' = \text{let } x = e' \text{ in } e$

Then  $(\lambda x.((\lambda y. (\lambda z.z) (x + y)) e')) e$

Can be rewritten as

```
let x = e in
  let y = e' in
    let z = x + y in
      z
```

# Comments

```
let x = e in  
  let y = e' in  
    let z = x + y in  
      z
```

Can be read as a sequential program

```
x = e  
y = e'  
z = x + y
```

# Comments

let x = e in

let y = e' in

let z = x + y in

z

Note:

- The order of evaluation is explicit
- Every intermediate result has a name



# Back to the First Step

Recall the first step of the transformation:

$(\lambda x. x + e') e$

Which is equivalent to

$\text{let } x = e \text{ in } x + e'$

# Continuations

let  $x = e_1$  in  $e_2$

We can view this as splitting the program into two sequentially ordered parts:

- The computation of  $x = e_1$
- The *continuation*  $e_2$  which represents the computation of the rest of the program

# What is a Continuation?

Recall  $\text{let } x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \Leftrightarrow (\lambda x. e_2) e_1$

A continuation is a function that takes a value as an argument and evaluates the “rest of the program”.

# Continuation Passing Style

- Rewrite the program using continuations
- Each continuation
  - Performs just one primitive step of the computation
  - And then passes the result to another continuation

# Back to the Example

Recall we translated  $e + e'$  to

$(\lambda x. ((\lambda y. (\lambda z. z) (x + y)) e')) e$

$k_0 = \lambda w. k_1 e$

$k_1 = \lambda x. k_2 e'$

$k_2 = \lambda y. k_3 (x + y)$

$k_3 = \lambda z. z$

# Back to the Example

Recall we translated  $e + e'$  to

$(\lambda x. ((\lambda y. (\lambda z. z) (x + y)) e')) e$

$k_0 = \lambda w. k_1 e$

$k_1 = \lambda x. k_2 e'$

$k_2 = \lambda y. k_3 (x + y)$

$k_3 = \lambda z. z$

$k_0$ : let  $x = e$  in

$k_1$ : let  $y = e'$  in

$k_2$ : let  $z = x + y$  in

$k_3$ :  $z$

# Continuations

- Continuations are like statement labels in C
  - Syntactically, names a point in the program
  - Semantically, names the computation that executes by jumping to that point
- By systematically using continuations, we
  - Make the order of evaluation explicit
  - Give a name to every intermediate value
  - *Name every step (continuation) of the computation*

# Continuation Passing Style Transformation

Define  $C(e,k)$  to be the translation of  $e$  with continuation  $k$  into continuation passing style

So semantically,  $C(e,k) = k\ e$

i.e., evaluate  $e$  and pass the value to  $k$  to run the rest of the program.  
But of course we want to convert  $e$  into CPS style, too ...



# CPS Transformation: Constants and Variables

Easy cases first!

$$C(i,k) = k \ i$$

$$C(x,k) = k \ x$$

For an integer or variable there is no further translation to do, just pass the value directly to the continuation.

# CPS Transformation: Addition

$$C(e + e', k) = C(e, \lambda v. C(e', \lambda v'. k (v + v'))))$$

Note: The variables  $v$  and  $v'$  must be fresh.

# CPS Transformation: Abstraction

$$C(\lambda x.e, k) = ?$$

Here  $k$  is the continuation of the function definition.

We also want to translate the body  $e$  of the function. What is the continuation of the function body?

Problem: The function is called at a different time than it is defined, so the continuation for the body is different from the continuation for the function itself.

# CPS Transformation: Abstraction

$$C(\lambda x.e, k) = k (\lambda k'.\lambda x. C(e, k'))$$

Idea: Simply define the translation of the function to first take a continuation  $k'$  and then take the function argument.

The continuation when the function is applied is  $k'$ , which we use in the translation of the function body.

Notice how the two continuations  $k$  and  $k'$  capture the two relevant points in a function's life: When it is defined and when it is applied.

# CPS Transformation: Application

$$C(e\ e',k) = C(e, \lambda f.C(e', \lambda v.f\ k\ v))$$

The translation is fully determined by two things:

We evaluate  $e$  and then  $e'$ . Note the structural similarity to addition, the other construct with two subexpressions.

The expression  $e$  evaluates to a CPS-transformed function  $f$ , requiring a continuation  $k$  and a value  $v$  as arguments.

# Continuation Passing Style Transformation

$$C(x, k) = k \ x$$

$$C(\lambda x. e, k) = k \ (\lambda k'. \lambda x. C(e, k'))$$

$$C(e \ e', k) = C(e, \lambda f. C(e', \lambda v. f \ k \ v))$$

$$C(i, k) = k \ i$$

$$C(e + e', k) = C(e, \lambda v. C(e', \lambda v'. k \ (v + v')))$$

# Reminder

When reading lambda expressions, the scope of an abstraction  $\lambda x.e$  extends as far to the right as possible

- All the way to the end of the expression
- Or until blocked by a right parenthesis

$\lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda y. f y x = \lambda f.\lambda x.\lambda y. (f y x)$

is very different from

$\lambda f.\lambda x.(\lambda y. f y) x$

# An Example

$C((\lambda x. x + 1) 2, k_0) =$

$C(\lambda x. x + 1, \lambda f. C(2, \lambda v_0. f k_0 v_0)) =$

$C(\lambda x. x + 1, \lambda f. ((\lambda v_0. f k_0 v_0) 2)) =$

$(\lambda f. ((\lambda v_0. f k_0 v_0) 2)) \lambda k_1. \lambda x. C(x + 1, k_1) =$

$(\lambda f. ((\lambda v_0. f k_0 v_0) 2)) \lambda k_1. \lambda x. C(x, \lambda v_1. C(1, \lambda v_2. k_1 (v_1 + v_2))) =$

$(\lambda f. ((\lambda v_0. f k_0 v_0) 2)) \lambda k_1. \lambda x. C(x, \lambda v_1. (\lambda v_2. k_1 (v_1 + v_2)) 1) =$

$(\lambda f. ((\lambda v_0. f k_0 v_0) 2)) \lambda k_1. \lambda x. (\lambda v_1. (\lambda v_2. k_1 (v_1 + v_2)) 1) x$



# Evaluation

$(\lambda f.((\lambda v_0.f\ k_0\ v_0)\ 2))\ \lambda k_1.\lambda x.(\lambda v_1.(\lambda v_2.\ k_1\ (v_1+v_2))\ 1)\ x \rightarrow$   
 $(\lambda v_0.\ (\lambda k_1.\lambda x.(\lambda v_1.(\lambda v_2.\ k_1\ (v_1+v_2))\ 1)\ x)\ k_0\ v_0)\ 2 \rightarrow$   
 $(\lambda k_1.\lambda x.(\lambda v_1.(\lambda v_2.\ k_1\ (v_1+v_2))\ 1)\ x)\ k_0\ 2 \rightarrow$   
 $(\lambda x.(\lambda v_1.(\lambda v_2.\ k_0\ (v_1+v_2))\ 1)\ x)\ 2 \rightarrow$   
 $(\lambda v_1.(\lambda v_2.\ k_0\ (v_1+v_2))\ 1)\ 2$   
 $(\lambda v_2.\ k_0\ (2+v_2))\ 1$   
 $k_0\ (2+1)$   
 $k_0\ 3$

# Complete Programs

For a full program  $P$ , the initial continuation is the identify function  $I$ .

So the CPS transformation of  $P$  is

$C(P, I)$

# Discussion

- The CPS transformation is important in language implementations
  - Very convenient to have a program representation where every intermediate result is named.
  
- But we can go a step further and make it useful to the programmer
  - By making continuations available as program values

# Call/CC

$e \rightarrow x \mid \lambda x.e \mid e e \mid i \mid e + e \mid \text{call/cc } \lambda k.e \mid \text{resume } k e$

Call/cc calls its function argument with the current continuation.

Resume passes the value of its expression argument to its continuation argument.

# Call/CC

$$C(x, k) = k \ x$$

$$C(\lambda x. e, k) = k \ (\lambda k'. \lambda x. C(e, k'))$$

$$C(e \ e', k) = C(e, \lambda f. C(e', \lambda v. f \ k \ v))$$

$$C(i, k) = k \ i$$

$$C(e + e', k) = C(e, \lambda v. C(e', \lambda v'. k \ (v + v')))$$

$$C(\text{call/cc } \lambda x. e, k) = (\lambda x. C(e, k)) \ k$$

$$C(\text{resume } k \ e, k') = C(e, k)$$

# Example

`call/cc  $\lambda k.1 + (\text{resume } k \ 0)$`

What is the result of this program?

# Translation and Evaluation

$C(\text{call/cc } \lambda k.1 + (\text{resume } k \ 0), I) =$   
 $(\lambda k.C(1 + (\text{resume } k \ 0), I)) \ I =$   
 $(\lambda k.C(1, \lambda m.C(\text{resume } k \ 0, \lambda n.I (m + n)))) \ I =$   
 $(\lambda k.C(1, \lambda m.C(0, k))) \ I =$   
 $(\lambda k.C(1, \lambda m.k \ 0)) \ I =$   
 $(\lambda k.(\lambda m.k \ 0) \ 1) \ I \rightarrow$   
 $(\lambda m. \ I \ 0) \ 1 \rightarrow$   
 $I \ 0 \rightarrow$   
 $0$

# A Variation

$C(\text{call/cc } \lambda k. (\text{resume } k \ 0) + 1, I) =$   
 $(\lambda k. C((\text{resume } k \ 0) + 1, I)) \ I =$   
 $(\lambda k. C(\text{resume } k \ 0, \lambda m. C(1, \lambda n. I (m + n)))) \ I =$   
 $(\lambda k. C(0, k)) \ I =$   
 $(\lambda k. k \ 0) \ I \rightarrow$   
 $I \ 0 \rightarrow$   
 $0$



# Discussion

This program simulates an “abort” or “exit” statement

- Capture the continuation at the start of the program
- Invoking that continuation at any point will terminate the computation

# Discussion

- In general continuations can be used to resume execution from an arbitrary point in the program
- Can implement many non-local control operations
  - Exceptions
  - Backtracking
  - Setjmp/longjmp
  - Co-routines
  - ...

# Discussion

- A few languages expose call/cc or something similar
  - Scheme, Racket
- But programmers can also code continuation-passing style directly
  - Often used as a software architecture device
  - E.g., event-driven systems
- Pluses and minuses
  - Makes program control into first-class values, which is necessary for programs that need to programmatically manipulate the flow of control
  - Turns programs “inside out”
  - Contagious: Affects the structure of the entire program