# Space

Understanding the space complexity of functional programs

- At least two interesting components:
  - the amount of *live space* at any instant in time
  - the *rate of allocation* 
    - a function call may not change the amount of live space by much but may allocate at a substantial rate
    - because functional programs act by generating new data structures and discarding old ones, they often allocate a lot
      - » OCaml garbage collector is optimized with this in mind
      - » interesting fact: at the assembly level, the number of writes by a functional program is roughly the same as the number of writes by an imperative program

# Space

Understanding the space complexity of functional programs

- At least two interesting components:
  - the amount of *live space* at any instant in time
  - the *rate of allocation* 
    - a function call may not change the amount of live space by much but may allocate at a substantial rate
    - because functional programs act by generating new data structures and discarding old ones, they often allocate a lot
      - » OCaml garbage collector is optimized with this in mind
      - » interesting fact: at the assembly level, the number of writes by a function program is roughly the same as the number of writes by an imperative program

#### - What takes up space?

- conventional first-order data: tuples, lists, strings, datatypes
- function representations (closures)
- the call stack

# **CONVENTIONAL DATA**

# Blackboard!

Numbers

Tuples

Data types

Lists

#### Space Model

Data type representations:

type tree = Leaf | Node of int \* tree \* tree





In C, you allocate when you call "malloc"

In Java, you allocate when you call "new"

What about ML?

```
let rec insert (t:tree) (i:int) =
match t with
Leaf -> Node (i, Leaf, Leaf)
| Node (j, left, right) ->
if i <= j then
Node (j, insert left i, right)
else
Node (j, left, insert right i)</pre>
```





































Whenever you use a constructor, space is allocated:



Total space allocated is proportional to the height of the tree.

~ log n, if tree with n nodes is balanced



The garbage collector reclaims

unreachable data structures on the heap.





John McCarthy invented g.c. 1960



The garbage collector reclaims

unreachable data structures on the heap.



The garbage collector reclaims

unreachable data structures on the heap.



The garbage collector reclaims

unreachable data structures on the heap.

let fiddle (t: tree) =
 insert t 21

Net new space allocated: 1 node

(just like "imperative" version of binary search trees)



But what if you want to keep the old tree?



#### But what if you want to keep the old tree?



```
let check_option (o:int option) : int option =
  match o with
    Some _ -> o
    None -> failwith "found none"
;;
```

```
let check_option (o:int option) : int option =
  match o with
    Some j -> Some j
    None -> failwith "found none"
;;
```

```
let check_option (o:int option) : int option =
  match o with
    Some _ -> o
    None -> failwith "found none"
;;
```

allocates nothing when arg is Some i

```
let check_option (o:int option) : int option =
  match o with
    Some j -> Some j
    None -> failwith "found none"
;;
```

allocates an option when arg is Some i

```
let cadd (c1:int*int) (c2:int*int) : int*int =
    let (x1,y1) = c1 in
    let (x2,y2) = c2 in
    (x1+x2, y1+y2)
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
   let c2 = c1 in
   cadd c1 c2
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
   cadd c1 c1
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
    let (x1,y1) = c1 in
    cadd (x1,y1) (x1,y1)
;;
```

```
let cadd (c1:int*int) (c2:int*int) : int*int =
    let (x1,y1) = c1 in
    let (x2,y2) = c2 in
    (x1+x2, y1+y2)
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
   let c2 = c1 in
   cadd c1 c2
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
   cadd c1 c1
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
    let (x1,y1) = c1 in
    cadd (x1,y1) (x1,y1)
;;
```



```
let cadd (c1:int*int) (c2:int*int) : int*int =
    let (x1,y1) = c1 in
    let (x2,y2) = c2 in
    (x1+x2, y1+y2)
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
   let c2 = c1 in
   cadd c1 c2
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
   cadd c1 c1
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
    let (x1,y1) = c1 in
    cadd (x1,y1) (x1,y1)
;;
```



```
let cadd (c1:int*int) (c2:int*int) : int*int =
    let (x1,y1) = c1 in
    let (x2,y2) = c2 in
    (x1+x2, y1+y2)
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
   let c2 = c1 in
   cadd c1 c2
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
   cadd c1 c1
;;
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
    let (x1,y1) = c1 in
    cadd (x1,y1) (x1,y1)
;;
```



```
let cadd (c1:int*int) (c2:int*int) : int*int =
  let (x1, y1) = c1 in
  let (x_{2}, y_{2}) = c_{2} in
   (x1+x2, y1+y2)
;;
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
  let c2 = c1 in
                                                              no allocation
  cadd c1 c2
;;
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
  cadd c1 c1
                                                              no allocation
;;
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
  let (x1, y1) = c1 in
                                                              allocates 2 pairs
  cadd (x1, y1) (x1, y1)
                                                               (unless the compiler
;;
```

happens to optimize...)

```
let cadd (c1:int*int) (c2:int*int) : int*int =
   let (x1,y1) = c1 in
   let (x2,y2) = c2 in
   (x1+x2, y1+y2)
;;
```



# **FUNCTION CLOSURES**

Consider the following program:

```
let choose (arg:bool * int * int) : int -> int =
    let (b, x, y) = arg in
    if b then
        (fun n -> n + x)
    else
        (fun n -> n + y)
;;
choose (true, 1, 2);;
```

Consider the following program:

```
let choose (arg:bool * int * int) : int -> int =
    let (b, x, y) = arg in
    if b then
      (fun n -> n + x)
    else
      (fun n -> n + y)
;;
choose (true, 1, 2);;
```



Consider the following program:

```
let choose (arg:bool * int * int) : int -> int =
    let (b, x, y) = arg in
    if b then
        (fun n -> n + x)
    else
        (fun n -> n + y)
;;
choose (true, 1, 2);;
```

```
choose (true, 1, 2)
-->
let (b, x, y) = (true, 1, 2) in
if b then (fun n -> n + x)
else (fun n -> n + y)
```

Consider the following program:

```
let choose (arg:bool * int * int) : int -> int =
    let (b, x, y) = arg in
    if b then
      (fun n -> n + x)
    else
      (fun n -> n + y)
;;
choose (true, 1, 2);;
```

```
choose (true, 1, 2)
-->
let (b, x, y) = (true, 1, 2) in
if b then (fun n -> n + x)
else (fun n -> n + y)
-->
if true then (fun n -> n + 1)
else (fun n -> n + 2)
```

Consider the following program:

```
let choose (arg:bool * int * int) : int -> int =
    let (b, x, y) = arg in
    if b then
        (fun n -> n + x)
    else
        (fun n -> n + y)
;;
choose (true, 1, 2);;
```

```
choose (true, 1, 2)
-->
let (b, x, y) = (true, 1, 2) in
if b then (fun n -> n + x)
else (fun n -> n + y)
-->
if true then (fun n -> n + 1)
else (fun n -> n + 2)
-->
(fun n -> n + 1)
```

```
let choose arg =
    let (b, x, y) = arg in
    if b then
      (fun n -> n + x)
    else
      (fun n -> n + y)
;;
choose (true, 1, 2);;
```











# What we aren't going to do

The substitution model of evaluation is *just a model*. It says that we generate new code at each step of a computation. We don't do that in reality. Too expensive!

The substitution model is a faithful model for reasoning about the relationship between inputs and outputs of a function but it doesn't tell us much about the resources that are used along the way.

I'm going to tell you a little bit about how ML programs are compiled so you can understand how much space your programs will use. Understanding the space consumption of your programs is an important component in making these programs more efficient.

# **Compiling functions**

General tactic: Reduce the problem of compiling ML-like functions to the problem of compiling C-like functions.

Some functions are already C-like:



### But what about nested, higher-order functions?



# But what about nested, higher-order functions?



Darn! *Doesn't work naively*. Nested functions contain *free variables*. Simple unnesting leaves them undefined.

# But what about nested, higher-order functions?

We can't execute a function like the following:

let f2 n = n + y;;

But we can execute a *closure* which is a pair of some code and an environment:



closure

```
let choose arg =
    let (b, x, y) = arg in
    if b then
        (fun n -> n + x + y)
    else
        (fun n -> n + y)
;;
```

add environment

Closure conversion (also called lambda lifting) converts open,

nested functions in to closed, top-level functions.







![](_page_49_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Figure_2.jpeg)

Even though the original, non-closure-converted code was welltyped, the closure-converted code isn't—because the environments are different

![](_page_51_Figure_2.jpeg)

Even though the original, non-closure-converted code was welltyped, the closure-converted code isn't—because the environments are different

```
let choose (arg,env) =
    let (b, x, y) = arg in
    if b then
      (f1, F1 {xe=x; ye=y})
    else
      (f2, F2 {ye=y})
;;
```

```
let f1 (n,env) =
    n + env.xe + env.ye
;;
let f2 (n,env) =
    n + env.ye
;;
```

Solution 0: Don't bother to typecheck after closure conversion.

After all, the source program was well typed (checked by the source-language ML typechecker), and the compiler (with its *closure conversion* algorithm) cannot possibly have produced a program with the wrong behavior.

That is, consider the post-closure-converted language to be an *untyped* language.

This is the traditional solution, and it's not stupid. But can we do better?

Even though the original, non-closure-converted code was welltyped, the closure-converted code isn't because the environments are different

![](_page_53_Figure_2.jpeg)

fix I: type env = F1 of f1\_env | F2 of f2\_env
type f1\_clos = (int \* env -> int) \* env
type f2\_clos = (int \* env -> int) \* env

Even though the original, non-closure-converted code was welltyped, the closure-converted code isn't because the environments are different

![](_page_54_Figure_2.jpeg)

Even though the original, non-closure-converted code was welltyped, the closure-converted code isn't because the environments are different

![](_page_55_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Aside: Existential Types

map has a *universal* polymorphic type:

map : ('a -> 'b) -> 'a list -> 'b list "for *all* types 'a and for *all* types 'b, ..."

when we closure-convert a function that has type int -> int, we get a function with *existential* polymorphic type:

∃ 'a. ((int \* 'a) -> int) \* 'a "there *exists some* type 'a such that, ..."

In OCaml, we can approximate existential types using datatypes (a data type allows you to say "there exists a type 'a drawn from one of the following finite number of options." In Haskell, you've got the real thing.

sion: Summary
(after)
with extra env parameter:
<pre>let f_code (arg, env) =</pre>
arameters or environment:
env.cx
nvironment:
(f_code, {cx1=v1;; cxn=vn})
<pre>environment and call code:     let (f_code, f_env) = f in</pre>

### The Space Cost of Closures

The space cost of a closure

- = the cost of the pair of code and environment pointers (2 words)
- + the cost of the data referred to by function free variables

(1 word for each free variable)