

=====

Intro to Naming: Scope, lifetime, bindings, and storage management

A **name** is exactly what you think it is.

Most names are identifiers, though symbols (like '+') can also be names.

A **binding** is an association between two things, such as a name and the thing it names.

The **scope** of a binding is the part of the program (textually) in which the binding is active.

Binding time is the point at which a binding is created or, more generally, the point at which any implementation decision is made.

Examples include

language design time
program structure, possible types
language implementation time
I/O, arithmetic overflow, type equality (if unspecified in manual)
program writing time
algorithms, names
compile time
plan for data layout
link time
layout of whole program in memory
load time
choice of physical addresses
run time
value/variable bindings, sizes of strings
subsumes
program start-up time
module entry time
elaboration time (point at which a declaration is first "seen")
procedure entry time
block entry time
statement execution time

The terms **static** and **dynamic** are generally used to refer to things bound before run time and at run time, respectively. Clearly "static" is a coarse term. So is "dynamic."

What gets bound when varies from language to language.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of binding times in programming languages.

In general, early binding times are associated with greater efficiency.

Later binding times are associated with greater flexibility.

Languages with lots of early binding tend to be compiled.

Languages with lots of late binding tend to be interpreted.

Today I want to talk in particular about the binding of identifiers to the things they name. I'll use the name "object," informally, for anything that can have a name.

Scope and Lifetime

Fundamental to all programming languages is the ability to name things, i.e., to refer to things using symbolic identifiers rather than values, addresses, etc. Things we might name include

constants
variables
functions
parameters
modules
classes
fields
types
exceptions
labels
threads
...

Anything that isn't figured out until run time (values of variables and parameters in particular) has to be represented by data (bits) in memory. Some but not all data have names.

Dynamic storage in C, Ada 95, or Fortran 90, for example, is referenced through pointers, not names. Similarly, dynamic storage in Java or C# is referred to indirectly through references.

Let's call anything that is represented by bits in memory as an **object**. (This is **not** using the term in the OO programming sense.)

The **lifetime** of an object runs from when the space for it is allocated until it is reclaimed.

The **lifetime of a binding** runs from when the name is first associated with the object until it is no longer associated with it (and never will be again).

A binding may not be **active** (usable) throughout its lifetime. It may be hidden by a nested use of the same name, or it may be valid only when running a given function or a method of a given class.

Typical timeline:

creation of object
creation of binding
uses of name that is bound to object
(temporary) deactivation (hiding) of binding
reactivation of binding
destruction of binding
destruction of object

If an object outlives its binding it's **garbage**.

If a binding outlives its object it's a **dangling reference**.

The **scope** of a binding is the textual region of a program in which the binding is active. In most but not all languages this scope is determined at compile time.

That is, nothing has to happen at run time to activate and deactivate

bindings; the compiler has already figured out what's visible where.

In such languages, scope is sometimes called **lexical extent**; lifetime is sometimes called **dynamic extent**.

(More on the rules that determine scope in the following lecture.)

In addition to talking about the "scope of a binding," we sometimes use the word 'scope' as a noun all by itself, without an indirect object.

A "scope" is a program region of maximal size in which no bindings are destroyed.

In many, but not all languages, the scope of a binding is determined by a **declaration**. From the perspective of formal semantics, the declaration can be thought of as code that actively establishes visibility, even if the compiler is smart enough to do all the work ahead of time.

Algol 68 introduced the term **elaboration** for the "execution" of declarations. It's a useful concept because some declarations do more than establish bindings, and some of the extra stuff has to happen at run time. Elaboration can

- allocate space
- perform dynamic semantic checks (is the lower bound of this array \leq the upper bound?) and perhaps raise an exception

- start a thread

- ...

And in some languages (e.g., Python & Ruby), declarations really **are** executed:

```
class Foo
  if A > B
    method bar() ...
  else
    method bar() ...
```


The **referencing environment** of a statement or expression is the set of active bindings. A referencing environment corresponds to a collection of scopes that are examined (in order) to find a binding.

Scope rules determine that collection and its order.

Storage Management -- for objects with various lifetimes.

Static allocation for
globals
own/static variables
explicit constants (strings, sets, other aggregates)
some scalars may be global, others may simply be embedded in instructions

Central stack (chap. 9) for
parameters
local variables
temporaries
bookkeeping information
why a stack?
allocate space for recursive routines
reuse space
minimize management overhead

Heap (chap. 7) for
dynamic allocation

Maintaining the run-time stack

Contents of a stack frame
bookkeeping: return PC (dynamic link), saved registers, line number, static link, etc.

arguments and returns
local variables
temporaries

Maintenance of stack is responsibility of "calling sequence" (more on this in Chap. 9)

space is saved by putting as much in the prologue and epilogue as possible

time may be saved by putting stuff in the caller instead, or by combining what's known in both places (interprocedural optimization)

Access to non-local variables is usually implemented using **static links**.

Each frame has a pointer to the frame of the (correct instance of) the routine inside which it was declared. In the absence of formal subroutines, "correct" means closest to the top of the stack.

Local variables and arguments are assigned fixed offsets from the stack pointer and arguments are assigned offsets from the stack pointer at runtime.

You access a variable in a scope k levels out by following static links and then using the known offset within the frame thus found.

NB: many languages allow you to declare nested scopes **within** the body of a subroutine. (OCaml, for example, does this all the time.)

Declarations in these nested scopes hide outer variables with the same name, just as declarations at the tops of subroutines do. These nested scopes are generally considered to be a good idea, esp. in the implementation of roll space management into that of the surrounding routine: then the run-time overhead is zero.

Next lecture: static and lexical **scope rules**, which determine the scopes of bindings.

Then: deep and shallow **binding rules**, which (somewhat confusingly) associate referring environments with functions that are passed as

parameters or return values, or stored in variables.