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Abstract
To fix bugs or to enhance a software system without service disruption, one has to update it dynamically during execution. Most prior dynamic software updating techniques require that the code to be changed is not running at the time of the update. However, this restriction precludes any change to the outermost loops of servers, OS scheduling loops and recursive functions. Permitting a dynamic update to more generally manipulate the program’s execution state, including the runtime stack, alleviates this restriction but increases the likelihood of type errors. In this paper we present ReCaml, a language for writing dynamic updates to running programs that views execution state as a delimited continuation. ReCaml includes a novel feature for introspecting continuations called match_cont which is sufficiently powerful to implement a variety of updating policies. We have formalized the core of ReCaml and proved it sound (using the Coq proof assistant), thus ensuring that state-manipulating updates preserve type-safe execution of the updated program. We have implemented ReCaml as an extension to the Caml bytecode interpreter and used it for several examples.

Categories and Subject Descriptors D.3.2 [Programming Languages]: Language Classifications—Applicative (functional) languages; D.3.3 [Programming Languages]: Language Constructs and Features—Control structures; D.3.4 [Programming Languages]: Processors—Compilers; F.3.2 [Logics and Meanings of Programs]: Semantics of Programming Languages

General Terms Languages

Keywords dynamic software updating, continuation, functional language, execution state introspection, static typing, Caml

1. Introduction
Stopping a critical and long-running system may not be possible or more simply not acceptable as it would incur an excessive financial or human cost. Dynamic software updating technology addresses this challenge by enabling updates to running software, including bugfixes, feature additions, or even temporary instrumentation for diagnosis or performance tuning [3, 28]. One of the main issues when updating a running software is to ensure safety. After an update, the modified software must remain consistent and continue to achieve its goals. Final results must not be compromised even if intermediate results are reused in a different context. The Gmail outage in February 2009 [11] has shown possible consequences of unsafe updates: an update of the data placement service inconsistent with the redundancy strategy has caused a global denial of service.

Much prior work on dynamic software updating has observed that forms of safety (such as type safety) can be ensured by restricting updates to active system components [1, 9, 19, 22, 36]. For example, if an update attempts to fix a bug in function foo, then the update may be rejected if foo happens to be on the call stack. Baumann et al. [7] and Arnold and Kaashoek [4] report that for an OS kernel, up to 80% to 90% of the security fixes are supported by this approach. However, it happens that a function that never becomes passive, potentially in critical parts of the software system, needs to be updated. Not being able to update actively running functions prevents for instance updating the outermost loop of a server. Extracting loop bodies into separate functions [28] makes the code briefly inactive between each iteration. However, this technique does not solve any of the following additional cases. The primary Linux scheduler function is never passive as it is on the stack of all threads [4]. Baumann et al. [7] also mention exception handlers in a kernel which may need update at runtime [26]. The use of some compilers that squash software structure makes the situation even worse. For example, synchronous languages, used to program embedded systems, rely on compilers [2] that interleave instructions coming from many components and depending on the same input data into a single block of code. The compiled software structure thus causes what were once independent source-code units to be considered active when any one of them is.

In order to support more updates, Hofmeister and Purtilo [20] have proposed to focus on the execution state rather than the program structure. Upon update, the runtime stack is captured, adjusted then restored. Because the stack is appropriately handled, it does not matter if some of the updated functions are actively running. However, this approach has currently no formal semantics and provides no guarantee that update developers will not produce type-incorrect states.

This paper places the execution state approach [10, 20, 25] on safer ground by defining ReCaml, a functional language designed for manipulating execution states in a safe manner. We have defined ReCaml formally and proved it sound. Viewing the execution state as a delimited continuation [15], updating a computation consists in capturing, modifying and reinstating a continuation. To support the modification of a continuation, we define a new “match_cont” pattern-matching operator. It matches a continuation with call sites.
to decompose it in stack frames performing specific update actions on each of them. Depending on the execution state, the update programmer specifies the action to apply, e.g., discarding a frame, modifying a frame or keeping it unmodified. Combining such actions, the approach is flexible enough to support many policies, such as completing the computation at the old version, combining old results with subsequent new computation, or discarding old results for recomputing entirely at the new version. Attaching types to call sites allows us to check that the “match_cont” operator is well typed, and therefore that stack introspection is correct. The main contributions of our work are:

- **Explicit execution state management.** Updates are expressed as manipulations of the execution states. The work of update developers focuses mainly on this aspect, which we call compensation. In doing so, a developer can implement resulting deterministic behaviors by explicitly controlling the operations executed by the update depending on its timing.

- **Optimistic update.** As a consequence of the previous point, updates can occur at any time. A compensation ensures consistency afterwards, according to the execution state at the time of the update. Therefore, no preventive action (such as waiting for elements of the software to become inactive) is required. In addition, even if updates might not be effective immediately, they are executed with no delay.

- **DSU as manipulation of delimited continuations.** While continuations are common when studying languages and modelling exceptions and coroutines, they have not before been used for dynamic software updating. Relying on continuations, ReCaml does not require any source code transformation or any specific compilation scheme. DSU as manipulation of continuations fits nicely within a functional framework.

- **Formal semantics and static type system.** ReCaml comes with operators for capturing, modifying and reinstating continuations. It is equipped with a formal operational semantics. Although it is aimed at manipulating execution states, which are dynamic structures, ReCaml, and especially the continuation manipulation, is statically typed. The type system is proved to be sound using the Coq theorem prover.

- **Working prototype.** We have developed a prototype of ReCaml, which we have used to implement a few examples.

In Section 2 we first present concrete strategies based on our approach. Section 3 outlines our approach. Section 4 describes in details ReCaml, the formal language underlying our approach. Section 5 discusses implementation issues.

2. **Update Complexity vs Application Simplicity**

In this section, our aim is to convince the reader that updates can be so complex that the search for sophisticated solutions is justified. We are aware that supporting tools will be required in order to ease the proposed solution. We leave this problem to subsequent work, beyond the scope of this paper.

Our argumentation relies on a program computing a Fibonacci number. This very simple toy example is just aimed as a proof of concept to illustrate the difficulties when updating a program which is repeatedly active at the time of the update. If updates are already complex for such a simple program, then it should be worse for real applications. The initial version of our example is:

```ml
let rec fib n =
  if n < 2 then n
  else (fib (n-1)) + (fib (n-2))
in fib 12345
```

2.1 Initial Remarks and Overall Approach

There is no point in splitting this code in finer structural elements. This program is built around a single recursive function, whose outermost execution completes only when the whole program terminates. Hence trying to passivate the `fib` function makes no sense. If old and new versions can be mixed, dynamic rebinding [12, 14] obviously solves the problem: active calls complete with the old version while new calls can be directed to the new version. Usually, this assumption implies that the type of the rebound function does not change. If the type of the `fib` function is changed, then rebinding it breaks consistency.

An update has therefore to deal with the current execution state. It corresponds to the stack of calls already started with their arguments. Such ongoing calls are called activations in the rest of the paper. Updating a function requires to specify the action to handle each activation. Such specifications are called compensations. For example, updating a function `f` of type `τ_1 → τ_2` while changing its type to `τ'_1 → τ'_2` may require to convert its argument to its new type (`τ'_1`) or its result to be used by code expecting values of the old type (`τ_2`). More generally, a compensation can:

- yield to the activation, hence executing the old version until the completion of the activation. The result may need to be converted to conform to the new type of its calling activation if it has changed. Note that this is the semantics of Erlang [14], Java HotSwap [12] and more generally of dynamic rebindings, where result conversion is the identity function.

- cancel the activation, hence starting over the call with the new version. Call parameters shall be converted according to the new version. The result shall also be converted according to how the compensation handles its calling activation.

- extract intermediate results from the activation in order to feed some custom code. Depending on how the calling activation is compensated, this custom code computes the new result in place of the canceled activation.

The relative worth of each strategy depends on the time at which the update occurs. For example, if the considered activation is close to its completion, then it may be worthwhile to let it complete its execution. If the activation has started recently, then it may be better to abort and start over. If the update occurs in the middle of the execution period, then the third option could be more appropriate.

In the third option, the amount of reusable intermediate results varies depending on the old and new versions. The extreme case where no intermediate result can be reused matches the second option, i.e., aborting the activation and starting over the call. The quantity of reusable results gives an additional hint in order to choose the most advantageous option.

2.2 Replacing the Type of Integers

We first emphasize problems arising when modifying a type. As the computed Fibonacci number becomes high, using fixed-size integers will result in an overflow. Instead, it is safer to use arbitrary precision integers. The new version of the program is¹:

---

¹ Except possibly abstracting arithmetic operations in the integer data type. Here, the abstract data type is implicit as Haskell’s `Int` type class.

² Makris and Bazzi [25] use the name `stack/continuation transformer` and Gupta et al. [18] use `state mapping`. Being functional, ReCaml does not allow in place modification of a continuation but favors the construction of a new future. Hence, we prefer a new name to avoid misunderstanding.

³ In Caml libraries, `num_of_int` is the function that converts an integer to arbitrary precision; `+` is the addition over arbitrary precision integers.
let rec fib n =
if n < 2 then num_of_int n
else (fib (n-1)) +/ (fib (n-2))

Obviously, using dynamic rebinding fords this update as the type of fib is changed and there is at least one active call. Assuming that the integer data type has been well abstracted, one possible strategy could consist in updating this data type, like Gilmore et al. [16] and Neamtiu et al. [28] do. This approach has two major drawbacks. First, it updates all the uses of integers, while we want that only the result of the fib function has the overhead of arbitrary precision integers. Second, at the time of the update, some of the executions of the fib function might have already produced overflowed integers. A systematic update of all integers has no chance to distinguish the overflowed values that must be recomputed.

One possible update is as follows. Given an activation, if none of the recursive calls has been evaluated, then the activation can start over with the new version of the function. Otherwise, the compensation checks intermediate results in order to detect whether an overflow has occurred. Only non-overflowed results are converted to the new type. Overflowed or missing results are computed using the new version. Last, the compensation uses the arbitrary precision operator in order to perform the addition. The compensation handles caller activations in a similar way, taking into account the fact that the type of the call result has already been converted. The code of this update is outlined in Section 3 and detailed in Section 6 to illustrate ReCaml.

2.3 Introducing Memoization

Second, we emphasize difficulties that occur when changing the algorithmic structure. In our example, there is a well-known algorithm with linear time complexity, while the initial one has exponential time complexity. The new version of the program is 4:

let rec fib' n =
if i=n then i
else fib' n (i+1) (fi +/ fi1) fi

We can safely mix new and old versions and rebind dynamically the name fib as the type of the function is not changed. However, in this case, the effective behavior still has polynomial time complexity. Indeed, in the worst case, there is a stack of n activations of the old function, each of which subsequently performs up to one call to the new version. The effective behavior is worse than aborting and starting over the program, which is not satisfactory.

A better way to perform this update is to look out for two consecutive Fibonacci numbers in intermediate results. The new version is evaluated from the greatest pair, passed as parameters to the fib' function. If there is no such pair, it is not worth reusing any intermediate result and the program would rather start over.

2.4 Discussion

Using these two simple examples, we aim at showing that updating a software at runtime and in the right way is a difficult task. There is no general scheme that applies well to all of the cases. In the first case (Section 2.2), each activation is converted independently of the others to the new version. In the second case (Section 2.3), as the algorithm changes radically, all of the activations are cancelled and there is a lookup for specific intermediate results. These update schemes are complex despite the simplicity of the application.

4To keep the program simple, we extend Caml with  1 to denote the arbitrary precision literal 1 similarly to the +/ notation for arbitrary precision addition.

In addition, our examples show that even for a single application, the right scheme depends on the update itself. This is the reason why we argue in favor of a mechanism that allows developers to design specific schemes for each update. This approach would not prevent proposing some update schemes “off-the-shelf”, e.g., relying on some tools such as code generators, thus avoiding burdening developers when possible. Makris and Bazzi [25] for instance have already proposed such automatic generation strategies.

3. Overview of the Approach

In the above examples, the key mechanism is the ability to introspect activations when updating. Updates of Section 2 require intermediate results from activations. They also need to identify what has been done and what has still to be evaluated in each activation. For the implementer, this means that we need a mechanism to reify the state of the execution, including the call stack. To achieve this, we use continuations to model activations and we propose a new pattern matching operator match_cont, abbreviated as mc. Given a continuation, it matches the return address of the top stack frame as an indication of what remains to be done in the activation. It pops this stack frame and picks values from it in order to retrieve intermediate results. To do this, we extend the semantics with low-level details of the dynamics of the runtime stack.

In the following, we give an overview of how this operator helps in the fib example (Section 2.2). Here we give only part of it to make it easier to comment and understand. Section 6 gives more details and the full source code is in Figure 7.

The version below of the fib function is annotated for the purpose of update. Call sites’ labels may be given by the update developer or generated by some assisting tool. The labelling strategy is not discussed here because it is beyond the scope of this paper.

let rec fib n =
if n < 2 then n
else (let fn1 = <L1> fib (n-1) in
let fn2 = <L2> fib (n-2) in
fn1+fn2)
in <Lroot> fib 12345

Using these labels, the update developer can write a function that chooses the most appropriate strategy for each activation of fib depending on the point it has reached.

The main function compensating the effect of the update from int to num is given below. At each step, this function match_fib_callers proceeds by finding what is the state of the activation at the top of the current continuation (k) using match_cont. The second parameter (r) is the result value that would have been used to return to the top stack frame.

let rec match_fib_callers_ k r =
match_cont k with
| <L1:n>: : k’ → (+ (1) complete with new version *)
| <L2:n fn1>: : k’ → (+ (2) convert fn1 *)
let fn1 = if (n-1)>44 then fib (n-1)
else num_of_int fn1 in
let r’ = fn1’ +/ r in
match_fib_callers_ k’ r’
| <Lroot>: _ → (+ (3) resume normal execution *)

Notice that when filtering a case the update developer can specify values that he wants to extract from the current activation. For example, in case (1), he may use the rank of the Fibonacci number being calculated (here it is bound to n) and in case (2), he may also access the intermediate result of fib (n-1) named here fn1.

As described in Section 2.2, when the top stack frame matches L2, the compensation has first to check whether fib (n-1) has
over flowed. Assuming that integers are coded by, e.g., 31-bits signed integers, we statically know that the biggest correct (smaller than \(2^{30} - 1\)) Fibonacci number has rank 44. So the compensation compares the rank \(n - 1\) (where \(n\) is picked from the stack frame top on top of the continuation \(k\)) to 44 in order to decide whether fn1 can be reused. We assume here that \(r\) has already been handled appropriately by the compensation, hence its type is \(\text{num}\). See Section 6 for details on how it switches from \(\text{int}\) to \(\text{num}\). Then the compensation completes the popped activation in \(r\). Last, we have to compensate the tail \(k'\) of the continuation. Because the next stack frame is also suspended at a call of \(\text{fib}\) (L2 originates from \(\text{fib}\)), we have to check once again for the callers of \(\text{fib}\). Hence the tail \(k'\) is compensated by a recursive call of \(\text{match\_fib\_callers}\).

4. The ReCaml Language

Building on the \(\lambda\)-calculus, ReCaml adds a model of stack frames, which are generated by the compiler. On top of this model and of a continuation framework, it implements the \(\text{mc}\) operator. In doing so, developers programming updates in ReCaml can manipulate runtime states using the same language. Embedding the operator in the language allows us to extend the type system in order to eliminate statically unsound update programs.

Triggering and executing an update is the responsibility of the execution platform. It is done by some kind of interrupt that can preempt execution at any time. However, updates must deal on their own with their timing with respect to the application execution. The execution platform captures the execution state and passes it as an argument to the update. In return, updates have to guess when the execution has been preempted to select appropriate actions. To mitigate the issue in bootstrapping the compensation and to align continuation extremities on stack frame boundaries, as a first implementation, we check for the trigger only when the execution control returns to a caller. This restriction is equivalent to explicit update points. The application developer can cause additional points thanks to dummy calls, each of which incurs a return.

4.1 Syntax

We first describe the syntactical constructs and notations (Figure 1) then we discuss the choices in the design of the grammar.

4.1.1 Description of the grammar

Because we use an environment-based semantics, we need explicit closures and environment management. While \(\lambda x.e\) is the usual abstraction construct, \(\langle \lambda x.e, E\rangle\) denotes a closure such that the captured environment \(E\) is used to evaluate the body of the function upon application. The syntax of the application operator \(\langle\langle\rangle e e\rangle\) is extended with a label \(\langle\rangle\) that names the call site. The \(\langle\text{env} e\rangle\) operator evaluates its subterm \(e\) in the environment \(E\) instead of the current evaluation environment. Recursive functions are defined as usual (let rec \(x = \lambda x.e\) in \(e\)).

Our continuation framework defines first-class instantiable prompts and first-class delimited continuations. Intuitively, prompts are delimiters that bound the outermost context that shall be captured within a continuation. Hence a delimited continuation represents only part of the remainder of execution. The newprompt operator instantiates a fresh prompt. The \(\langle\text{setprompt}\rangle\) \(e\) \(e\) operator inserts a delimiter in the evaluation context. Given a prompt, the \(\langle\text{capture}\rangle\) \(e\) \(e\) operator captures and replaces the current continuation up to the innermost delimiter. The continuation is wrapped by the \(\langle\rangle\) \(e\) \(e\) operator. The \(\langle\text{reinstall}\rangle\) \(e\) \(e\) operator reinstates and evaluates a continuation. We shall explain later in Section 4.1.2 the \(\langle\text{cap}\rangle\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) operator, which is an explicit intermediate step in the capture of a continuation.

In order to model the state structure, we introduce an operator \(\langle\text{frame}\rangle\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\), which annotates activation boundaries. The opera-

tor denotes that \(e\) is evaluated in a new stack frame that results from the call/return site \(\langle\rangle\). At the boundary, a prompt is possibly set if the third annotation \(\langle\rangle\) is not \(\bot\) (i.e., it is the name of a prompt). \(E\) recalls the evaluation environment of the enclosing context of the operator thus keeping track of the values accessible in this frame.

The last operator \(\langle\text{setsubcont}\rangle\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) \(e\) de-

constructs a continuation relying on its stack frame structure. It compares \(\langle\rangle\) and the return address on top of the continuation. If the labels match, the continuation is split at the second innermost frame operator in a head (the inner subcontinuation) bound to \(x_1\) and a tail (the outer subcontinuation) bound to \(x_2\). Furthermore, the variables \(\pi_2\) are bound to the values of the topmost stack frame. Then \(e_1\) is executed in the so extended evaluation environment. There are two other cases: either the return address does not match \(e_2\) is executed) or the continuation is empty (\(e_3\) is executed).

The language has 3 kinds of values: closures, prompts and continuations.

4.1.2 Discussion

Having explicit closures and the \(\text{env}\) operator is the usual approach for the implementation of lexical scoping in small-step environment-based semantics. As a side-effect, the \(\text{env}\) operator also ensures that continuations are independent of any evaluation environment, i.e., any continuation brings its required environment in an \(\text{env}\) construct. To some extent, this is similar to the destruct-

tor for in an \(\text{env}\) construct. To some extent, this is similar to the destruct-

Figure 1. Grammar of terms and continuations
In addition, we adapt the framework:

- We align the delimiters of continuations with the delimiters of stack frames. To do so, we annotate the `frame` operator with an optional prompt in order to delimit where prompts are set. Furthermore, the continuation operators must have a call site label `<\>` in order to insert `frame` constructs.

- We have to introduce a dummy `cap` operator to align a stack frame delimiter with the inner delimiter of the continuation. To do so, a `frame` operator (which needs the evaluation environment) is inserted at the innermost position of the continuation, in place of the `capture` operator. The `cap` operator saves the needed evaluation environment (the one at the position of the `capture` operator) before the continuation is actually captured.

- Like Dybvig et al. [13], we encode continuations in a specific construct form rather than a closure [17]. That way, the linear structure of continuations (a stack in the implementation; the nesting of evaluation contexts in the language) is maintained and can be used by the `mc` operator. Furthermore, encoding a continuation as a closure would introduce a variable, which would infringe the type preservation lemma due to the typing of call site labels, as we will see later (Section 4.4). Last, making the distinction between continuations and closures, the `mc` operator does not have to handle regular closures.

Intuitively, a `frame` operator is inserted when a call is done and disappears when the callee terminates. Thus, when a continuation is captured, all its activations are delimited by `frame` operators. The `mc` operator uses them to split continuations into smaller ones. One can note that the environment of a `frame` is redundant. This environment indeed comes from the enclosing `env` construct. While our choice imposes a dummy `cap` operator in the continuation framework, it makes `mc` simpler. Indeed, it does not need to look for `env` constructs to collect environments when a continuation is split.

### 4.2 Semantics

The small step operational semantics of Figure 2 formalizes the above description of ReCaml. We adopt an environment-based approach with lexical scoping of variables. The judgment $E \vdash e \rightarrow e'$ asserts that the term $e$ reduces to $e'$ in the evaluation environment $E$. Rules `SUBST`, `CLOSE` and `LETREC` are the classical ones for substituting a variable, building a closure and recursive definitions, respectively. As usual with environment-based semantics, the `env` operator installs a local environment in order to evaluate the nested term (rule `ENV`). Because the `frame` operator bounds activations, the local environment used to evaluate the nested term is empty (rule `FRAME`). Here, it is the role of the inner `env` operator to give the actual execution environment. Figure 2 gives only primitive reduction rules. Except `frame` and `env`, which need special treatment of the environment, the `CONTEXT` rule generically reduces contexts according to the grammar of $k$. Because it is constrained with values, it fixes a strict right-to-left call-by-value evaluation order.

The management of the `frame` operator is one originality of the semantics. It implements the life cycle of activations. This operator is instantiated when a closure is applied (rule `APPLY`), when a prompt is set (rule `SETPROMPT`) and when a continuation is reinstated (rule `RESTATE`). It collapses when a callee activation returns a value (rule `FRAMEVAL`). Paired with the `frame` operator, the `env` operator provides the local evaluation environment for the instantiated activation. For instance, applying a closure, e.g., the identity function, proceeds as follows:

$$E \vdash \lambda x.x, E_2 \quad \text{APPLY} \quad \text{frame}_{\varepsilon_1}, \varepsilon_1 \downarrow \left(\text{env}(\varepsilon_1); E_2, v\right)$$

Capturing a continuation is done in two steps. First, the evaluation environment at the `capture` operator is saved, mutating the operator into cap (rule `CAP1`). The second step is the standard continuation capturing. A cap operator using prompt $p$ is only reduced within a `frame` tagged by $p$. If such a `frame` exists, the context $k$ between this `frame` and `cap` is reified as a continuation `cont` ($k$). A `frame` is inserted in place of cap consistently with the constraint of our language (see at the bottom of Fig. 1). The closure argument of `cap` is applied to the resulting continuation (rule `CAP2`). In rule `CAP2`, the enclosing prompt $p$ is consumed. The system proceeds as follows:

$$E_1 \vdash \text{frame}_{\varepsilon_1}, \varepsilon_1, p (\text{env}_{\varepsilon_2} (\text{capture}_{\varepsilon_2}) \uparrow \text{up with } (\lambda x.e, E_3))$$

$$\text{FRAME} \quad \text{frame}_{\varepsilon_1}, \varepsilon_1, p (\text{env}_{\varepsilon_2} (\text{capture}_{\varepsilon_2}) \uparrow \text{up with } (\lambda x.e, E_3))$$

$$\text{CLOSE} \quad \text{frame}_{\varepsilon_1}, \varepsilon_1, \downarrow \left(\text{env}(\varepsilon_2); E_2, e\right)$$

with $k = \text{env}_{\varepsilon_2} (\text{frame}_{\varepsilon_2}, \varepsilon_2, \downarrow \square)$

We proceed in two steps in order to handle easily any context in place of `env` $\varepsilon_2$. If no frame tagged by $p$ encloses `cap` $p$ (terms structured like $k [\text{cap}_{\varepsilon_2}, \varepsilon_2] \uparrow \text{up with } v$ where $k$ does not contain any frame `$\varepsilon_2$, $p$`, a runtime error occurs.

The `mc` operator splits a continuation at the second innermost `frame`, which delimits the top stack frame (rule `MCMATCH`). The rule `MCMATCH` handles the case where the continuation contains a single stack frame. The tail substitution is therefore the empty continuation. The rules for `mc` assume that the continuation is either empty (rule `MCEMPTY`) or the innermost operator within the continuation is `frame` (rules `MCNO MATCH`, `MCMATCH` and `MCMATCHC`).

As shown in Fig. 1, this is enforced as a structural constraint on the language. It is trivial to show that the semantics produces only continuations that conform to this constraint.

### 4.3 Type System

The type system adheres to the usual design of the simply-typed $\lambda$-calculus. Types may be type variables $\tau$, usual functional types, prompt types or continuation types. The type of a prompt is parameterized by the type of the values that flow through delimiters tagged by that prompt. The type of a continuation is parameterized by the type of the parameter and the type of the result of the continuation. The grammar for types is:

$$\tau ::= \alpha \mid \tau \rightarrow \tau \mid \tau \text{ prompt} \mid \tau \overset{k}{\rightarrow} \tau$$

Fig. 3 gives the type system for the term language. The judgement $E, P, L, \tau \vdash e : \tau_e$ asserts that the typing environments $E, P$ and $L$, in an enclosing function whose return type is $\tau$, the term $e$ has type $\tau_e$. $E$ (resp. $P$) maps variables (resp. prompts) to types. $L$ maps call site labels to label types, which are triplets $\{\text{prompt}, \tau_{res}, V\}$ where $\text{prompt}$ and $\tau_{res}$ are types; and $V$ is an environment that maps variables to types. The inference algorithm computes $\tau_e$ and $L$.

The $L$ environment is intended for splitting continuations at activation boundaries. Figure 4 gives an intuition of its interpretation, based on the semantics of the `mc` operator. A $\tau \overset{k}{\rightarrow} \tau_e$ continuation

---

3 We use type variables for convenience to solve the type inference problem. As ReCaml is simply typed, type variables are never generalized as type parameters. Instead, they are unknown types that shall later be instantiated by unification. This is similar to Caml’s weak type variables such as `$\_\_a` in the type `$\_\_a list ref of ref []$`. 
k is split into \( k_{\text{head}} (\tau_1 \xrightarrow{k} \tau_2) \) and \( k_{\text{tail}} (\tau_2 \xrightarrow{k} \tau_3) \). Composing the two subcontinuations results obviously in the original continuation. \( \tau_2 \) is the return type of the function that encloses \( l_1 \). This is the reason why the type judgment has \( \tau \) (the type of the enclosing function) in its left-hand side. \( \tau_3 \) is the return type of the call \( l_1 \). In order to type values that \( \text{mc} \) retrieves from the popped activation, e.g., the value of \( x_1 \), the type of \( l_1 \) contains the type environment at the call \( l_1 \). Consequently, the type of \( l_1 \) is:

- \( \tau_{\text{part}_1} = \tau_1 \) is the type of the value that flows at the boundary;
- \( \tau_{\text{rec}_1} = \tau_2 \) is the return type of the enclosing function;
- \( V_{l_1} = [x_1 \mapsto \tau_{x_1}] \) binds types to the activation variables.

In the example (Section 3), the types of labels are:

- \( L_1 \) \( \{ \tau_{\text{par}} = \text{int}; \tau_{\text{rec}} = \text{int}; \} \)
- \( L_2 \) \( \{ \tau_{\text{par}} = \text{int}; \tau_{\text{rec}} = \text{int}; V = \{ \text{fib} \mapsto \text{int}; n \mapsto \text{int}; \} \)
- \( L_{\text{root}} \) \( \{ \tau_{\text{par}} = \text{int}; \tau_{\text{rec}} = \text{unit}; V = \{ \text{fib} \mapsto \text{int}; n \mapsto \text{int}; \} \)

As usual, when typing an application (\text{APPLY}), the two subexpressions are typed using the same hypotheses. The first subexpression must be a function accepting values of the type of the second subexpression. The originality of our rule concerning application is the calculus of the type of the label. This type captures the type of the enclosing function \( \tau_1 \), the current environment \( E \) and the type \( \tau_3 \) that \( \text{flows} \) at the label, i.e., the type of the result.

Some constructs introduce frames and therefore modify the type of the enclosing function of a subexpression. For example, the type of the enclosing function of \( e_2 \) in \text{setprompt} \( l_1 \), \( e_1 \) \( e_2 \) is \( \tau_2 \) because the \text{setprompt} operator encloses \( e_2 \) in a frame whose prompt is of type \( \tau_2 \) (see \text{SETPROMPT} in Figures 2 and 3).

Typing a continuation expression (\text{CONT}) requires a specific type system. It is mutually recursive with the type system for terms. The judgment \( E, P, L, \tau \vdash \kappa : \tau_1 \xrightarrow{\kappa} \tau_2 \) is similar to the one for terms. Most of the rules derive from the type system for terms. For instance, the following rule is immediate from rule \text{APPLY} (Fig. 3):

\[
E, P, L, \tau_1, \tau_3 \vdash \kappa : \tau_2 \xrightarrow{\kappa} \tau_4 \quad E, P, L, \tau_1 \vdash v : \tau_3 \\
\begin{align*}
\text{APPLY:} & \quad L (l) = \{ \tau_{\text{par}} = \tau_4; \tau_{\text{rec}} = \tau_1; V = E \} \\
& \quad E, P, L, \tau_1, \kappa \vdash \kappa : \tau_2 \xrightarrow{\kappa} \tau_4 \\
\end{align*}
\]

We therefore omit the rules, except the following additional one for empty continuations:

\[
\text{HOLE:} \quad E, P, L, \tau_1 \vdash \kappa : \tau_2 \xrightarrow{\kappa} \tau_2
\]

4.4 Soundness

We consider soundness as the conjunction of type preservation and progress, stated as follows.

\text{Lemma 1 (Type preservation).} Given a term \( e_1 \) and an evaluation environment \( E \) such that \( T (E), P, L, \tau_1, \vdash e_1 : \tau_2 \). If \( e_1 \) reduces to \( e_2 \) in \( E \), then there exists an extension \( P' \) of \( P \) (\( \tau_p \Rightarrow P' (p) = \tau_p \)) such that in \( P' \), \( e_2 \) has the same type as \( e_1 \), i.e., \( T (E), P', L, \tau_1, \vdash e_2 : \tau_2 \).
The existential quantification of $P'$ is the technique of Gunter et al. [17][6] in order to handle the newprompt case. Assume $T(E), P, L, \tau \vdash \text{newprompt} : \tau_2$ prompt. newprompt reduces to a fresh prompt $p$ in $E, p$ is not in the domain of $P$. Hence choosing $P'' = (p \mapsto \tau_2) : P$ trivially ensures type preservation. In the other cases, we systematically choose $P'' = P$.

Unlike usual proofs, we do not use a lemma showing that extending the environment would preserve typing. Instead, we use a context invariance approach. While Pierce [30], Pierce et al. [31] do so for pedagogical reasons, we have to because the standard weakening lemma is false due to the typing of call sites. Indeed, in $L$, the $V$ field of the type associated with the label stores the typing environment (rules APPLY, FRAME, FRAME', CAPTURE, CAP, REINSTATE and SETPROMPT). Hence adding new variables to the environment, even if they do not occur free, may change label types in $L$. Intuitively, it would change the structure and content of stack frames, hence their types. Nevertheless, we must prove that the type of a value is independent of the context.

**Lemma 2** (Typing values). Given a value $v$, the type of $v$ is independent of any context: $E, P, L, \tau \vdash v : \tau_\alpha$, implies $E', P, L, \tau' \vdash v : \tau_\alpha$ for any $\tau'$ and $\tau'\alpha$.

This lemma is trivial following the CLOSURE, PROMPT and CONT typing rules. Type preservation for the SUBST reduction rule is therefore immediate. Restricting evaluation environments to values is a pragmatic solution to avoid any variable capture issue upon substitution.

In order to prove each of the other cases, we proceed in two stages. We first show that in order to type subterms, the rules build exactly the same environment before and after reduction. Hence reduction preserves the type of subterms. Then we use these results as premises of the typing rules for the reduced term.

Let’s sketch for instance the case of the APPLY reduction rule. Before reduction, assuming the parameter $v$ has type $\tau_\alpha$, the body
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\[
\begin{align*}
\text{continuation: } & \quad x_2 : \tau_{x2} \mid l_2 
\quad \vdash \quad \tau_1 \overset{\rho}{\rightarrow} \tau_n \\
\text{is split into: } & \quad x_2 : \tau_{x2} \mid l_2 
\quad \vdash \quad \tau_2 \overset{\rho}{\rightarrow} \tau_n \\
\text{continuation khead: } & \quad V_{\text{head}} = \{x_1 : \tau_{x1} \mid l_1\} 
\quad \vdash \quad \tau_1 \overset{\rho}{\rightarrow} \tau_2 \\
\text{continuation ktail: } & \quad \tau_{\text{tail}} = \tau_3 
\text{and } \quad \tau_{\text{par}} = \tau_2 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Lemma 3 (Progress). Given \(e_1\) such that \([\_], P, L, \tau \vdash e_1 : \tau\). Then \(e_1\) is either a value; or \(e_1\) is a runtime error (redex position is \(\text{cap}_{x_{>\_p}}\) up to \(p\) but it is not enclosed by any \(\text{frame}_{x_{>\_p}}\); or \(e_1\) reduces to some term \(e_2\) in the empty evaluation environment.

In order to prove progress, we inductively analyze the typing rules. This proof is classical.

The proofs have been mechanized using the Coq theorem prover and the library of Aydemir et al. [6], which together help to do machine-verified formal proofs on language semantics and type systems. For commodity reason, our Coq scripts differ in the following from the system of this paper. We explode the MCMATCH, MCMATCH', CAPI/CAI2 and REINSTATE reduction rules into detailed small steps. For example, we instantiate the CAPI2 for each context in the innermost \(\text{eval}_{\text{frame}}\) operator of the continuation operand. Instead, it is much more convenient to reverse the nesting of operators in the continuation. At the cost of yet another dummy operand and of additional rules, we therefore represent continuations inside out. We use the technique of Gunter et al. [17] to implement the freshness of instantiated prompts. Last, we move from the grammar to the type system the constraint on the form of continuations (bottom of Fig. 1).

4.5 Alternatives

One of the constraints that guides our work is to leave unchanged the application compiler. The rationale behind this constraint is that it makes it easier to integrate the ReCaml approach into existing compilers. To fulfill this constraint, we need to accommodate the choices done in legacy compilers. We identify several alternatives that shall impact dynamic updates. In the following, we present how these points integrate our formal system. We focus on the specificities of our language. Hence we do not discuss variations, e.g., of the continuation framework, which have already been studied by Dybvig et al. [13].

Usually, the implementation of execution states is not of great interest in the design of a language. This issue regards the compiler. But because ReCaml focuses on modelling state manipulations, we have to take into consideration the implementation. For instance, label types depend on the context, and therefore on captured environments when building closures.

Regarding variables, we implement the following rules in the semantics and type system:

- When a closure is built, it captures all the variables in the scope of which the \(\lambda\) operator lies, regardless these variables occur free in the body of the function.
- The parameter of a function is systematically added to the evaluation environment, regardless it occurs free in the body of the function. We do the same for \texttt{let rec}.

This is a coarse behavior. Indeed, many compilers optimize closures in order to capture only the variables that occur free. In order to model this behavior in ReCaml, we can replace the \texttt{CLOSE} reduction rule with the following one:

\[
\text{RESTRICT-CLOSE: } \vdash \lambda x.e \rightarrow (\lambda x.e, \text{restrict}_{x}(\mathcal{E}))
\]

where \(\text{restrict}_{x}\) computes the restriction of the environment, e.g., \(\{x \mapsto E(x)\mid x \in \text{fv}(e)\}\) to capture only the variables that occur free in the body. To change the system type accordingly, replacing \texttt{ABS} with:

\[
\text{RESTRICT-ABS: } (x \mapsto \tau_2) :: \text{restrict}_{x}(\mathcal{E}), P, L, \tau_3 \vdash e : \tau_3 
\]

Type soundness obviously still holds.

This implementation does the restriction when the closure is built. This is what happens in many compilers. Instead, we could have delayed the restriction until application, hence inserting \(\text{restrict}\) in the \texttt{APPLY} reduction rule and in the \texttt{CLOSE} and \texttt{ABS} typing rules. As of ReCaml, both implementations have the same behavior. We can also restrict parameters and \texttt{let rec} bound variables using the same technique.

Accurate modelling of the variables is important as it impacts type labels and the amount of values the \texttt{mc} operator is able to retrieve from continuations. Other aspects, such as tail-call optimization and function inlining, impact when new stack frames are created. Consequently, they (indirectly) impact the outcome of the \texttt{mc} operator as well.

Tail-call optimization consists in destroying the calling activation at the time of a call when it occurs at the return position. We can implement this optimization thanks to additional rules, e.g., duplicating the \texttt{APPLY} reduction rule for the specific case, such that it does not insert any new \texttt{frame} operator. Possibly, there are also several \texttt{env} constructs that must collapse with the stack frame.

\[
\text{TAIL-APPLY: } k \text{ contains only (0 or more) env} \\
\quad \vdash \text{framee1,x1,y1'} (k \ <{l_2} > (\lambda x.e, E_2)) \\
\quad \rightarrow \text{framee1,x1,y1'} (\text{env} (x \mapsto v) : E_2 : e)
\]

Notice that the \texttt{frame} in the right-hand side is the exact copy of the left-hand side one. Indeed, the properties of the enclosing stack frame (return address, local environment) are unaffected.

In order to handle inlined calls, the idea is coarsely the same, without any constraint on the context of the call. Nevertheless, there
While there are some pending arguments on the stack, the application closure if there are not enough parameters on the stack). popping only those it can immediately handle (or to build a partial-new one; and it branches to the body of the callee. The push / enter uncurrying technique lets the caller of a function push all the available arguments onto the stack. The callee is responsible of returning back to the caller.

As a proof of concept, we have developed a prototype compiler of Let as a specific instruction for tail calls. Like our Tail-Apply compiler would produce: as the arity of the operator can handle pending arguments:

- Pending arguments can go to the tail subcontinuation, as depicted in Figure 6 and described earlier in this section. Adding tail call optimization does not need any special treatment. Indeed, activation annotations of tail calls simply never match as there is no corresponding location in the code.

In order to handle currying, the generated code uses the recorded number of pending arguments in order to find the location of the return address. Pending arguments are simply skipped, as if the callee was \( n \)-expanded according to the call. Following the same principle, arguments between the two subcontinuations belong to the tail. Therefore, the number of pending arguments has to be adjusted in subcontinuations like in Figure 6. In the head subcontinuation, the number of pending arguments in the stack frame is set to 0, as there is no pending argument below the stack frame. In the tail subcontinuation, the number of pending arguments on top of the stack comes from the popped stack frame (1 in the example).

As Marlow and Peyton-Jones [27] have previously noticed, the push / enter un-currying technique is not the most favorable setup in order to walk the stack, which is what our \( \text{mc} \) operator achieves. More precisely, we remark that problems arise only when push / enter is combined with tail call optimization.

Assume the following code:

```plaintext
let \( f_2 = \lambda a. (\text{capture}_{l_3} \text{up to } p \text{ with } v) \) in
let \( f_1 = \lambda a. b. (\langle l_2, \langle l_3, f_2 x_3 \rangle x_4 \rangle) \) in
let \( x = \langle l_2, \langle l_1, f_1 x_1 \rangle x_2 \rangle \) in
```

As uncurrying is done, \( l_1 \) and \( l_2 \) (resp. \( l_3 \) and \( l_4 \)) refer to the same code location. They differ in the number of pending arguments above the return address, respectively 0 and 1. Due to tail call optimization, \( l_1 \) and \( l_3 \) (resp. \( l_2 \) and \( l_4 \)) cannot be distinguished. Given the above description of the compiler, the captured continuation is split like in Figure 6. If the tail subcontinuation is subsequently compared to \( l_1 \), it matches as there is 1 pending argument. Our formal system assumes that the type of the produced head subcontinuation is \( l_3 \rightarrow \tau \). However, its effective (runtime) type is \( l_4 \rightarrow \tau \). The problem arises because, due to tail call optimization, there is no means at this point to know where the pending parameter comes from, i.e., to distinguish between \( l_1 \) and \( l_3 \).

Since our formal system does not implement un-currying or tail-call optimization, it does not raise the problem, consistently with our type soundness result. Indeed, our formal system produces the following continuation, which is different from Figure 6:

```plaintext
let \( x = \text{frame}_{l_2, r, p} (\langle l_2, \text{frame}_{l_3, r, p} x_3 \rangle x_4) \) in
```

Notice that this continuation is actually the same as the one an eval / apply compiler would produce: as the arity of the \( f_2 \) closure is 1, \( l_4 \) is not applied and \( l_5 \) is not a tail call. In order to solve this problem in our prototype, we simply prevent un-currying tail calls. Alternatively, we could have implemented the push / enter technique in our formal system, for instance extending our frame operator with pending arguments. We have identified the following options the \( \text{mc} \) operator can handle pending arguments:
6. Detailed Example

Figure 7 contains the full source code that updates fib from int to num. The set_updateRoutine primitive (line 78) registers the call optimization breaks type preservation for call site labels because each tail call can push new pending parameters with types different than those previously popped from the stack; and the types of pending arguments appear in label types. Hence we confirm what Marlow and Peyton-Jones [27] say with a stronger argument: push / enter with tail-call optimization and me-like stack-walking is not type-sound.

- Pending arguments can go to the head subcontinuation. In this case, the type of the subcontinuations depends on how many arguments are pending on the stack. In the example, we would have to discriminate between \( L_5 / \rightarrow L_6 / \rightarrow \) pending argument, and so on.

- Pending arguments can be dropped. In this case, part of the calculation captured by the original continuation is lost.

Nevertheless, notice that the updated program actually walks the stack. We feel that one of the weaknesses of our current approach is that our me operator handles one stack frame independently of any context. We leave the issue for future works.

call optimization breaks type preservation for call site labels because each tail call can push new pending parameters with types different than those previously popped from the stack; and the types of pending arguments appear in label types. Hence we confirm what Marlow and Peyton-Jones [27] say with a stronger argument: push / enter with tail-call optimization and me-like stack-walking is not type-sound.

- Pending arguments can go to the head subcontinuation. In this case, the type of the subcontinuations depends on how many arguments are pending on the stack. In the example, we would have to discriminate between \( L_5 / \rightarrow L_6 / \rightarrow \) pending argument, and so on.

- Pending arguments can be dropped. In this case, part of the calculation captured by the original continuation is lost.

Nevertheless, notice that the updated program actually walks the stack. We feel that one of the weaknesses of our current approach is that our me operator handles one stack frame independently of any context. We leave the issue for future works.

6. Detailed Example

Figure 7 contains the full source code that updates fib from int to num. The set_updateRoutine primitive (line 78) registers the function that is called when the virtual machine receives an update signal. In addition we use the following syntactic sugar:

```
| line 1 prompt p → e |
| line 79 capture<Updt> upto p as k in e |
```

The captured continuation corresponds to a path in the stack call graph of the program (Figure 8) going from the root of execution to the compensation. The compensation is implemented by the compensate function (line 70). As represented by the dashed L uptep edge in the call graph, the top stack frame is an activation of the anonymous function (line 79) registered by set_updateRoutine primitive. It comes from the update infrastructure. Hence line 70, match_cont pops this useless stack frame.
before entering the effective compensation. In a more realistic application, we would have to find out which function the update is called from. In the example, as it can only be the fib function, the compensation calls the match_fib_callers function (lines 47–67) to handle the calls to fib according to the strategy described in Section 2.2:

L1 The compensation function receives the result of fib (n−1).

Using ifnotover, we ensure that it is correct (line 52). Notice that if the result has overflowed, the function ifnotover recomputes the Fibonacci number using the new version (line 23). To complete the fib function, we compute fib (n−2) with the new version (line 53) then we sum the two results (line 55). Last, we recursively compensate the tail of the continuation (line 55) as if the popped stack had returned the newly computed value.

L2 The compensation function receives the result of fib (n−2).

Futhermore, the match_cont gets the value of fib (n−1) from the call stack name naming it fn1. Using the ifnotover function, we ensure that those intermediate results are correct (lines 58–61). Last we complete the fib function and we recursively compensate the tail of the continuation (line 63).

Lroot At this point, r is fib 12345 and the compensation has completed. We use ifnotover to ensure r is correct before reinstating the tail subcontinuation (line 66).

The match_fib_callers_function (lines 31–46) is almost a clone of match_fib_callers, except that it assumes the compensation has already dealt correctly with the received result (parameter r). So recursive calls in match_fib_callers do in fact switch to match_fib_callers.

In these functions, we assume that (1) the evaluation order is known, i.e., that fib (n−1) is evaluated before fib (n−2); and (2) intermediate results have names. To make this explicit, we use 1et. Instead, intermediate results could have had system-generated or a posteriori names. The evaluation order shall be inferred by the compensation.

Because we have not integrated any exception handling in our prototype, a negative number is returned (lines 46, 67 and 73) to notify errors. Runtime errors can occur if the continuation does not match, when the update developer forgets to handle some call sites.

7. Discussions and Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented two dynamic software updates (Sec. 2–though only one example is detailed in Sec. 6 and Fig. 7) that many current systems are unable to implement. Even if we consider a toy example, we have argued that the technique is still relevant in realistic applications. Despite the apparent simplicity of our use case, the two updates show high complexity both in design and in implementation. These examples contrast with the usual simple updates of complex applications in related works. In our work, we accept that updates might be difficult to design and implement. We have first focused in this paper on being able to achieve these updates. Still, we acknowledge that our current proposal is not very handy yet. In the context of a similar approach, Makris and Bazzi [25] have for instance proposed automatic generators for some of the updates, which could be used as building blocks for a higher level update language.

The ReCaml language is the cornerstone of our work. It provides an operator (match_cont or mc) in order to introspect and walk continuations. Our examples have indeed emphasized how this operation helps in updating. We have formalized its environment-based semantics and defined a type system whose soundness is proved mechanically. Even if we have not discussed it in this paper, we have also developed a sound substitution-based semantics. Our prototype compiler of ReCaml is able to execute all the updates of Section 2. The two examples of this article, the compiler and proofs (the coq scripts) can be found at http://perso.telecom-bretagne.eu/taibiendagnet/reccaml.

In this paper, we have built ReCaml on top of a simply typed λ-calculus for simplicity reasons. It is well known that polymorphism with continuations needs restrictions in order to ensure soundness [5, 24, 35, 37]. As the mc operator splits continuations at activation boundaries, any type variable involved in an application might cause problems if it is generalized. One of the future challenges is therefore to reconcile ReCaml with polymorphism and to infer more precise types.

We have adopted a strict functional language and the ZAM2 virtual machine [23]. The ZAM2 machine has allowed us quick and easy prototyping. Strict evaluation has made it easier to understand and therefore to manipulate the execution state. Unlike similar approaches [20, 25], ReCaml does not require any specific code generation. Instead, relying on low level details of the underlying machine, it is adapted to the form of the code generated by the legacy Caml compiler. Using continuations is not a necessity. Yet it provides sound formal foundations for our work. As works that provide production level JVM and CLR with continuations [29, 32] use specific code generation, targeting such machines might not be in the scope of ReCaml. On the contrary, call site types are actually close to usual debug information. Therefore the debugging infrastructures of JVM and CLR could be used to implement ReCaml for these platforms. While these infrastructures provide mechanisms to manipulate states, ReCaml brings static typing. We therefore plan experiences to ensure that our approach also fits these platforms. To do so, we will have to enhance ReCaml to support imperative features, especially shared data. We will also have to consider multithreading, reusing previous work such as [25].
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