

Haskelite: A Tracing Interpreter Based on a Pattern-Matching Calculus

Pedro Vasconcelos

University of Porto
Porto, Portugal
pbvascon@fc.up.pt

Rodrigo Marques

University of Porto
Porto, Portugal
rodrigo.marques@fc.up.pt

Abstract

Many Haskell textbooks explain the evaluation of pure functional programs as a process of stepwise rewriting using equations. However, usual implementation techniques perform program transformations that make producing the corresponding tracing evaluations difficult.

This paper presents a tracing interpreter for a subset of Haskell based on the pattern matching calculus of Kahl. We start from a big-step semantics in the style of Launchbury and develop a small-step semantics in the style of Sestoft's machines. This machine is used in the implementation of a step-by-step educational interpreter. We also discuss some implementation decisions and present illustrative examples.

CCS Concepts: • Software and its engineering → Functional languages; Semantics; Interpreters.

Keywords: lazy evaluation, pattern matching, operational semantics, interpreters, teaching

Acknowledgments

This work was financially supported by the Artificial Intelligence and Computer Science Laboratory (LIACC) under the base research grant UIDB/00027/2020 of the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia funded by national funds through the FCT/MCTES (PIDDAC).

1 Introduction

Many commonly used Haskell textbooks explain the evaluation of pure functional programs as a process of stepwise rewriting using equations [2, 3, 8, 23]. These traces are presented as sequences of expressions where each step follows from the previous one by a program equation or some primitive operation. However, practical implementations such as GHC perform program transformations that lead to executions that do not directly relate to the source program. These transformations make it difficult to automatically generate execution traces similar to the ones in textbooks. We believe that such traces can be helpful while learning functional programming, particularly in a language with an unfamiliar evaluation strategy, but there is little tooling to support this available to beginners. To fill this gap, we have developed *Haskelite*, a web-based tracing interpreter for a subset of Haskell. Our goal is to create an educational tool that complements rather than replaces GHC/GHCi.

```

insert 3 [1, 2, 4]
{ 3 <= 1 = False }
= ... False
{ insert x (y:ys) | otherwise = y:insert x ys }
= 1 : (insert 3 [2, 4])
{ 3 <= 2 = False }
= ... False
{ insert x (y:ys) | otherwise = y:insert x ys }
= 1 : (2 : (insert 3 [4]))
{ 3 <= 4 = True }
= ... True
{ insert x (y:ys) | x<=y = x:y:ys }
= 1 : (2 : (3 : (4 : [])))
{ final result }
= [1, 2, 3, 4]

```

Figure 1. Evaluation trace for `insert 3 [1,2,4]`.

For example, consider the canonical definition of insertion into an ordered list:

```

insert x [] = [x]
insert x (y:ys) | x<=y = x:y:ys
                  | otherwise = y:insert x ys

```

Evaluating an expression such as `insert 3 [1,2,4]` in *Haskelite* produces the trace in Figure 1, where each evaluation step is explained as either a primitive or the use of an equation.¹

Besides equational reasoning, *Haskelite* can also be used to illustrate operational aspects of lazy evaluation: consider the list insertion sort defined as a fold of the previous `insert` function:

```
isort = foldr insert []
```

Figure 2 shows the evaluation trace for the composition of `head` with `isort`. Because of lazy evaluation, this computation does *not* require sorting the entire list, instead performing just $O(n)$ steps (essentially computing the minimum). We believe that the ability to easily show such evaluation traces can be helpful for teaching and learning Haskell.

The implementation of *Haskelite* required the development of an alternative operational model, namely, a lazy operational semantics based on the pattern matching calculus

¹The ellipsis (...) represent a pending continuation, for example, for evaluating guards.

```

head (isort [3, 2, 1])
{ isort = foldr insert [] }
= .... foldr insert [] [3, 2, 1]
  { foldr f z (x:xs) = f x (foldr f z xs) }
= .... insert 3 (foldr insert [] [2, 1])
  { foldr f z (x:xs) = f x (foldr f z xs) }
= ..... insert 2 (foldr insert [] [1])
  { foldr f z (x:xs) = f x (foldr f z xs) }
= ..... insert 1 (foldr insert [] [])
  { foldr f z [] = z }
= ..... []
  { insert x [] = [x] }
= ..... [1]
  { 2 <= 1 = False }
= ..... False
  { insert x (y:ys) | otherwise = y:insert x ys }
= ..... 1:(insert 2 [])
  { 3 <= 1 = False }
= ..... False
  { insert x (y:ys) | otherwise = y:insert x ys }
= .... 1:(insert 3 (insert 2 []))
  { head (x:_) = x }
= 1

```

Figure 2. Evaluation trace for `head (isort [3,2,1])`.

of Kahl [10]. We start with a big-step semantics in the style of Launchbury [11] and develop a small-step semantics in the style of Sestoft’s machines [22] that forms the foundation for the Haskellite interpreter.

The contributions presented in this paper are:

1. the definition of λ PMC, a small core language based on a pattern matching calculus;
2. a big-step operational semantics for λ PMC;
3. an abstract machine derived from the big-step semantics;
4. the description of an implementation of this machine for a tracing interpreter of a subset of Haskell.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 defines the syntax of λ PMC and reviews the pattern-matching calculus it is based on. Section 3 defines normal forms and presents a big-step semantics for language. Section 4 defines configurations and small-step reduction rules of an abstract machine for λ PMC and discusses the correspondence between the two semantics. Section 5 describes the implementation. Section 6 discusses related work. Finally, Section 7 highlights directions for further work.

2 Syntax

2.1 Motivation

Handling pattern matching with nested or overlapping patterns in a strict language is straightforward because the rules for matching can be separated from the rest of evaluation

(see, for example, Chapter 8 of [21]). However, in a lazy language, *pattern matching forces evaluation* and hence matching and evaluation must be intertwined.

Established implementation techniques for pattern matching in lazy languages solve this problem by translating nested patterns into *simple cases* [1, 9, 20], i.e. case expressions with patterns consisting of a single constructor applied to variables. Evaluating simple cases requires the evaluation of the scrutinized expression only to the outermost constructor (i.e. weak head normal form). Consider, for example, the following Haskell function, which checks whether a list has fewer than two elements:

```

isShort (x:y:ys) = False
isShort ys       = True

```

The translation into simple cases is:

```

isShort xs = case xs of
  (x:xs') -> case xs' of
    (y:ys) -> False
    []      -> True
  []      -> True

```

Multiple equations and nested patterns such as $(x:y:ys)$ must be translated into nested case expressions with simple patterns and matches are completed by introducing missing constructors.

By contrast, the translation of *isShort* into λ PMC is direct:

$$isShort = \lambda((x : y : ys) \Rightarrow [False] \mid ys \Rightarrow [True])$$

Compared to the version with simple cases, the λ PMC version preserves a closer relation to the original source program: each equation corresponds to one alternative in a *matching abstraction* and nested patterns are preserved. The downside is that evaluation becomes more complex, because it may have to force sub-expressions while matching and keep track of alternatives to try in case of failure. We claim that the trade-off is beneficial in an interpreter where performance is not critical.

2.2 Expressions and Matchings

Figure 3 defines λ PMC, a small functional language with syntactical categories for *expressions*, *matchings* and *patterns*. Matchings and patterns are based on the PMC calculus of Kahl [10]. The principal syntactical extension is a where construct for defining (possibly) recursive local bindings.

A matching can be a return expression $[e]$ (signaling a successful match), the matching failure ζ , a pattern match $p \Rightarrow m$ (expecting a single argument that must match pattern p), an argument application $e \triangleright m$, or the alternative $m_1 \mid m_2$ between two matchings. Note that patterns p can be nested; for example $(x : (y : ys))$ is a valid pattern (using infix notation for the list constructor).

Matching abstraction subsumes lambda abstraction: $\lambda x. e$ is equivalent to $\lambda(x \Rightarrow [e])$.

e	expressions	
$e ::=$	x	variable
	$ e_1 e_2$	function application
	$ \lambda m$	matching abstraction
	$ c(e_1, \dots, e_n)$	constructor application
m matchings		
$m ::=$	$[e]$	return expression
	$ \zeta$	failure
	$ p \Rightarrow m$	match pattern
	$ e \triangleright m$	argument supply
	$ m_1 m_2$	alternative
	$ m \text{ where } binds$	local bindings
$binds$ bindings		
$binds ::=$	$\{x_1 = e_1; \dots; x_n = e_n\}$	
p patterns		
$p ::=$	x	variable pattern
	$ c(p_1, \dots, p_n)$	constructor pattern

 Figure 3. Syntax of λ PMC.

Like Launchbury’s semantics, we introduce a syntactical construct to define local bindings; this is needed to implement lazy evaluation by guaranteeing that evaluation results are shared (see Section 3.1). Unlike Launchbury’s semantics, local bindings are introduced in *matchings* rather than expressions. By analogy with the Haskell language, we use “where” instead of “let” because the scope of the bindings scope extends beyond a single expression.

The expression-level let can be obtained by a straightforward translation into a where:

$$\text{let } binds \text{ in } e \equiv \lambda([e] \text{ where } binds) \quad (1)$$

However, due to the potential for matching failure, the reverse translation is *not* direct. In other words, where-bindings cannot be readily translated into a let (see the final example in Section 2.4).

Case expressions can also be obtained by translation into matching abstractions:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{case } e_0 \text{ of } \{p_1 \rightarrow e_1; \dots; p_n \rightarrow e_n\} \\ & \equiv \lambda(e_0 \triangleright (p_1 \Rightarrow [e_1] | \dots | p_n \Rightarrow [e_n])) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Note that the above translation is valid even if the patterns p_1, \dots, p_n are nested, overlapping or non-exhaustive. Also note that we can omit parenthesis because $|$ is associative.

As in the STG machine [9], we assume that constructors are always *saturated*; partial application of constructors can be expressed using a matching abstraction. For example, the curried list constructor is

$$(:) \equiv \lambda(x \Rightarrow y \Rightarrow [:(x, y)]) \quad (3)$$

For readability, we will write list constructors using infix notation, e.g. use $x:y$ instead of $:(x, y)$. We will also present some examples using integers and arithmetic operations. These are straightforward to define and therefore omitted from the syntax of Figure 3 and the semantics of Sections 3 and 4 to avoid unnecessary complexity.

2.3 Reduction Relations

The pattern matching calculus is defined as two *redex* reduction relations, namely, \xrightarrow{E} between expressions and \xrightarrow{M} between matchings. Kahl describes the calculus and proved its confluence irrespective of reduction strategies [10]. In Section 3 we will define a call-by-need (i.e. lazy) reduction strategy, but for now we will just review the reduction rules that apply to our setting.

We use the notation $m[e'/x]$ for the substitution of free occurrences of variable x for an expression e' in the matching m . The definitions of free occurrences and substitution are standard and therefore not included here.

The first two rules define failure as the left unit of alternative, and return as the left zero:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta | m & \xrightarrow{M} m & (\zeta |) \\ [e] | m & \xrightarrow{M} [e] & ([\] |) \end{aligned}$$

The next rule states that matching an abstraction built from a return expression reduces to the underlying expression.

$$\lambda [e] \xrightarrow{E} e \quad (\lambda [\])$$

There is no reduction rule for $\lambda \zeta$: this is because matching failure corresponds to a runtime error that cannot be caught in λ PMC.²

Application of a matching abstraction reduces to argument supply to the matching. Dually, argument supply to a return expression reduces to application of the expression.³

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda m) a & \xrightarrow{E} \lambda(a \triangleright m) & (\lambda @) \\ a \triangleright [e] & \xrightarrow{M} [e a] & (@ [\]) \end{aligned}$$

The following rule propagates a matching failure through an argument supply.

$$e \triangleright \zeta \xrightarrow{M} \zeta \quad (\triangleright \zeta)$$

Next, argument supply distributes through alternatives.

$$e \triangleright (m_1 | m_2) \xrightarrow{M} (e \triangleright m_1) | (e \triangleright m_2) \quad (\triangleright |)$$

²Kahl considers a variant of his pattern calculus where $\lambda \zeta$ reduces to an “empty expression” that can be converted back to matching failure. We do not require this for our semantics.

³Rule $(\triangleright [\])$ is reasonable in a higher-order language because the returned expression can be a function.

Note that the above rule duplicates the expression e ; in the lazy semantics of Section 3 we will restrict e to be a variable so that the result of evaluation can be shared (thus preventing duplication of work). For now, however, we are concerned only with the pure calculus regardless of a particular reduction strategy.

The following rules handle argument supply to patterns; the successful match ($c \triangleright c$) decomposes the arguments into the nested patterns, while the non-successful match ($c \triangleright c'$) fails immediately. Finally, matching a variable succeeds and performs substitution.

$$\begin{aligned}
 c(e_1, \dots, e_n) \triangleright c(p_1, \dots, p_n) &\Rightarrow m \xrightarrow{M} & (c \triangleright c) \\
 e_1 \triangleright p_1 \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow e_n \triangleright p_n &\Rightarrow m \\
 c'(e_1, \dots, e_k) \triangleright c(p_1, \dots, p_n) &\Rightarrow m \xrightarrow{M} \text{!} & (c \triangleright c') \\
 &\text{if } c \neq c' \\
 e \triangleright x &\Rightarrow m \xrightarrow{M} m[e/x] & (\triangleright x)
 \end{aligned}$$

A clarification on notation: because of the syntax of Figure 3, a matching such as

$$e_1 \triangleright p_1 \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow e_n \triangleright p_n \Rightarrow m$$

can only be interpreted as associating to the right:

$$e_1 \triangleright (p_1 \Rightarrow (e_2 \Rightarrow (p_2 \dots \Rightarrow e_n \triangleright (p_n \Rightarrow m) \dots)))$$

We therefore omit the redundant parentheses in the rule above and in the remaining presentation.

2.4 Translating Haskell into λ PMC

We will now show some examples of translating a subset of Haskell definitions into λ PMC. The emphasis is on developing intuitions rather than presenting formal rules (this would also require a formal definition of Haskell's syntax which is beyond the scope of this paper). The translation is automatic and can be done during parsing (see Section 5).

Overlapping patterns. Consider the following definition of the `zipWith` function that combines two lists using a functional argument:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{zipWith } f \ (x:xs) \ (y:ys) &= f \ x \ y : \text{zipWith } f \ xs \ ys \\
 \text{zipWith } f \ xs \ ys &= []
 \end{aligned}$$

This definition translates directly to λ PMC:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{zipWith} &= \\
 &\lambda (f \Rightarrow (x : xs) \Rightarrow (y : ys) \Rightarrow [f \ x \ y : \text{zipWith } f \ xs \ ys] \\
 &\quad | f \Rightarrow xs \Rightarrow ys \Rightarrow [[]])
 \end{aligned}$$

Overlapping patterns are handled directly because matching alternatives are tried in left-to-right order; see rules ($\text{!} \mid$) and ($\llbracket \mid \rrbracket$) of Section 2.3.

As-patterns and Boolean guards. Next consider a function `nodups`, which removes identical consecutive elements from a list, expressed using an *as-pattern* and a *Boolean guard*:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{nodups } (x:xs@(y:ys)) \mid x==y &= \text{nodups } xs \\
 \text{nodups } (x:xs) &= x:\text{nodups } xs \\
 \text{nodups } [] &= []
 \end{aligned}$$

This can be translated to λ PMC as a matching abstraction with nested alternatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{nodups} &= \lambda ((x : xs) \Rightarrow xs \triangleright (y : ys) \Rightarrow \\
 &\quad (x == y) \triangleright \text{True} \Rightarrow [\text{nodups } xs] \\
 &\quad | (x : xs) \Rightarrow [x : \text{nodups } xs] \\
 &\quad | [] \Rightarrow [[]])
 \end{aligned}$$

Following Kahl [10], the Boolean guard is encoded as the evaluation of the expression ($x == y$) matched against the constructor `True`.

Note that λ PMC could also be used to encode more advanced pattern matching extensions, such as *pattern guards*, *view patterns* and *lambda cases*. However, we do not require this for our interpreter, so we omit the details from this presentation.

Local bindings. Our final example illustrates the use of local bindings in λ PMC. Consider the following (contrived) Haskell function:

```
foo x y
  | z>0 = z+1
  | z<0 = z-1
  where z = x*y
foo x y = x+y
```

Note that the binding for z scopes over both Boolean guards and corresponding right-hand sides but not over the last equation. Also, note that the guards are not exhaustive: the last equation applies when $z = 0$.

We can translate this into λ PMC preserving the scoping and the matching semantics using a `where` binding:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{foo} &= \lambda (x \Rightarrow y \Rightarrow ((z > 0 \triangleright \text{True} \Rightarrow [z + 1]) \\
 &\quad | (z < 0 \triangleright \text{True} \Rightarrow [z - 1]))) \\
 &\quad \text{where } z = x * y \\
 &\quad | x \Rightarrow y \Rightarrow [x + y])
 \end{aligned}$$

At first glance, it may appear that one could have also expressed this using `let`:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{foo}' &= \lambda (x \Rightarrow y \Rightarrow [\text{let } z = x * y \\
 &\quad \text{in } \lambda (z > 0 \triangleright \text{True} \Rightarrow [z + 1]) \\
 &\quad | z < 0 \triangleright \text{True} \Rightarrow [z - 1])]) \\
 &\quad | x \Rightarrow y \Rightarrow [x + y])
 \end{aligned}$$

However, foo' is not equivalent to foo : when $z = 0$ then the inner lambda matching fails and the second equation is not tried (meaning foo' is undefined for x, y such that $x * y = 0$). This is because a return expression such as `[let $z = x * y$ in ...]` is a committed choice, absorbing any remaining alternatives.⁴

⁴See rule ($\llbracket \mid \rrbracket$) in Section 2.3.

3 Big-step Semantics

In this section, we define a big-step semantics for λPMC . The semantics is based in Sestoft’s revision [22] of Launchbury’s semantics for lazy evaluation [11]. The definitions of *matching arity* and *weak head normal forms* in Section 3.2 are novel, as are the rules for matchings.

3.1 Normalized Syntax

As in Launchbury’s semantics, we will restrict arguments of applications to be simple variables rather than arbitrary expressions; this is needed to implement call-by-need by updating a heap with results of evaluations. We need to restrict arguments of applications not just in expressions but also in matchings⁵:

$$\begin{aligned} e &::= \dots \mid e y \mid c(y_1, \dots, y_n) \mid \dots \\ m &::= \dots \mid y \triangleright m \mid \dots \end{aligned}$$

It is always possible to translate arbitrary λPMC terms into these forms by using let and where bindings:

$$\begin{aligned} c(e_1, \dots, e_n) &\rightsquigarrow \text{let } \{y_i = e_i\} \text{ in } c(y_1, \dots, y_n) \\ e_1 e_2 &\rightsquigarrow \text{let } y = e_2 \text{ in } (e_1 y) \\ e \triangleright m &\rightsquigarrow (y \triangleright m) \text{ where } y = e \end{aligned}$$

where the variables y_i are suitably “fresh”.

Note that normalized syntax still allows nested constructors in patterns; indeed, the whole purpose of the semantics presented here is to treat such matchings directly.

3.2 Preliminary Definitions

Let *heaps* Γ, Δ, Θ be finite mappings from variables to (possibly unevaluated) expressions. The notation $\Gamma[y \mapsto e]$ represents a heap that maps variable y to e and otherwise behaves as Γ .

Because matchings can encode multi-argument functions and also argument applications, we have to define the results of evaluations accordingly. First we define a syntactical measure $\#m$ of the *arity* of a matching:

$$\begin{aligned} \#[e] &= 0 \\ \#\zeta &= 0 \\ \#(p \Rightarrow m) &= 1 + \#m \\ \#(y \triangleright m) &= \max(0, \#m - 1) \\ \#(m_1 \mid m_2) &= \#m_1, \quad \text{if } \#m_1 = \#m_2 \\ &\quad \text{(otherwise undefined)} \\ \#(m \text{ where binds}) &= \#m \end{aligned}$$

The penultimate equation states that matchings in alternatives must have equal arities; this generalizes the Haskell syntax rule requiring that equations for a binding should have the same number of arguments [13].

⁵Rule ($\triangleright \mid$) of Section 2.3 distributes a argument matching over alternatives; by restricting the argument to be a variable we ensure that any evaluation result is shared.

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{}{\Gamma; L; w \Downarrow_E \Gamma; w} \text{WHNF}_{\Downarrow} \\ \#m = 0 \quad &\frac{\Gamma; L; []; m \Downarrow_M \Delta; [e] \quad \Delta; L; e \Downarrow_E \Theta; w}{\Gamma; L; \lambda m \Downarrow_E \Theta; w} \text{SAT}_{\Downarrow} \\ &\frac{\Gamma; L \cup \{y\}; e \Downarrow_E \Delta; w}{\Gamma[y \mapsto e]; L; y \Downarrow_E \Delta[y \mapsto w]; w} \text{VAR}_{\Downarrow} \\ &\frac{\Gamma; L; e \Downarrow_E \Delta; \lambda m \quad \Delta; L; \lambda(y \triangleright m) \Downarrow_E \Theta; w}{\Gamma; L; (e y) \Downarrow_E \Theta; w} \text{APP}_{\Downarrow} \end{aligned}$$

Figure 4. Expression evaluation

An expression is in weak head normal (whnf) w if it is either a matching abstraction of arity greater than zero or a constructor:

$$\begin{aligned} w &::= \lambda m \quad \text{such that } \#m > 0 \\ &\mid c(y_1, \dots, y_n) \end{aligned}$$

If $\#m > 0$ then m expects at least one argument, i.e. behaves like a lambda abstraction. If $\#m = 0$ then m is *saturated* (i.e. fully applied) and therefore *not* a whnf. This definition of weak normal forms implies that partially applied matchings will be left unevaluated e.g. $\lambda(z \triangleright x \Rightarrow y \Rightarrow [e])$ is in whnf. This is similar to how partial applications are handled in abstract machines with multi-argument functions e.g. the STG [9]. However, in our case, this is not done for efficiency, but rather to ensure that we only evaluate *saturated* matchings. The results μ of evaluating such matchings are either a return expression or a failure:

$$\mu ::= [e] \mid \zeta$$

3.3 Evaluation Rules

Evaluation is defined in Figures 4 and 5 by two mutually recursive judgments:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma; L; e \Downarrow_E \Delta; w &\text{ Evaluating expression } e \text{ from heap } \Gamma \text{ yields} \\ &\text{heap } \Delta \text{ and result } w; \\ \Gamma; L; A; m \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu &\text{ Evaluating matching } m \text{ from heap } \Gamma \\ &\text{and argument stack } A \text{ yields heap } \Delta \text{ and result } \mu. \end{aligned}$$

In the \Downarrow_M judgments the argument stack A is a sequence of variables representing the pending arguments to be applied to the matching expression.

In both judgments the set L keeps track of variables under evaluation and is used to ensure freshness of variables in the $\text{WHERE}_{\Downarrow}$ rule.

Definition 3.1 (Freshness condition, adapted from [22]). A variable y is fresh with respect to a judgment $\Gamma; L; A; m \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu$ if it does not occur (free or bound) in Γ, L, A or m .

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{\Gamma; L; A; [e] \Downarrow_M \Gamma; [A \triangleright e]} \text{RETURN}_{\Downarrow} \\
 \\
 \frac{}{\Gamma; L; A; \zeta \Downarrow_M \Gamma; \zeta} \text{FAIL}_{\Downarrow} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; L; (y : A); m \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu}{\Gamma; L; A; y \triangleright m \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu} \text{ARG}_{\Downarrow} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; L; A; m[y/x] \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu}{\Gamma; L; (y : A); x \Rightarrow m \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu} \text{BIND}_{\Downarrow} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; L; y \Downarrow_E \Delta; c(y_1, \dots, y_n) \quad \Delta; L; A; y_1 \triangleright p_1 \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow y_n \triangleright p_n \Rightarrow m \Downarrow_M \Theta; \mu}{\Gamma; L; (y : A); c(p_1, \dots, p_n) \Rightarrow m \Downarrow_M \Theta; \mu} \text{CONS1}_{\Downarrow} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; L; y \Downarrow_E \Delta; c'(y_1, \dots, y_k) \quad c \neq c'}{\Gamma; L; (y : A); c(p_1, \dots, p_n) \Rightarrow m \Downarrow_M \Delta; \zeta} \text{CONS2}_{\Downarrow} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; L; A; m_1 \Downarrow_M \Delta; [e]}{\Gamma; L; A; (m_1 \mid m_2) \Downarrow_M \Delta; [e]} \text{ALT1}_{\Downarrow} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma; L; A; m_1 \Downarrow_M \Delta; \zeta \quad \Delta; L; A; m_2 \Downarrow_M \Theta; \mu}{\Gamma; L; A; (m_1 \mid m_2) \Downarrow_M \Theta; \mu} \text{ALT2}_{\Downarrow} \\
 \\
 \frac{\Gamma[y_i \mapsto \widehat{e}_i]; L; A; \widehat{m} \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu}{\Gamma; L; A; (m \text{ where } \{x_i = e_i\}) \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu} \text{WHERE}_{\Downarrow} \quad (y_i \text{ are fresh})
 \end{array}$$

Figure 5. Matching evaluation

Remarks about rules for expressions (Figure 4). Rule WHNF_{\Downarrow} terminates evaluation immediately when we reach a weak head normal form, namely a non-saturated matching abstraction or a constructor.

Rule SAT_{\Downarrow} applies to saturated matching abstractions; if the matching evaluation succeeds then we proceed to evaluate the returned expression.

Rule VAR_{\Downarrow} forces the evaluation of an expression in the heap; as in Launchbury and Sestoft’s semantics, we remove the entry from the heap during evaluation (“black-holing”) and update the heap with the result afterwards.

Rule APP_{\Downarrow} first evaluates the function to obtain a matching abstraction and then evaluates the argument application.

Remarks about rules for matchings (Figure 5). Rule $\text{RETURN}_{\Downarrow}$ terminates evaluation successfully when we reach a return expression. The notation $A \triangleright e$ represents the nested

applications of left over arguments on the stack A to the expression e . The definition is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 [] \triangleright e &= e \\
 (y : ys) \triangleright e &= ys \triangleright (e y)
 \end{aligned}$$

Rule FAIL_{\Downarrow} terminates evaluation unsuccessfully when we reach the match failure ζ .

Rule ARG_{\Downarrow} pushes an argument onto the stack and carries on evaluation.

Rule BIND_{\Downarrow} binds a variable pattern to an argument on the stack. This is simply a renaming of the pattern variable x to the heap variable y .

Rules $\text{CONS1}_{\Downarrow}$ and $\text{CONS2}_{\Downarrow}$ handle the successful and unsuccessful matching of a constructor pattern; in the later case the matching evaluation returns ζ . Note also that $\text{CONS1}_{\Downarrow}$ decomposes the matching of sub-patterns in left-to-right order (i.e. first matching p_1 , then p_2 , etc.).

Rules ALT1_{\Downarrow} and ALT2_{\Downarrow} handle progress and failure in alternative matchings. Note that in ALT2_{\Downarrow} evaluation continues with the updated heap Δ because the effects of evaluation of the failed match must be preserved when evaluating m_2 . Note also that the argument stack is shared between m_1 and m_2 implementing rule $(\triangleright |)$ of Section 2.3. This sharing justifies why we restrict argument supply to single variables: allowing arbitrary expressions as arguments could duplicate computations because the same expression could be evaluated in more than one alternative. By restricting to single variables we can ensure that results are shared.

Rule $\text{WHERE}_{\Downarrow}$ is analogous to the one by Sestoft for let: it allocates new unevaluated expressions in the heap (taking care of renaming) and continues evaluation of the body. We use \widehat{e}_i and \widehat{m} for the renaming of bound expressions and body, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widehat{e}_i &= e_i[y_1/x_1, \dots, y_n/x_n] \\
 \widehat{m} &= m[y_1/x_1, \dots, y_n/x_n]
 \end{aligned}$$

4 Abstract Machine

We will now transform the big-step semantics of Section 3 into an abstract machine, i.e. a transition function between configurations. Each transition performs a bounded amount of work, which suits the implementation of a step-by-step interpreter. The presentation follows the derivation done by Sestoft [22].

4.1 Configurations

Because our big-step semantics has two mutually recursive judgments, we introduce a *control* component that keeps track of the current evaluation mode.

C		control
$C ::=$	$E e$	evaluate expression e
	$ M A m$	evaluate matching m with arguments A

Heap	Control	RetStack	rule
Γ	$E(e\ y)$	S	$\text{APP1} \Rightarrow$
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$E\ e$	$y : S$	
Γ	$E\ \lambda m$	$y : S$	$\text{APP2} \Rightarrow$
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$E\ \lambda(y \triangleright m)$	S	
if $\#m > 0$			
Γ	$E\ \lambda m$	S	$\text{SAT} \Rightarrow$
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$M\ []\ m$	$\$: S$	
if $\#m = 0$			
$\Gamma[y \mapsto e]$	$E\ y$	S	$\text{VAR} \Rightarrow$
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$E\ e$	$!y : S$	
Γ	$E\ w$	$!y : S$	$\text{UPDATE} \Rightarrow$
$\Rightarrow \Gamma[y \mapsto w]$	$E\ w$	S	

Figure 6. Abstract machine rules for expressions.

The next step is to make evaluation order explicit in a *stack*, which is a list of *continuations* κ :

κ	continuations
$\kappa ::= y$	push argument
$!y$	push update
$\$$	end matching
$?(A, m)$	push alternative
$@(A, c(\vec{p}) \Rightarrow m)$	push pattern

A machine configuration is a triple (Γ, C, S) of heap, control, and return stack. The initial configuration for evaluating e is $(\{\}, E\ e, [])$. Evaluation may terminate successfully in a configuration $(\Gamma, E\ w, [])$, get “stuck” in a configuration $(\Gamma, M\ A\ \not\downarrow, \$: S)$ due to pattern matching failure, or continue indefinitely (i.e. diverge).

4.2 Transitions

The transitions between configurations are given by rules in Figures 6 and 7. Meta-variables that appear on the left-hand side and right-hand side are unmodified. For example: rule $\text{APP1} \Rightarrow$ applies on any heap and stack, and does not modify the heap, but pushes a single continuation onto the stack.

Rules $\text{APP1} \Rightarrow$, $\text{VAR} \Rightarrow$, $\text{UPDATE} \Rightarrow$ are identical to the ones in the first version of Sestoft’s abstract machine [22].

Rule $\text{APP2} \Rightarrow$ and $\text{SAT} \Rightarrow$ handle application and matching evaluations, respectively. Note that the side conditions on $\#m$ ensure at most one rule applies. As in the big-step semantics, rule $\text{SAT} \Rightarrow$ switches from evaluating an expression to a matching, pushing a mark ‘\$’ onto the return stack to allow checking when no pending alternatives are available (rule $\text{RETURN1B} \Rightarrow$).

Rule $\text{CONS1} \Rightarrow$ switches from evaluating a matching to an expression in order to perform a pattern match, pushing a

continuation onto the return stack. Rule $\text{CONS2} \Rightarrow$ and $\text{FAIL} \Rightarrow$ handle the successful and unsuccessful matches. Rules $\text{ALT1} \Rightarrow$ and $\text{ALT2} \Rightarrow$ deal with alternatives. Rule $\text{ARG} \Rightarrow$ pushes arguments on the local argument stack. Finally, rule $\text{WHERE} \Rightarrow$ is analogous to Sestoft’s rule for let.

4.3 Consistency Between the Two Semantics

Now that we have introduced both a big-step semantics and an abstract machine, we show they are consistent with each other. The methodology follows that of Sestoft [22] and uses induction on the derivations. We present only the definitions and main statements; the proofs are straightforward but tedious.

The first result states that a big-step evaluation corresponds to a sequence of small-step transitions in the machine. Because the evaluation of expressions and matchings are mutually recursive, we must prove the result for both evaluations simultaneously. We use \Rightarrow^* for the reflexive and transitive closure of the small-step transition relation.

Theorem 4.1 (\Downarrow implies \Rightarrow^*). *If $\Gamma; L; e \Downarrow_E \Delta; w$ then, for all S , $(\Gamma, E\ e, S) \Rightarrow^* (\Delta, E\ w, S)$.*

If $\Gamma; L; A; m \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu$ then, for all S , $(\Gamma, M\ A\ m, S) \Rightarrow^ (\Delta, M\ []\ \mu, S)$*

Proof. This result can be proved by simultaneous induction on the height of the derivations of \Downarrow_E and \Downarrow_M . \square

The second result establishes that the small-step semantics derives only evaluations corresponding to the big-step semantics, provided we restrict ourselves to *balanced* evaluations.

Definition 4.2. A sequence of evaluation steps $(\Gamma, C, S) \Rightarrow^* (\Delta, C', S)$ is *balanced* if the initial and final stacks are identical and every intermediate stack is of the form $S' = \kappa_1 : \kappa_2 : \dots : \kappa_n : S$, i.e. an extension of the initial stack.

Definition 4.3. The *trace* of a sequence of small-step evaluation steps $(\Gamma, C, S) \Rightarrow^* (\Delta, C', S')$ is the sequence of rules used in the evaluation.

Definition 4.4. Let $!S$ be the set of locations marked for updates in a stack S , i.e. $!S = \{y : (!y) \in S\}$.

Theorem 4.5 (\Rightarrow^* implies \Downarrow). *If $(\Gamma, E\ e, S) \Rightarrow^* (\Delta, E\ w, S)$ is a balanced expression evaluation then $\Gamma; !S; e \Downarrow_E \Delta; w$.*

If $(\Gamma, M\ A\ m, S) \Rightarrow^ (\Delta, M\ []\ \mu, S)$ is a balanced matching evaluation then $\Gamma; !S; A; m \Downarrow_M \Delta; \mu$*

Proof. The proof is by induction on the height of balanced derivations. \square

As a direct consequence of Theorem 4.5, we conclude that an abstract machine evaluation starting with an empty stack must correspond to a successful big-step evaluation, with identical resulting whnf and heap.

Heap	Control	RetStack	Rule
Γ	$M A \uparrow e \downarrow$	S	RETURN1A \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$M [] \uparrow A \triangleright e \downarrow$	S	
if $A \neq []$			
Γ	$M [] \uparrow e \downarrow$	$\$: S$	RETURN1B \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$E e$	S	
Γ	$M [] \uparrow e \downarrow$	$(?(A', m)) : S$	RETURN2 \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$M [] \uparrow e \downarrow$	S	
Γ	$M (y : A) (x \Rightarrow m)$	S	BIND \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$M A m[y/x]$	S	
Γ	$M (y : A) (c(\vec{p}) \Rightarrow m)$	S	CONS1 \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$E y$	$@(A, c(\vec{p}) \Rightarrow m) : S$	
Γ	$E c(y_1, \dots, y_n)$	$@(A, c(p_1, \dots, p_n) \Rightarrow m) : S$	CONS2 \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$M A (y_1 \triangleright p_1 \Rightarrow \dots y_n \triangleright p_n \Rightarrow m)$	S	
Γ	$E c'(y_1, \dots, y_k)$	$@(A, c(p_1, \dots, p_n) \Rightarrow m) : S$	FAIL \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$M [] \downarrow \zeta$	S	
if $c \neq c'$			
Γ	$M A (y \triangleright m)$	S	ARG \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$M (y : A) m$	S	
Γ	$M A (m_1 \mid m_2)$	S	ALT1 \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$M A m_1$	$?(A, m_2) : S$	
Γ	$M A' \downarrow \zeta$	$?(A, m) : S$	ALT2 \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma$	$M A m$	S	
Γ	$M A (m \text{ where } \{x_i = e_i\})$	S	WHERE \Rightarrow
$\Rightarrow \Gamma[y_i \mapsto \widehat{e}_i]$	$M A \widehat{m}$	S	
where y_i are fresh and $\widehat{e}_i = e_i[y_1/x_1, \dots, y_n/x_n]$ and $\widehat{m} = m[y_1/x_1, \dots, y_n/x_n]$			

Figure 7. Abstract machine rules for matchings.

Corollary 4.6. *If $(\Gamma, E e, []) \Rightarrow^* (\Delta, E w, [])$ then $\Gamma; \emptyset; e \Downarrow_E \Delta; w$.*

Proof. The result follows from the first statement of Theorem 4.5 when $S = []$. \square

5 Implementation

5.1 Overview

The abstract machine derived in Section 4 forms the basis for *Haskelite*, a web-based interpreter for a small subset of Haskell. The interpreter is written in *Elm*⁶ and consists of:

1. a parser for translating a subset of Haskell into λ PMC (written using Elm's parser combinator library);
2. a simple type checker based on the Hindley-Milner system;

3. an abstract machine based on the semantics of Section 4;
4. pretty-printing code for expressions and the evaluation state;
5. a subset of the Haskell Prelude, implemented in the Haskelite language itself and bundled with the interpreter.

The interpreter compiles to JavaScript and runs from an HTML page entirely on the client side (i.e. the web browser). We also use an open-source JavaScript editor supporting syntax highlighting.⁷ The application requires little resources by today's web standards and runs on computers, tablets, or even smartphones. The minimized JavaScript file for the interpreter (excluding the text editor) is around 100 KB. On a selection of typical functional programming introductory

⁶<https://elm-lang.org>

⁷<https://codemirror.net/>


```

insert x [] = [x]
insert x (y:ys) | x<=y = x:y:ys
                 | otherwise = y:insert x ys

insert = λ(x ⇒ [] ⇒ [x : []], "insert x [] = [x]")
         | x ⇒ (y : ys) ⇒ x ≤ y ▷ True ⇒ [x : y : ys, "insert x (y:ys) | x<=y = x:y:ys"]
         | x ⇒ (y : ys) ⇒ [y : insert x ys, "insert x (y:ys) | otherwise = y:insert x ys"]

```

Figure 8. Annotated translation of insert into λ PMC.

examples the web page consumes between 5–30 MB of memory when running.⁸

The evaluator follows the rules of Figures 6 and 7 using purely functional data structures for stacks and heap. Since evaluations are likely to be of small examples, there is no garbage collector.⁹ We have also added primitive values and operations over integers and characters; these straightforward to implement, so we omit the details in this paper.

The normalization of expressions and matchings (Section 3.1) is done by introducing indirection bindings for arguments that are not atomic. Indirection bindings are short-circuited during pretty-printing, so that the students are unaware of the normalization; this allows presenting evaluation as if it were performed on an expression rather than a graph.¹⁰

5.2 Producing Traces

We avoid showing all transition steps of the abstract machine for two reasons:

- the transition steps are too fine-grained, resulting in many uninteresting intermediate configurations, e.g. after a partial application (rules $\text{APP1}\Rightarrow$ and $\text{APP2}\Rightarrow$);
- we do not want to expose the details of λ PMC to students, in particular, the evaluations of matchings which cannot be easily translated back into Haskell.

Our solution is to show only configurations after two kinds of transitions:

1. the evaluation of primitive operations (e.g. integers); and
2. matching evaluations that return an expression (rule $\text{RETURN1B}\Rightarrow$).

Obtaining equations for primitive operations is trivial (e.g. $2 * 3 = 6$). For matching evaluations, we simply collect the equations from the Haskell source during parsing and annotate the λ PMC abstract syntax. Figure 8 shows an example translation of insert into annotated λ PMC.

⁸Measured using Firefox’s web developer’s tools on an Ubuntu Linux AMD64 PC.

⁹Also, because the interpreter keeps the evaluation history, a garbage collector would probably reclaim less free space than a real implementation.

¹⁰To ensure termination for cyclic structures, we limit the short-circuiting to the first traversal of a cycle.

To show configurations we transform the return stack into an evaluation context around the current expression. When the return stack contains pending matchings (i.e. during the evaluation of guards), we simply hide the remaining continuations and show only the stack depth as a sequence of dots (see Figures 1 and 2). This simple solution highlights the current evaluation context while also limiting the size of the visualized expressions.

5.3 Evaluating Constructors to Normal Form

The semantics of Sections 3 and 4 evaluate only to weak head normal form, i.e. the outermost data constructor. In a read-eval-print loop such as GHCi, full evaluation is done by converting the result into a string.

In Haskelite we implement full evaluation as a function $\text{force} :: a \rightarrow a$ that finds the next outermost redex in a constructor and continues evaluation. Unlike the Haskell function of the same name, force is built-in rather than defined in a type class (which we do not support anyway).

Forcing is implicitly done for the outermost expression under evaluation; this works even with infinite data structures, e.g. lists, showing evaluation step-by-step. Furthermore, force can also be explicitly called to force full evaluation of (finite) intermediate data structures for pedagogical reasons.

5.4 Bang Patterns

We have added GHC’s *bang patterns* extension [12] to our implementation: matching a pattern of the form $!x$ succeeds binding a variable x with any value, provided we can reduce it to whnf before continuing.

The changes to the abstract machine consist of just two new rules:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\Gamma \quad M (y : A) (!x \Rightarrow m) \quad S \\
\Rightarrow \Gamma \quad E y \quad !(A, m[y/x]) : S \quad \text{BANG1}\Rightarrow \\
\\
\Gamma \quad E w \quad !(A, m) : S \quad \text{BANG2}\Rightarrow \\
\Rightarrow \Gamma \quad M A m \quad S
\end{array}$$

The continuation $!(A, m[y/x])$ records what to do after evaluation of y . We handle the binding of x to y in rule $\text{BANG1}\Rightarrow$; rule $\text{BANG2}\Rightarrow$ applies after the evaluation of y to

whnf (and its result is updated in the heap); hence, we can simply ignore the whnf w and evaluate the matching m .

Bang patterns can be used to define a variant of the `foldl` with a strict accumulator:

```
foldl' f z [] = z
foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs
```

Figure 9 show the traces for `foldl` and `foldl'` applied to the same arguments. It is immediate that `foldl` accumulates an unevaluated expression while `foldl'` reduces the accumulator at each recursion step, thus avoiding a space leak.

One pitfall that programmers need to be aware of is that `foldl'` forces evaluation of the accumulator *only* to whnf; this means that we can still get space leaks with lazy data types, e.g. tuples. Consider the function `sumcount` that computes the pair with the length and sum of a list of numbers:

```
sumcount = foldl' step (0,0)
step (n,s) x = (1+n,s+x)
```

Although we are using the strict `foldl'`, the accumulator is a (lazy) pair, hence `sumcount` still exhibits space leaks. This can be solved by adding strictness annotations in the components of the pair [19]:

```
sumcount = foldl' step (0,0)
step (!n,!s) x = (1+n,s+x)
```

Figure 10 shows the evaluation traces for both versions; observing the trace on the right, we can see that the components of the pair are evaluated at each folding step, whereas the trace on the left builds up two expressions that are evaluated after the fold. Hence, Haskellite traces can also be used to *explain operational issues of lazy evaluation at a high-level* without having to explain implementation concepts such as thunks or examining GHC's Core or STG output.

6 Related Work

The basis for our work is the pattern-matching calculus of Kahl [10]. The principle differences are: (1) we add a where binding construct to name sub-expressions; (2) we define an operational semantics and normal forms for a call-by-need evaluation strategy; (3) we do not consider the “empty expression” corresponding to a pattern matching failure $\lambda\zeta$; there is simply no evaluation in such cases. The definitions of matching arity and whnf's in Section 3 are also novel.

Chapter 4 of the classic textbook by Peyton Jones [20] defines the semantics of pattern matching using lambda abstractions with patterns $\lambda p.E$ together with a FAIL expression and a “fatbar” operator. This semantics is denotational and serves primarily as the basis for defining the correctness of compilation into case expressions presented in the subsequent chapter.

Mitchell and Runciman have proposed the *Catch* static analyser for pattern matching safety in Haskell [14, 15], namely checking that pattern matchings are *exhaustive* and *non-redundant*. The analysis is defined by translating the source program

into a first-order core language with only simple case expressions solving a set of generated constraints. This work is therefore orthogonal to the contribution presented in this paper.

Hat is a suite of tools for transforming Haskell 98 programs to generate runtime traces and inspecting the resulting traces [4, 5] in various ways, including for debugging or program comprehension. Unlike Haskellite, *Hat* supports full Haskell 98 and produces traces as an output file, which works only for terminating programs (or at least programs that were interrupted by the user). The *hat-observe* tool allows inspecting the arguments and results of top-level functions, similarly to the traces Haskellite produces. However, it does not highlight which equations were used.

There are many teaching tools for the evaluation of computer programs. One of the most popular is *Python tutor*, a website that allows visualizing the execution of Python, JavaScript, C, C++ and Java programs [6, 7]. The computational model is strictly imperative: the program state is visualized as a pointer to the current instruction and the current values of variables in scope.

In the functional programming community there is a long tradition of teaching languages based on Scheme; *DrScheme* (now *DrRacket*) is an IDE for programming used for teaching which includes a graphical debugger. This allows setting breakpoints, inspecting variables and step-by-step execution. There is even a web-based version [25]. However, Scheme does not encourage reasoning by pattern-matching and equations that we are interested in teaching [24].

Hazel is a live-programming environment based on a dialect of the Elm language designed for teaching [18]. It is part of a larger research goal on contextual editors based on *typed holes*, where editing states of incomplete programs are given a formal meaning [17]; the subsequent publication [26] presents a small-step semantics for evaluation which preserves the ordering among possibly overlapping patterns (this is necessary to be able to give a semantics to a program with pattern holes). However, the *Hazel* language is strict rather than lazy, which simplifies the operational semantics but also means that the technique does not transfer to the lazy setting.

More closely related to our work, Olmer et al. have developed a step-by-step evaluator for a subset of Haskell used in a tutoring environment [16]. The evaluator is based on a general tool for defining rewriting systems and supports different strategies (innermost or outermost); it can also be used to check student's traces against an expected strategy. However, unlike our operational semantics and interpreter, it does not implement a lazy evaluation strategy and does not support guards. Additionally, students are unable to provide their own function definitions.

<pre> foldl (*) 1 [2, 3, 4] { foldl f z (x:xs) = foldl f (f z x) xs } = foldl (*) (1 * 2) [3, 4] { foldl f z (x:xs) = foldl f (f z x) xs } = foldl (*) ((1 * 2) * 3) [4] { foldl f z (x:xs) = foldl f (f z x) xs } = foldl (*) (((1 * 2) * 3) * 4) [] { foldl f z [] = z } = ((1 * 2) * 3) * 4 { 1 * 2 = 2 } = (2 * 3) * 4 { 2 * 3 = 6 } = 6 * 4 { 6 * 4 = 24 } = 24 </pre>	<pre> foldl' (*) 1 [2, 3, 4] { foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs } = foldl' (*) (1 * 2) [3, 4] { 1 * 2 = 2 } = ... 2 { foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs } = foldl' (*) (2 * 3) [4] { 2 * 3 = 6 } = ... 6 { foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs } = foldl' (*) (6 * 4) [] { 6 * 4 = 24 } = ... 24 { foldl' f !z [] = z } = 24 </pre>
---	---

Figure 9. Evaluation traces for foldl and foldl'.

<pre> sumcount [1, 2, 3] { sumcount = foldl' step (0,0) } = foldl' step (0, 0) [1, 2, 3] { foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs } = foldl' step (step (0, 0) 1) [2, 3] { step (n,s) x = (1+n,x+s) } = ... (1 + 0, 1 + 0) { foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs } = foldl' step (step (1 + 0, 1 + 0) 2) [3] { step (n,s) x = (1+n,x+s) } = ... (1 + (1 + 0), 2 + (1 + 0)) { foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs } = foldl' step (step (1 + (1 + 0), 2 + (1 + 0)) 3) [] { foldl' f z [] = z } = step (1 + (1 + 0), 2 + (1 + 0)) 3 { step (n,s) x = (1+n,x+s) } = (1 + (1 + (1 + 0)), 3 + (2 + (1 + 0))) { 1 + 0 = 1 } = (1 + (1 + 1), 3 + (2 + (1 + 0))) { 1 + 1 = 2 } = (1 + 2, 3 + (2 + (1 + 0))) { 1 + 2 = 3 } = (3, 3 + (2 + (1 + 0))) { 1 + 0 = 1 } = (3, 3 + (2 + 1)) { 2 + 1 = 3 } = (3, 3 + 3) { 3 + 3 = 6 } = (3, 6) </pre>	<pre> sumcount [1, 2, 3] { sumcount = foldl' step (0,0) } = foldl' step (0, 0) [1, 2, 3] { foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs } = foldl' step (step (0, 0) 1) [2, 3] { step (!n,!s) x = (1+n,x+s) } = ... (1 + 0, 1 + 0) { foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs } = foldl' step (step (1 + 0, 1 + 0) 2) [3] { 1 + 0 = 1 } = 1 { 1 + 0 = 1 } = 1 { step (!n,!s) x = (1+n,x+s) } = ... (1 + 1, 2 + 1) { foldl' f !z (x:xs) = foldl' f (f z x) xs } = foldl' step (step (1 + 1, 2 + 1) 3) [] { foldl' f z [] = z } = step (1 + 1, 2 + 1) 3 { 1 + 1 = 2 } = 2 { 2 + 1 = 3 } = 3 { step (!n,!s) x = (1+n,x+s) } = (1 + 2, 3 + 3) { 1 + 2 = 3 } = (3, 3 + 3) { 3 + 3 = 6 } = (3, 6) </pre>
--	--

Figure 10. Evaluation traces for two versions of sumcount.

7 Conclusion and Further Work

This paper presented a tracing interpreter based on λ PMC, a small lazy functional language based on a pattern matching calculus together with two operational semantics: a big-step

semantics in the style of Launchbury and an abstract machine in the style of Sestoft. The principal contribution of λ PMC is that translating a source language such as Haskell

is more direct than with case expressions: each equation corresponds to one alternative in a matching abstraction. Furthermore, we have shown that λ PMC can seamlessly handle extensions such as bang patterns. Finally, we have described an implementation of a tracing interpreter based on this abstract machine used for teaching a subset of Haskell.

A number of directions for extending this work are possible:

Binding patterns. λ PMC does not allow patterns to occur in `let` or `where` bindings. It may appear that we could re-use matchings to translate a pattern binding:

$$\text{let } p = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \equiv \lambda(e_1 \triangleright (p \Rightarrow e_2)) \quad (4)$$

However, the above translation would not work if the binding is recursive (i.e. the pattern variables of p occur in e_1). Moreover, it does not respect the Haskell semantics: pattern bindings should introduce *irrefutable patterns* [13]; this means that the matching should be delayed until the pattern variables are used. One approach for dealing with this is to employ the translation of irrefutable patterns into simple patterns as defined in the Haskell report. Alternatively, we could investigate adding irrefutable patterns explicitly to λ PMC.

List comprehensions. We have not included support for list comprehensions in our interpreter; this is because the semantics for comprehensions is defined by translation into higher-order functions [13] instead of an equational theory. One alternative would be to perform the translations as part of the rewriting steps. However, this may be confusing to students, as comprehensions are sometimes introduced before higher-order functions [8].

I/O and effects. We have only so far considered tracing purely functional programs. However, we do cover I/O in our introductory functional programming course. It would also be interesting to be able to show evaluation of I/O code. One of the challenges is to balance simplicity with abstraction: should we de-sugar `do`-notation into monadic operations or keep it as a kind of pseudo-imperative layer? More experimentation is required to find the most effective approaches.

Improving the interpreter UI. The user interface in our implementation is currently rather basic; in particular, there are no mechanisms for skipping evaluation steps, controlling the granularity of evaluations or the depth of pretty-printing. Being able to control evaluation directly from the UI might also be useful (for example, introducing `force` for strict evaluation). Additional feedback from students could be helpful here.

Educational assessment. We are currently teaching an introductory functional programming course where students

are using Haskelite while learning. Feedback from this experiment will be helpful to understand how useful is the interpreter and possible improvements to be made.

References

- [1] Lennart Augustsson. Compiling pattern matching. In Jean-Pierre Jouannaud, editor, *Functional Programming Languages and Computer Architecture*, pages 368–381, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1985. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-39677-2.
- [2] Richard Bird. *Thinking Functionally with Haskell*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [3] Richard Bird and Philip Wadler. *Introduction to Functional Programming*. Prentice-Hall, 1988.
- [4] Olaf Chitil, Colin Runciman, and Malcolm Wallace. Transforming haskell for tracing. In Ricardo Peña and Thomas Arts, editors, *Implementation of Functional Languages*, pages 165–181, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-44854-9.
- [5] York Functional Programming Group. Hat - the Haskell tracer. <https://www.cs.york.ac.uk/fp/hat/>, 2008.
- [6] Philip J. Guo. Python tutor. <https://pythontutor.com/>. [Online; accessed May 2024].
- [7] Philip J. Guo. Online Python tutor: Embeddable web-based program visualization for Cs education. In *Proceeding of the 44th ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education, SIGCSE '13*, page 579–584, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450318686. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2445196.2445368>.
- [8] Graham Hutton. *Programming in Haskell*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, 2016.
- [9] Simon L. Peyton Jones. Implementing lazy functional languages on stock hardware: the spineless tagless g-machine. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 2(2):127–202, 1992. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095679680000319>.
- [10] Wolfram Kahl. Basic pattern matching calculi: a fresh view on matching failure. In Yuki Yoshi Kameyama and Peter J. Stuckey, editors, *Functional and Logic Programming*, pages 276–290, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-24754-8. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-24754-8_20.
- [11] John Launchbury. A natural semantics for lazy evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, POPL '93, page 144–154, New York, NY, USA, 1993. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 0897915607. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/158511.158618>.
- [12] GHC maintainers. Ghc user guide, 2023. URL https://downloads.haskell.org/~ghc/7.8.4/docs/html/users_guide/bang-patterns.html.
- [13] Simon Marlow. Haskell 2010 language report, 2023. URL <https://www.haskell.org/onlinereport/haskell2010/>.
- [14] Neil Mitchell and Colin Runciman. A static checker for safe pattern matching in Haskell. *Trends in Functional Programming Volume 6*, page 15, 2005.
- [15] Neil Mitchell and Colin Runciman. Not all patterns, but enough: an automatic verifier for partial but sufficient pattern matching. *SIGPLAN Notices*, 44(2):49–60, sep 2008. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1543134.1411293>.
- [16] Tim Olmer, Bastiaan Heeren, and Johan Jeuring. Evaluating Haskell expressions in a tutoring environment. 170:50–66. ISSN 2075-2180. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.170.4>.
- [17] Cyrus Omar, Ian Voysey, Michael Hilton, Joshua Sunshine, Claire Le Goues, Jonathan Aldrich, and Matthew A. Hammer. Toward semantic foundations for program editors. In *Summit on Advances in Programming Languages (SNAPL)*, volume 71 of *LIPICs*, pages 11:1–11:12. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.SNAPL.2017.11>.

- [18] Cyrus Omar, Ian Voysey, Ravi Chugh, and Matthew A. Hammer. Live functional programming with typed holes. *PACMPL*, 3(POPL), 2019. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290327>.
- [19] Bryan O’Sullivan, John Goerzen, and Don Stewart. *Real World Haskell*. O’Reilly Media, 2008.
- [20] Simon Peyton-Jones. *The implementation of functional languages*. Prentice-Hall, 1987.
- [21] Norman Ramsey. *Programming Languages: Build, Prove, and Compare*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [22] Peter Sestoft. Deriving a lazy abstract machine. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 7:231–264, 05 1997. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796897002712>.
- [23] Simon Thompson. *Haskell: The Craft of Functional Programming*. Addison-Wesley, 3rd edition, 2011.
- [24] Philip Wadler. A critique of Abelson and Sussman or why calculating is better than scheming. *SIGPLAN Notices*, 22(3):83–94, 1987. ISSN 0362-1340. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/24697.24706>.
- [25] Danny Yoo, Emmanuel Schanzer, Shriram Krishnamurthi, and Kathi Fisler. WeScheme: The browser is your programming environment. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Joint Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education*, ITiCSE ’11, page 163–167, New York, NY, USA, 2011. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450306973. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1999747.1999795>.
- [26] Yongwei Yuan, Scott Guest, Eric Griffis, Hannah Potter, David Moon, and Cyrus Omar. Live pattern matching with typed holes. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 7(OOPSLA1), apr 2023. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586048>.

This figure "acm-jdslogo.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2407.11831v1>