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Storage Classes and Memory Layout

Stack: objects created/destroyed in last-in, first-out order

Heap: objects created/destroyed in any order; automatic garbage collection optional

Static: objects allocated at compile time; persist throughout run
Static Objects

```java
class Example {
    public static final int a = 3;

    public void hello() {
        System.out.println("Hello");
    }
}
```

Examples

- Static class variable
- Code for hello method
- String constant “Hello”
- Information about the Example class

Advantages

- Zero-cost memory management
- Often faster access (address a constant)
- No out-of-memory danger

Disadvantages

- Size and number must be known beforehand
- Wasteful if sharing is possible
The Stack and Activation Records
Stack-Allocated Objects

Natural for supporting recursion.

Idea: some objects persist from when a procedure is called to when it returns.

Naturally implemented with a stack: linear array of memory that grows and shrinks at only one boundary.

Each invocation of a procedure gets its own frame (activation record) where it stores its own local variables and bookkeeping information.
An Activation Record: The State Before Calling `bar`

```c
int foo(int a, int b) {
    int c, d;
    bar(1, 2, 3);
}
```
Recursive Fibonacci

(Real C)

```c
int fib(int n) {
    if (n<2)
        return 1;
    else
        return fib(n-1) + fib(n-2);
}
```

(Assembly-like C)

```c
int fib(int n) {
    int tmp1, tmp2, tmp3;
    tmp1 = n < 2;
    if (!tmp1) goto L1;
    return 1;
L1: tmp1 = n - 1;
    tmp2 = fib(tmp1);
L2: tmp1 = n - 2;
    tmp3 = fib(tmp1);
L3: tmp1 = tmp2 + tmp3;
    return tmp1;
}
```

```
fib(3) └── fib(2) └── fib(1) └── fib(1) └── fib(0)
```
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Executing fib(3)

```c
int fib(int n) {
    int tmp1, tmp2, tmp3;
    tmp1 = n < 2;
    if (!tmp1) goto L1;
    return 1;
    L1: tmp1 = n - 1;
        tmp2 = fib(tmp1);
    L2: tmp1 = n - 2;
        tmp3 = fib(tmp1);
    L3: tmp1 = tmp2 + tmp3;
        return tmp1;
}
```

n = 3
return address
last frame pointer
 tmp1 = 3 ← result
 tmp2 = 2
 tmp3 = 1
Local arrays with fixed size are easy to stack.

```c
void foo()
{
    int a;
    int b[10];
    int c;
}
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>return address</th>
<th>← FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b[9]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b[0]</td>
<td>← FP – 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variable-sized local arrays aren’t as easy.

```c
void foo(int n)
{
    int a;
    int b[n];
    int c;
}
```

![Diagram showing memory allocation and expected offset for c]

Doesn’t work: generated code expects a fixed offset for c. Even worse for multi-dimensional arrays.
Allocating Variable-Sized Arrays

As always:
add a level of indirection

```c
void foo(int n)
{
    int a;
    int b[n];
    int c;
}
```

Variables remain constant offset from frame pointer.
Nesting Function Definitions

```plaintext
let articles words =
    let report w =
        let count = List.length (List.filter ((=) w) words)
        in w ^ "": " " ^ string_of_int count
    in String.concat ", "
        (List.map report ["a"; "the"])
    in articles
        ["the"; "plt"; "class"; "is"; "a"; "pain"; "in"; "the"; "butt"]

let count words w = List.length (List.filter ((=) w) words) in
let report words w = w ^ "": " " ^ string_of_int (count words w) in
let articles words = String.concat ", "
    (List.map (report words) ["a"; "the"])

articles
    ["the"; "plt"; "class"; "is"; "a"; "pain"; "in"; "the"; "butt"]
```

Produces “a: 1, the: 2”
Implementing Nested Functions with Access Links

```ml
let a x s =
  let b y =
    let c z = z + s in
    let d w = c (w+1) in
    d (y+1) (* b *)
  in
  let e q = b (q+1) in
  e (x+1) (* a *)
```

What does “a 5 42” give?

(a: `x = 5
  s = 42`)
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Implementing Nested Functions with Access Links

```
let a x s =
  let b y =
    let c z = z + s in
    let d w = c (w+1) in
    d (y+1) (* b *)
  in
  let e q = b (q+1) in
  e (x+1) (* a *)
```

What does “a 5 42” give?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Link</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a:</td>
<td>x = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s = 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e:</td>
<td>q = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b:</td>
<td>y = 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementing Nested Functions with Access Links

```plaintext
let a x s =
  let b y =
    let c z = z + s in
    let d w = c (w+1) in
    d (y+1) in (* b *)
  in (* e *)
let e q = b (q+1) in
  e (x+1) (* a *)
```

What does “a 5 42” give?
Implementing Nested Functions with Access Links

```
let a x s =
    let b y =
        let c z = z + s in
        let d w = c (w+1) in
        d (y+1) (* b *)
    in
    let e q = b (q+1) in
    e (x+1) (* a *)
```

What does “a 5 42” give?
In-Memory Layout Issues
Modern processors have byte-addressable memory.

The IBM 360 (c. 1964) helped to popularize byte-addressable memory.

Many data types (integers, addresses, floating-point numbers) are wider than a byte.

16-bit integer: 1 0
32-bit integer: 3 2 1 0
Layout of Records and Unions

Modern memory systems read data in 32-, 64-, or 128-bit chunks:

Reading an aligned 32-bit value is fast: a single operation.

It is harder to read an unaligned value: two reads plus shifting

SPARC and ARM prohibit unaligned accesses

MIPS has special unaligned load/store instructions

x86, 68k run more slowly with unaligned accesses
Padding

To avoid unaligned accesses, the C compiler pads the layout of unions and records.

Rules:

- Each $n$-byte object must start on a multiple of $n$ bytes (no unaligned accesses).
- Any object containing an $n$-byte object must be of size $mn$ for some integer $m$ (aligned even when arrayed).

```c
struct padded {
    int x;    /* 4 bytes */
    char z;   /* 1 byte */
    short y;  /* 2 bytes */
    char w;   /* 1 byte */
};
```

```c
struct padded {
    char a;   /* 1 byte */
    short b;  /* 2 bytes */
    short c;  /* 2 bytes */
};
```
Unions

A C struct has a separate space for each field; a C union shares one space among all fields

```c
union intchar {
    int i; /* 4 bytes */
    char c; /* 1 byte */
};

union twostructs {
    struct {
        char c; /* 1 byte */
        int i; /* 4 bytes */
    } a;
    struct {
        short s1; /* 2 bytes */
        short s2; /* 2 bytes */
    } b;
};
```

or

```c

or
```
Arrays

Basic policy in C: an array is just one object after another in memory.

```c
int a[10];
```

This is why you need padding at the end of structs.

```c
struct {
    int a;
    char c;
} b[2];
```
Arrays and Aggregate types

The largest primitive type dictates the alignment

```
struct {
    short a;
    short b;
    char c;
} d[4];
```
Arrays of Arrays

```c
char a[4];

char a[3][4];
```
The Heap
Heap-Allocated Storage

Static works when you know everything beforehand and always need it.

Stack enables, but also requires, recursive behavior.

A heap is a region of memory where blocks can be allocated and deallocated in any order.

(These heaps are different than those in, e.g., heapsort)
struct point {
    int x, y;
};

int play_with_points(int n) {
    int i;
    struct point *points;

    points = malloc(n * sizeof(struct point));

    for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
        points[i].x = random();
        points[i].y = random();
    }

    /* do something with the array */

    free(points);
}

Dynamic Storage Allocation
Dynamic Storage Allocation

↓ free( )
↓ malloc( )
Dynamic Storage Allocation

\[ \text{malloc} \]

\[ \downarrow \text{free} \]
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Dynamic Storage Allocation

↓ free(
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Dynamic Storage Allocation

\[
\text{free( } \cdot \text{ )} \\
\text{malloc( } \cdot \text{ )}
\]
Dynamic Storage Allocation

Rules:
- Each allocated block contiguous (no holes)
- Blocks stay fixed once allocated

malloc()
- Find an area large enough for requested block
- Mark memory as allocated

free()
- Mark the block as unallocated
Simple Dynamic Storage Allocation

Maintaining information about free memory
  Simplest: Linked list

The algorithm for locating a suitable block
  Simplest: First-fit

The algorithm for freeing an allocated block
  Simplest: Coalesce adjacent free blocks
Simple Dynamic Storage Allocation
Simple Dynamic Storage Allocation

malloc( )
Simple Dynamic Storage Allocation

```
SN
```

```
malloc(       )
```

```
SS
SN
```

```
S
SS
SN
```

```
```
Simple Dynamic Storage Allocation

malloc

free

malloc

free
Simple Dynamic Storage Allocation

malloc()
Dynamic Storage Allocation

Many, many other approaches.
Other “fit” algorithms
Segregation of objects by size
More clever data structures
Heap Variants

Memory pools: Differently-managed heap areas
Stack-based pool: only free whole pool at once
   Nice for build-once data structures
Single-size-object pool:
   Fit, allocation, etc. much faster
   Good for object-oriented programs
Fragmentation

malloc( ) seven times give

free() four times gives

malloc( )?

Need more memory; can’t use fragmented memory.

Hockey smile
Fragmentation and Handles

Standard CS solution: Add another layer of indirection. Always reference memory through “handles.”

The original Macintosh did this to save memory.
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Automatic Garbage Collection
Automatic Garbage Collection

Entrust the runtime system with freeing heap objects

Now common: Java, C#, Javascript, Python, Ruby, OCaml and most functional languages

**Advantages**

- Much easier for the programmer
- Greatly improves reliability: no memory leaks, double-freeing, or other memory management errors

**Disadvantages**

- Slower, sometimes unpredictably so
- May consume more memory
Reference Counting

What and when to free?

- Maintain count of references to each object
- Free when count reaches zero

```
let a = (42, 17) in
let b = [a;a] in
let c = (1,2)::b in
b
```
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Reference Counting

What and when to free?

- Maintain count of references to each object
- Free when count reaches zero

let a = (42, 17) in
let b = [a;a] in
let c = (1,2)::b in
b
Issues with Reference Counting

Circular structures defy reference counting:

\[ \text{a} \xrightarrow{\circ} \text{b} \]

Neither is reachable, yet both have non-zero reference counts.

High overhead (must update counts constantly), although incremental
Mark-and-Sweep

What and when to free?

- Stop-the-world algorithm invoked when memory full
- Breadth-first-search marks all reachable memory
- All unmarked items freed

```
let a = (42, 17) in
let b = [a;a] in
let c = (1,2)::b in
b
```
Mark-and-Sweep

What and when to free?

- Stop-the-world algorithm invoked when memory full
- Breadth-first-search marks all reachable memory
- All unmarked items freed

```ocaml
let a = (42, 17) in
let b = [a;a] in
let c = (1,2)::b in
b
```

![Diagram showing memory allocation and garbage collection process]
Mark-and-Sweep

What and when to free?

- Stop-the-world algorithm invoked when memory full
- Breadth-first-search marks all reachable memory
- All unmarked items freed

```ocaml
let a = (42, 17) in
let b = [a;a] in
let c = (1,2)::b in
b
```
Mark-and-Sweep

What and when to free?

- Stop-the-world algorithm invoked when memory full
- Breadth-first-search marks all reachable memory
- All unmarked items freed

```
let a = (42, 17) in
let b = [a;a] in
let c = (1,2)::b in
b
```
Mark-and-Sweep

Mark-and-sweep is faster overall; may induce big pauses

Mark-and-compact variant also moves or copies reachable objects to eliminate fragmentation

Incremental garbage collectors try to avoid doing everything at once

Most objects die young; generational garbage collectors segregate heap objects by age

Parallel garbage collection tricky

Real-time garbage collection tricky
Shared Libraries and Dynamic Linking

The 1980s GUI/WIMP revolution required many large libraries (the Athena widgets, Motif, etc.)

Under a *static linking* model, each executable using a library gets a copy of that library's code.

Address 0:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>libXaw.a</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>libX11.a</td>
<td>xterm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xeyes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>libXaw.a</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>libX11.a</td>
<td>xclock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shared Libraries and Dynamic Linking

The 1980s GUI/WIMP revolution required many large libraries (the Athena widgets, Motif, etc.)

Under a *static linking* model, each executable using a library gets a copy of that library’s code.

Wasteful: running many GUI programs at once fills memory with nearly identical copies of each library.

Something had to be done: another level of indirection.
Shared Libraries: First Attempt

Most code makes assumptions about its location.

First solution (early Unix System V R3) required each shared library to be located at a unique address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>libXaw.so</th>
<th>libXaw.so</th>
<th>libXm.so</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>libX11.so</td>
<td>libX11.so</td>
<td>libX11.so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address 0: xeyes | xterm | netscape
Shared Libraries: First Attempt

Most code makes assumptions about its location.

First solution (early Unix System V R3) required each shared library to be located at a unique address:

```
libXm.so
libXaw.so
libX11.so
```

Obvious disadvantage: must ensure each new shared library located at a new address.

Works fine if there are only a few libraries; tended to discourage their use.
Problem fundamentally is that each program may need to see different libraries *each at a different address*. 
Solution: Require the code for libraries to be position-independent. Make it so they can run anywhere in memory.

As always, add another level of indirection:

- All branching is PC-relative
- All data must be addressed relative to a base register.
- All branching to and from this code must go through a jump table.
Position-Independent Code for bar()

Normal unlinked code

```assembly
save %sp, -112, %sp
sethi %hi(0), %o0
    R_SPARC_HI22 .bss
mov %o0, %o0
    R_SPARC_LO10 .bss
sethi %hi(0), %o1
    R_SPARC_HI22 a
mov %o1, %o1
    R_SPARC_LO10 a
call 14
    R_SPARC_WDISP30 strcpy
nop
sethi %hi(0), %o0
    R_SPARC_HI22 .bss
mov %o0, %o0
    R_SPARC_LO10 .bss
call 24
    R_SPARC_WDISP30 baz
nop
ret
restore
```

gcc -fpic -shared

```assembly
save %sp, -112, %sp
sethi %hi(0x10000), %l7
call 8e0 ! add PC to %l7
add %l7, 0x198, %l7
ld [ %l7 + 0x20 ], %o0
ld [ %l7 + 0x24 ], %o1
    Actually just a stub
call 10a24 ! strcpy
nop
ld [ %l7 + 0x20 ], %o0
    call is PC-relative
call 10a3c ! baz
nop
ret
restore
```
Objects and Inheritance
Single Inheritance
Simple: Add new fields to end of the object
Fields in base class always at same offset in derived class (compiler never reorders)
Consequence: Derived classes can never remove fields

C++
```cpp
class Shape {
    double x, y;
};

class Box : Shape {
    double h, w;
};

class Circle : Shape {
    double r;
};
```

Equivalent C
```c
struct Shape {
    double x, y;
};

struct Box {
    double x, y;
    double h, w;
};

struct Circle {
    double x, y;
    double r;
};
```
Virtual Functions

```cpp
class Shape {
    virtual void draw(); // Invoked by object’s run-time class
}; // not its compile-time type.

class Line : public Shape {
    void draw();
}

class Arc : public Shape {
    void draw();
};

Shape *s[10];
s[0] = new Line;
s[1] = new Arc;
s[0]->draw(); // Invoke Line::draw()
s[1]->draw(); // Invoke Arc::draw()
```
Virtual Functions

Trick: add to each object a pointer to the virtual table for its type, filled with pointers to the virtual functions.

Like the objects themselves, the virtual table for each derived type begins identically.

```cpp
struct A {
    int x;
    virtual void Foo();
    virtual void Bar();
};

struct B : A {
    int y;
    virtual void Foo();
    virtual void Baz();
};

A a1;
A a2;
B b1;
```
Exceptions
C++’s Exceptions

```c++
struct Except {} ex; // This struct functions as an exception

void top(void) {
    try {
        child();
    } catch (Except e) { // throw sends control here
        printf("oops\n");
    }
}

void child() {
    child2();
}

void child2() {
    throw ex; // Pass control up to the catch block
}
```
C's setjmp/longjmp: Idiosyncratic Exceptions

```c
#include <setjmp.h>

jmp_buf closure;     /* return address, stack & frame ptrs. */

void top(void) {
    switch ( setjmp(closure) ) { /* normal: store closure, return 0 */
        /* longjmp jumps here, returns 1 */
        case 0: child();
            break;
        case 1: break;     /* longjmp( ,1) called */
    }
}

void child() {
    child2();
}

void child2() {
    longjmp(closure, 1);  /* unexceptional case */
}
```
Implementing Exceptions

One way: maintain a stack of exception handlers

```plaintext
try {
    child();
} catch (Ex e) {
    foo();
}
void child() {
    child2();
}
void child2() {
    throw ex;
}
push(Ex, Handler); // Push handler on stack
child();
pop(); // Normal termination
goto Exit; // Jump over "catch"
Handler:
    foo(); // Body of "catch"
Exit:
void child() {
    child2();
}
void child2() {
    throw(ex); // Unroll stack; find handler
}
```

Incurs overhead, even when no exceptions thrown
Implementing Exceptions with Tables

Q: When an exception is *thrown*, where was the last *try*?

A: Consult a table: relevant handler or “pop” for every PC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Pop stack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5</td>
<td>Handler @ 5 for Ex1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–15</td>
<td>Pop stack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–18</td>
<td>Handler @ 14 for Ex2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19–21</td>
<td>Pop stack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```java
void foo() {
    try {
        bar();
        catch (Ex1 e) {
            a();
        }
    }
}

void bar() {
    baz();
}

void baz() {
    try {
        throw ex1;
        catch (Ex2 e) {
            b();
        }
    }
}
```