Memory safety is a good thing in that you can't accidentally use a value that has been deallocated: but even better is that ownership also helps with data races

Memory safety is a good thing in that you can't accidentally use a value that has been deallocated: but even better is that ownership also helps with data races

A data race can happen when one memory location is accessed by two threads, at least one doing a write

Memory safety is a good thing in that you can't accidentally use a value that has been deallocated: but even better is that ownership also helps with data races

A data race can happen when one memory location is accessed by two threads, at least one doing a write

A read-only (const) value can be shared; a writable (mutable) value shouldn't be shared (c.f., RW locks)

Memory safety is a good thing in that you can't accidentally use a value that has been deallocated: but even better is that ownership also helps with data races

A data race can happen when one memory location is accessed by two threads, at least one doing a write

A read-only (const) value can be shared; a writable (mutable) value shouldn't be shared (c.f., RW locks)

The Rust compiler can use ownership to track a value and will spot an attempt to modify a shared value and refuse to compile





Rust developers call this "Fearless Concurrency" as the language itself prevents these kinds of data-race



Rust developers call this "Fearless Concurrency" as the language itself prevents these kinds of data-race

Rust provides both mechanism and analysis for concurrency



Rust developers call this "Fearless Concurrency" as the language itself prevents these kinds of data-race

Rust provides both mechanism and analysis for concurrency

This fixes data races: unfortunately the Rust compiler is not (yet?) able to spot non-data-race race conditions, like deadlock



Rust has a classical heavyweight thread approach, with a thread module that contains functions like thread::spawn()



Rust has a classical heavyweight thread approach, with a thread module that contains functions like thread::spawn()

This takes a closure as argument as the thing to execute

Rust has a classical heavyweight thread approach, with a thread module that contains functions like thread::spawn()

This takes a closure as argument as the thing to execute

```
let threadid = thread::spawn(|| foo(x+1,y-1));
...
let val = threadid.join().unwrap();
```



What do we do if we need to mutate a shared value in different threads?



What do we do if we need to mutate a shared value in different threads?

We can use a mutex to sequentialise the accesses



What do we do if we need to mutate a shared value in different threads?

We can use a mutex to sequentialise the accesses

Mutexes can be shared across threads

A Mutex can be used to wrap any data: let mtx = Mutex::new(v);

A Mutex can be used to wrap any data: let mtx = Mutex::new(v);

And now the *only* way of accessing the data that used to be in v is via the mutex: let mut data = mtx.lock().unwrap();

```
A Mutex can be used to wrap any data:
let mtx = Mutex::new(v);
```

And now the *only* way of accessing the data that used to be in v is via the mutex: let mut data = mtx.lock().unwrap();

An important thing here is that the ownership of the value has passed to within the mutex mtx, and so is no longer available from the variable v

A Mutex can be used to wrap any data: let mtx = Mutex::new(v);

And now the *only* way of accessing the data that used to be in v is via the mutex: let mut data = mtx.lock().unwrap();

An important thing here is that the ownership of the value has passed to within the mutex mtx, and so is no longer available from the variable v

This prevents accidental direct access to the data, and this is checked and enforced by the compiler: we can't accidentally use \ensuremath{v}

A Mutex can be used to wrap any data: let mtx = Mutex::new(v);

And now the *only* way of accessing the data that used to be in v is via the mutex: let mut data = mtx.lock().unwrap();

An important thing here is that the ownership of the value has passed to within the mutex mtx, and so is no longer available from the variable v

This prevents accidental direct access to the data, and this is checked and enforced by the compiler: we can't accidentally use \ensuremath{v}

And we can get mutable access to the data only when locked



There is no unlock method: the mutex automatically unlocks when the holder goes out of scope



There is no unlock method: the mutex automatically unlocks when the holder goes out of scope

Thus the programmer can't forget to unlock a mutex, or access the data without using the mutex



Rust also has barriers, condition variables, channels, etc.



Rust also has barriers, condition variables, channels, etc.

As always, channels are still an excellent way for threads to communicate, but Rust's ownership model means sharing variables is no longer dangerous: the compiler simply won't let you share things unsafely

Rust is still being developed, but has already been taken up by many big companies and projects (e.g., by Google for Android, alongside Java and Kotlin; Microsoft are rewriting parts of Windows in Rust)

Rust is still being developed, but has already been taken up by many big companies and projects (e.g., by Google for Android, alongside Java and Kotlin; Microsoft are rewriting parts of Windows in Rust)

The ownership mechanism is a stumbling block to many programmers coming from other languages

Rust is still being developed, but has already been taken up by many big companies and projects (e.g., by Google for Android, alongside Java and Kotlin; Microsoft are rewriting parts of Windows in Rust)

The ownership mechanism is a stumbling block to many programmers coming from other languages

Mostly those programmers who don't like the compiler telling them their code is broken: you need to get more things correct before you can compile code

Rust is still being developed, but has already been taken up by many big companies and projects (e.g., by Google for Android, alongside Java and Kotlin; Microsoft are rewriting parts of Windows in Rust)

The ownership mechanism is a stumbling block to many programmers coming from other languages

Mostly those programmers who don't like the compiler telling them their code is broken: you need to get more things correct before you can compile code

But the learning curve is worth it for the safety achieved

Exercise For C++ geeks. The idea of tracking ownership ("move semantics") has recently been adopted by C++, though its use is optional and not the default. Read about this

Exercise The Rust compiler guarantees that a mutable (writable) memory location can never be accessed by more than one thread at a time. How might the compiler use this knowledge to optimise operations on that memory location?

Shared mutable state is the root of all evil. Most languages attempt to deal with this problem through the 'mutable' part, but Rust deals with it by solving the 'shared' part. From the Rust website

It may be harder to write Rust code than Java code, but it's a lot harder to write incorrect Rust code than incorrect Java code "Llogig on stuff" Feb 2016



Another single assignment, functional language, this time with *implicit* parallelism



Another single assignment, functional language, this time with *implicit* parallelism

Streams and Iteration in a Single Assignment Language, as its name suggests has special regard for streams and iterations

SISAL

Another single assignment, functional language, this time with *implicit* parallelism

Streams and Iteration in a Single Assignment Language, as its name suggests has special regard for streams and iterations

It distinguishes carefully between loops where the computations in the loop body are independent (thus parallelisable, they call them *for-loops*) and those where they are not independent (they call these *iterations*)



The for-loop looks like

for <range>
 <optional body>
returns <returns clause>
end for

All expressions in SISAL return one or more values

SISAL

An example:

```
for i in 1, n
    sqs := vals[i]*vals[i]
returns array of sqs
end for
```

returns an array of the squares of the values

SISAL

An example:

```
for i in 1, n
    sqs := vals[i]*vals[i]
returns array of sqs
end for
```

returns an array of the squares of the values

The effect is like a new instance of sqs is made for each value of i, then the array of operator collects (a reduce operation) them into an array

SISAL

Other reductions are possible

```
for i in 1, n
    sqs := vals[i]*vals[i]
returns array of sqs,
        value of sum sqs
end for
```

returns two things: the array as before, and the sum of the squares; sum is another reduction operation



The point here is that each squaring is independent



The point here is that each squaring is independent

SISAL makes us write the loop in such a way to make this simple and evident



The point here is that each squaring is independent

SISAL makes us write the loop in such a way to make this simple and evident

So it may choose to run this in parallel: automatic parallelisation

SISAL

SISAL

It is an example of a dataflow language

SISAL

It is an example of a *dataflow language*

These work on the idea that it is the data that should direct the processing

SISAL

It is an example of a *dataflow language*

These work on the idea that it is the data that should direct the processing

A spreadsheet is a simple example of the dataflow concept: change the value in a cell and this triggers various (re)computations, possibly running in parallel

SISAL

It is an example of a *dataflow language*

These work on the idea that it is the data that should direct the processing

A spreadsheet is a simple example of the dataflow concept: change the value in a cell and this triggers various (re)computations, possibly running in parallel

SISAL is of academic interest, but is not used widely

A single assignment language reminiscent of Prolog with dataflow (again, mid to late 1980s), declarative

A single assignment language reminiscent of Prolog with dataflow (again, mid to late 1980s), declarative

There is a single, shared global namespace and threads communicate by writing and reading variables

A single assignment language reminiscent of Prolog with dataflow (again, mid to late 1980s), declarative

There is a single, shared global namespace and threads communicate by writing and reading variables

If a thread tries to read a variable before it is set, that thread will block

A single assignment language reminiscent of Prolog with dataflow (again, mid to late 1980s), declarative

There is a single, shared global namespace and threads communicate by writing and reading variables

If a thread tries to read a variable before it is set, that thread will block

Thus we get both message passing and synchronisation

A single assignment language reminiscent of Prolog with dataflow (again, mid to late 1980s), declarative

There is a single, shared global namespace and threads communicate by writing and reading variables

If a thread tries to read a variable before it is set, that thread will block

Thus we get both message passing and synchronisation

And so variables are also a bit like single-use channels



Strand only supports parallel composition: i.e., you cannot write sequentially



Strand only supports parallel composition: i.e., you cannot write sequentially

The dataflow between the variables is all the sequencing we get

Strand only supports parallel composition: i.e., you cannot write sequentially

The dataflow between the variables is all the sequencing we get

And, conversely, if one expression does not depend on another, that can be run in parallel

Strand only supports parallel composition: i.e., you cannot write sequentially

The dataflow between the variables is all the sequencing we get

And, conversely, if one expression does not depend on another, that can be run in parallel

Again allowing automatic parallelism

Code is a list of *rules* rather like Prolog:

clause :- guard, guard, ... | body

Code is a list of *rules* rather like Prolog:

clause :- guard, guard, ... | body

A program consists of many rules





Guards can be evaluated in parallel



Guards can be evaluated in parallel

If a rule is selected, then a new process evaluates the body



Guards can be evaluated in parallel

If a rule is selected, then a new process evaluates the body

If no rules match, then it's an error in your program

Rules:

```
consumer(X) :- X | eat(X).
producer(Y) :- Y := "food".
```

with program:

```
producer(Z), consumer(Z).
```

the variable Z acts as a shared "channel" between the producer and consumer

As always, there's much more to Strand than this: streams, foreign language interface (to call C, etc.), garbage collection, and so on



As always, there's much more to Strand than this: streams, foreign language interface (to call C, etc.), garbage collection, and so on

And, just like Prolog, not widely used

As always, there's much more to Strand than this: streams, foreign language interface (to call C, etc.), garbage collection, and so on

And, just like Prolog, not widely used

It's just not the way most programmers think!

Thus there are several ways a language design can avoid races:

• have no shared variables (e.g., Erlang)

- have no shared variables (e.g., Erlang)
- have no mutable shared variables (e.g., Rust)

- have no shared variables (e.g., Erlang)
- have no mutable shared variables (e.g., Rust)
- have no mutation (e.g., Haskell)

- have no shared variables (e.g., Erlang)
- have no mutable shared variables (e.g., Rust)
- have no mutation (e.g., Haskell)
- have no parallelism! (e.g., JavaScript, Python)

Thus there are several ways a language design can avoid races:

- have no shared variables (e.g., Erlang)
- have no mutable shared variables (e.g., Rust)
- have no mutation (e.g., Haskell)
- have no parallelism! (e.g., JavaScript, Python)

Allowing unrestricted access to shared values (as we are used to in sequential programming) is a sure route to creating races

Thus there are several ways a language design can avoid races:

- have no shared variables (e.g., Erlang)
- have no mutable shared variables (e.g., Rust)
- have no mutation (e.g., Haskell)
- have no parallelism! (e.g., JavaScript, Python)

Allowing unrestricted access to shared values (as we are used to in sequential programming) is a sure route to creating races

But having any the above restrictions in a language is guaranteed to irritate some programmers — they don't like being forced to write correct programs!

And so on. See Wikipedia!

- C*. Connection Machine, SIMD
- C ω . Cray, modified C, like data parallel Fortran
- Concurrent Euclid. Functional influenced descendant of Pascal
- Data Parallel Haskell.
- E. Secure distributed programming
- Ease. A CSP language
- Fortress. Secure Fortran, implicit parallelism
- Janus. "bag channels" pool-like communications

- Joule. Dataflow, like E
- Joyce. Pascal syntax, CSP
- Limbo. Channels
- Lucid. Dataflow
- MultiLisp. Scheme extension, arguments to function calls explicitly evaluated in parallel, lazy evaluation
- NESL. Precursor to Data Parallel Haskell
- Orc. Concurrent, non-deterministic
- Oz. Multiparadigm: dataflow and declarative
- Parlog. Parallel Prolog

- SALSA. Actor, runs on Java machine
- Sing#. Extension of C#. Message passing
- SPARK. Based on Ada
- SR. Message passing
- *Lisp. Connection Machine
- Turing+. Monitors
- XC. Explicit parallelism
- ZPL. Like C/C++, implicit parallelism.

Exercise Swift, Rust and Go are all "modern" languages, designed in the current era of parallel hardware. Compare their approaches to parallelism

Exercise Swift, Rust and Go are all "modern" languages, designed in the current era of parallel hardware. Compare their approaches to parallelism

Exercise Think about using all of OpenMP, MPI (and CUDA/OpenCl on GPUs) in a single program

Exercise Swift, Rust and Go are all "modern" languages, designed in the current era of parallel hardware. Compare their approaches to parallelism

Exercise Think about using all of OpenMP, MPI (and CUDA/OpenCl on GPUs) in a single program

Redo Assignment 1 using Swift, Rust, Go, CUDA, etc.