Today: A little side excursion into nitty-gritty stuff: Storage management
Scope and Lifetime

- **Scope** of a declaration is portion of program text to which it applies (is visible).
  - Need not be contiguous.
  - In Java, is static: independent of data.

- **Lifetime** or extent of storage is portion of program execution during which it exists.
  - Always contiguous
  - Generally dynamic: depends on data

- Classes of extent:
  - Static: entire duration of program
  - Local or automatic: duration of call or block execution (local variable)
  - Dynamic: From time of allocation statement (new) to deallocation, if any.
Explicit vs. Automatic Freeing

• Java has no means to free dynamic storage.
• However, when no expression in any thread can possibly be influenced by or change an object, it might as well not exist:

```java
IntList wasteful ()
{
    IntList c = new IntList (3, new IntList (4, null));
    return c.tail;
    // variable c now deallocated, so no way
    // to get to first cell of list
}
```

• At this point, Java runtime, like Scheme's, recycles the object c pointed to: *garbage collection*. 
Under the Hood: Allocation

- Java pointers (references) are represented as integer addresses.
- Corresponds to machine’s own practice.
- In Java, cannot convert integers ↔ pointers,
- But crucial parts of Java runtime implemented in C, or sometimes machine code, where you can.
- Crude allocator in C:

```c
char store[STORAGE_SIZE]; // Allocated array
size_t remainder = STORAGE_SIZE;

/** A pointer to a block of at least N bytes of storage */
void* simpleAlloc (size_t n) { // void*: pointer to anything
    if (n > remainder) ERROR();
    remainder = (remainder - n) & ~0x7; // Make multiple of 8
    return (void*) (store + remainder);
}
```
Example of Storage Layout: Unix

- OS gives way to turn chunks of unallocated region into heap.
- Happens automatically for stack.
Explicit Deallocating

- C/C++ normally require explicit deallocation, because of
  - Lack of run-time information about what is array
  - Possibility of converting pointers to integers.
  - Lack of run-time information about unions:
    ```
    union Various {
      int Int;
      char* Pntr;
      double Double;
    } X; // X is either an int, char*, or double
    ```
- Java avoids all three problems; automatic collection possible.
- Explicit freeing can be somewhat faster, but rather error-prone:
  - Memory corruption
  - Memory leaks
Free Lists

- Explicit allocator grabs chunks of storage from OS and gives to applications.
- Or gives recycled storage, when available.
- When storage is freed, added to free list data structure to be recycled.
- Used both for explicit freeing and some kinds of automatic garbage collection.
- Problem: free memory fragments.
Boundary Tag Methods

```
G1 = malloc(96);
X = malloc(115);
Y = malloc(156);
G2 = malloc(19);
Z = malloc(26);
G3 = malloc(155);
free(G1); free(G3); free(G2);
```
Simplifying Coalescence: The Buddy System

- Allocate in powers of 2.
- **Coalesce only with your buddy:**
  - For object of size $2^n$ at byte #\(M\), buddy at byte #\((M \land (1\ll n))\).
  - Just need a bit to indicate if it is allocated, plus list of free blocks for each \(n\).
Buddy System at Work

X = malloc (32);

Y = malloc (32); Z = malloc (64);
Q = malloc (32); R = malloc (64)

free (Y); free (R);
free (X); free (Q);
free (X); free (Q);
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**Garbage Collection: Reference Counting**

- **Idea:** Keep count of number of pointers to each object. Release when count goes to 0.

```plaintext
Y: □
X: □ → 1 → 1 → 1
  □ → □ → □
     1A → 1B → 1C

Y = X.tail;
Y: □
X: □ → 1 → 2 → 1
  □ → □ → □
     1A → 1B → 1C

X = Y;
Y: □
X: □ → 3 → 1
  □ → □ → □
     1A → 1B → 1C

Y: □
X: □ → 2 → 1
  □ → □ → □
     0A → 1B → 1C etc.
```
Garbage Collection: Mark and Sweep

Roots (locals + statics)

1. Traverse and mark graph of objects.
2. Sweep through memory, freeing unmarked objects.

Before sweep:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B*</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D*</th>
<th>E*</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After sweep:

|   | B | D | G | D | 7 | G | D | G | E |
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Copying Garbage Collection

• Mark-and-sweep algorithms don’t move any existing objects—pointers stay the same.

• The total amount of work depends on the amount of memory swept—i.e., the total amount of active (non-garbage) storage + amount of garbage. Not necessarily a big hit: the garbage had to be active at one time, and hence there was always some “good” processing in the past for each byte of garbage scanned.

• Another approach: copying garbage collection takes time proportional to amount of active storage:

  - Traverse the graph of active objects breadth first, copying them into a large contiguous area (called “to-space”).
  - As you copy each object, mark it and put a forwarding pointer into it that points to where you copied it.
  - The next time you have to copy a marked object, just use its forwarding pointer instead.
  - When done, the space you copied from (“from-space”) becomes the next to-space; in effect, all its objects are freed in constant time.
Copying Garbage Collection Illustrated

(a) Roots

| B | 5 | E |

from: 42 D G F A 7 G D C E

to:

(b) Roots

| B' | 5 | E' |

from: 42 B' G F A 7 G E' C E

to: D G D

B: Old object

B': New object

(c) Roots

| B' | 5 | E' |

from: 42 B' G F A D' 7 G E' C G' E

to: D' G' D 7 G E

(d) Roots

| B' | 5 | E' |

from: 42 B' G F A D' 7 G E' C G' E

to: D' G' D' 7 G' E'