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Abstract. In this paper, we define a novel “write-key” operational semantics for a kernel language with fork-join parallelism, synchronization and “volatile” fields. We prove that programs that never suffer write-key errors are exactly those that are “data race free” and also those that are “correctly synchronized” in the Java memory model. This 3-way equivalence is proved using Twelf.

1 Introduction

This work is motivated by the desire to define a type system for a Java-like language to prevents data races. Data races are intrinsically a multi-threaded issue. However a scalable type system or program analysis analyzes each thread, indeed every method body separately, using invariants and annotations to ensure that interactions follow desired patterns. It is well known that deadlock can be prevented by requiring that mutexes be acquired in strictly increasing order. Here we show how we can characterize programs without data races in a similar way, that is without explicitly needing to refer to multiple threads.

There are different understandings of what a data race is. At an intuitive level, a data race occurs when an execution of a multi-threaded program leads to the point where two conflicting accesses in two different threads occur “at the same time.” Two accesses are conflicting if they are to the same object’s field and one of them is a write. Somewhat more precisely, the current Java memory model (JMM) [15] defines a “happens before” partial order; a program is correctly synchronized if in all sequentially consistent executions, two conflicting accesses are always ordered by “happens before.” Reading and writing of “volatile” fields affect the “happens before” order and thus whether a program is correctly synchronized. Both of these techniques explicitly involve reasoning about multiple threads at once.

This paper addresses this situation with the following contributions:

– It defines a simple imperative language with Java-style (re-entrant) monitors, volatile fields and fork-join parallelism. A novel aspect of the operational
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semantics is that the system constructs and passes “write keys” to simulate the “happens before” relation.
– The paper defines that a program is data-race free if no execution has a “write-key error” in which a thread attempts to access a (non-volatile) field for which it does not possess the write key.
– It is proved that this characterization is equivalent both to the intuitive concept of lack of “simultaneous” conflicting accesses, and to the JMM-inspired definition of “happens before”-ordered accesses. The proof is mechanically checked in Twelf’s metalogic [17].

A corollary to the last contribution is that the two earlier conceptions of data-race freedom are equivalent, a result that I have not seen previously.

The advantage of the “write-key error” conception for data races is that write-key errors are detected (and can be prevented) thread locally. In other words, if a type system can ensure for each thread that it always possesses the write keys for the (non-volatile) fields that it accesses and that it has exclusive access to fields it writes, then the entire program is thread safe. Moreover, since a write-key error causes a thread to get stuck in our semantics, and since (full) deadlocks always means the program as a whole is stuck, then if a type system enjoys “progress” and “preservation” over the operational semantics, then per force the type system will also prevent race conditions.

2 Background on the Current Java Memory Model

This section briefly describes multi-threading primitives in Java and the “happens before” relation of the current Java Memory Model.

In Java, a new thread can be started which executes a given run method; we call this a fork action. At the other end, one may wait for a thread t to complete execution by executing t.join(); this is a join action. Thread mutual exclusion is effected by “synchronizing” on an object o: synchronized (o) { body }. The runtime system ensures that two separate threads that both synchronize on the same object (known by its role as a mutex) mutually exclude each other’s “body” instructions. When a synchronized block is executed, it first attempts to acquire the mutex, blocking if some other thread is currently executing a synchronized block on the same object. Once acquisition is successful, the body is executed after which the mutex is released. Synchronized statements in Java are “re-entrant” in that if a synchronization block is nested dynamically within another synchronization block on the same object, the inner synchronization succeeds immediately.

Fields in Java may be declared as “volatile.” This designation may be seen as a declaration that these fields will be read and written without mutual exclusion. More importantly, accesses to volatile fields (denoted readv and writev) constrain the memory model.

A memory model is a contract between the programmer on the one hand and the compiler and the runtime system on the other hand. The most informative model for programmers is a “sequentially consistent” model that indicates that
execution will always be consistent with a system in which the thread interleaving of instructions ensures that each instruction fully executes before the next starts. Sequential consistency however is very limiting for a compiler. Consider the following situation where two threads are executing in parallel, x and y represent shared mutable locations and rn represent thread local “registers.”:

Initially $x = y = 0$

| x = 1 | r2 = y |
| y = 2 | r1 = x |

In a sequentially consistent execution, no interleaving of the threads could result in $r1 = 0$, $r2 = 2$. Thus a compiler would not be permitted to reorder the two write actions even though they have no data dependencies.

For such reasons, most memory models only guarantee sequential consistency for fields declared “volatile.” For other fields, threads must use mutual exclusion techniques. The (intuitive) guarantee for normal (non-volatile) fields is that if a program is data-race free, that is, if no sequentially consistent execution ever exhibits a “race condition” for a normal field, then that program will enjoy sequentially consistent semantics. A race condition is when one thread is ready to write an object’s field when another thread is ready to read or write the same object’s field. If a program could exhibit a race condition under a sequentially consistent semantics, then most memory models usually do not guarantee a sequentially consistent semantics. In the small example given above, there is a race condition. Thus a compiler is justified if it wishes to reorder the statements, even though this reordering violates sequential consistency.

In the current Java memory model (JMM) [15], the guarantee is expressed in a different way. First, a “synchronizes with” relation is defined:

1. A release action synchronizes with an acquire action on the same object;
2. A writev action synchronizes with a readv action on the same object’s field;
3. A fork action synchronizes with the first action in the spawned thread;
4. The last action in a thread synchronizes with a join action on that thread.

Additionally the default initialization of a field (with null for reference types) synchronizes with all actions in all threads.

Then the “happens before” partial order is defined as the transitive closure of (1) the intra-thread execution order and (2) the “synchronizes with” relation over actions already ordered by the execution.

Specifically of interest to the present paper, the JMM defines what it means to be “correctly synchronized”:

A program is correctly synchronized if and only if in all sequentially consistent executions, all conflicting accesses to non-volatile variables are ordered by “happens-before” edges.

The JMM (and generalizations [18]) guarantees that a correctly synchronized program will observe sequentially consistent semantics. This guarantee appears rather different than that expressed concerning “data race free” but as proved in Sect. 5, the definitions are equivalent for our small concurrent language.
class Node {
    Node next;
    Node(Node n) { next = n; }

    Node getNext() { next; }

    int count() {
        if this == null then 0
        else 1 + next.count();
    }

    Node copy() {
        if this == null then null
        else new Node(next.copy());
    }

    Node nap(Node n) {
        if this == null then n
        else (next = next.nap(n);
            this);
    }

    void add1() {
        this.nap(new Node(null));
    }
}

class Race {
    Node nodes;

    Race() {
    }

    int get() {
        nodes.count();
    }

    void inc() {
        nodes = nodes.add1();
    }
}

class Main {
    void main() {
        let t = new Race() in
            ( fork { t.inc(); t.get(); }
                t.inc(); t.get();
            );
    }
}

Fig. 1. A simple node class.

Fig. 2. A class with an unprotected field; and a test harness.

3 Example

Figure 1 declares a node class. The surface syntax resembles Java, but method bodies contain expressions, not statements. For instance, `getNext()` returns the next field. The `count` method shows another difference: since the language omits dynamic dispatch for simplicity, one can call methods on null references. In the body, one may test for null. In this way, we can model so-called “static” methods. The `copy` method performs a deep copy; `nap` does a destructive append; `add1` extends the list by one node. The `Node` class has mutable state and thus cannot be safely used in a concurrent program without additional restrictions.

We now define several different classes wrapping a node list with the same interface: an `inc` method that adds to the list and a `get` method that counts the size of the current list. The first implementation, `Race` (Fig. 2), does nothing to protect the list. The main program forks off a thread that calls `inc` and `get` and then proceeds to do the same calls in its own thread. Lacking synchronization, the call `t.inc()` in one thread conflicts with `t.inc()` or `t.get()` in the other.

The traditional technique (“standard practice”) for protecting mutable state is to designate a `protecting` object for each piece of mutable state (one object may protect many others) and ensure that all accesses to the state occur dynamically
class Traditional {
    Node nodes;
    int get() {
        synch (this) do
            nodes.count();
        }
    }
    void inc() {
        synch (this) do
            nodes = nodes.add1();
        }
}

Fig. 3. Traditional approach.

class UsingVolatile {
    volatile Node nodes;
    int get() {
        nodes.count();
    }
    void inc() {
        synch (this) do
            nodes = nodes.copy().add1();
        }
}

Fig. 4. Using volatility.

only within a synchronization on the protecting object. For example, see class Traditional in Fig. 3; the bodies of the methods get() and inc() include synchronizations around the access of the mutable state.

If get() calls are frequent and updates very infrequent, one can do better with a less-known pattern using volatile variables. Figure 4 shows how a volatile field can substitute for synchronization. The reading method can simply access the nodes directly using a volatile field read, and then traverse the list without synchronization. The incrementing method copies the structure before modifying it, to avoid interfering with get calls. Furthermore, inc is synchronized to ensure that two increments are not carried out in parallel (to preserve “atomicity” [9], an important concept beyond the scope of this paper). We permit interleaving of get() and inc() calls since the inc() method never updates state the get() method can see, except for the volatile field.

4 Operational Semantics

This section defines the syntax and dynamic semantics of the paper’s kernel concurrent language. The set of all fields is $F$. A subset $F_V \subseteq F$ are “volatile” and one (Lock $\in F_V$) holds the state of the mutex associated with each object.

4.1 Syntax

Figure 5 gives the syntax. For simplicity, we omit primitive types and arithmetic operators. Expressions include literal object references (natural numbers) and uses of local variables. A new object can be allocated with the given set of fields. Fields of objects can be read or written. The “let,” “if” and “while” constructs are conventional. Procedure calls are included, but not dynamic dispatch because the details would obscure the emphasis of this work.

The concurrency-related terms are fork-join terms (fork creates a new thread and starts it; and join waits for it to terminate) and synchronization (synch
Fig. 5. Syntax.

and hold. A hold expression is used to indicate that this thread is currently executing a synch statement.

The examples in the previous section use a surface syntax with classes, methods and types. A simple translation (not shown) can strip out these features.

4.2 Semantics

This section defines the small-step operational semantics. Novel here is the use of “write keys.” Write keys allow us to separate the notion of “happens before” from considering the execution of multiple threads and instead look at a single thread at a time. A (possibly new) write key (a natural number) is generated whenever a normal field is written. This field is added to the knowledge of the thread that performed the write. Knowledge is monotonically non-decreasing. Write keys are passed from one thread to another during synchronization actions indirectly through memory. In this way, if a write in one thread happens before the read in the other thread, the read is guaranteed to have the necessary key.

The main evaluation relation $(\mu; \theta; \kappa) \xrightarrow{g} (\mu'; \theta'; \kappa')$ relates triples:

- $\mu$ maps a location $(o.f)$ to a pair $(W, o')$ of a set of write keys and a value. For a normal field, $W = \{w\}$, where $w$ is the key from the most recent write; for a volatile field, $W$ is the set of keys from all threads having written it.
- $\theta$ maps a thread identifier (natural number) to the expression that the thread is currently executing.
- $\kappa$ maps a thread identifier to its set of known write keys.
- $g$ lists the procedure definitions.

The following notation is used for map update:

$$f[x \mapsto v](x') = \begin{cases} v & \text{if } x = x' \\ f(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad f[x \odot v] = f[x \mapsto f(x) \odot v]$$
new is needed to read the field. When a normal fields are associated with a write key that indicates what knowledge is substituted in the body once its value is ready. An if is evaluated by choosing the appropriate branch. A call with the procedure body, substituting the parameters. A let procedure in the program with the correct number of arguments and replace the

The first group of evaluation rules (Fig. 6) are those that have no side-effects. A if immediately into an

For explanatory reasons, the evaluation rules are presented in two groups. The first group of evaluation rules (Fig. 6) are those that have no side-effects. A procedure call uses rule E-CALL once all the parameters are evaluated; we find a procedure in the program with the correct number of arguments and replace the call with the procedure body, substituting the parameters. A let-bound variable is substituted in the body once its value is ready. An if with a constant boolean is evaluated by choosing the appropriate branch. A while loop is converted immediately into an if. Conditions use short-circuit evaluation (E-AndFalse).

Figure 7 includes the remaining evaluation rules. As mentioned previously, normal fields are associated with a write key that indicates what knowledge is needed to read the field. When a new expression is encountered, all of the fields are initialized with null using a write key (0) that all threads know. (This

\[
\begin{align*}
T[\bullet] & ::= \bullet \mid T[\bullet].f \mid T[\bullet].f := e \mid o.f := T[\bullet] \mid m(\overline{\sigma}, T[\bullet], \overline{e}) \\
& \mid \text{let } x := T[\bullet] \in e \mid \text{if } T[\bullet] \text{ then } e \text{ else } e \mid \text{synch } T[\bullet] \text{ do } e \\
& \mid \text{hold } o \text{ do } T[\bullet] \mid T[\bullet] \text{ and } e \mid \text{not } T[\bullet] \mid T[\bullet] == e \mid o == T[\bullet]
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{EVAL} & \quad \theta_p = T[t] \quad \begin{array}{l}
(\mu; \theta; \kappa; t) \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu'; \theta'; \kappa'; t') \quad \text{E-CALL} \\
(\mu; \theta; \kappa) \mapsto (\mu'; \theta'[p \mapsto T[t']]; \kappa') \quad (\mu; \theta; \kappa; m(\overline{\sigma})) \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; [\overline{x} \mapsto \sigma]e)
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{E-Let} \\
& (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{let } x = o_1 \text{ in } e_2) \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; [x \mapsto o_1]e_2)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{E-If} \\
& (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{if } c \text{ then } e_{\text{true}} \text{ else } e_{\text{false}}) \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; e_c)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{E-While} \\
& (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{while } c \text{ do } e) \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{if } c \text{ then } e \text{ while } c \text{ do } e \text{ else } 0)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{E-NotNotTrue} \\
& (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{not false}) \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{true})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{E-AndTrue} \\
& (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{true and } c) \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; c)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{E-AndFalse} \\
& (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{false and } c) \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{false})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{E-EqualTrue} \\
& o = o' \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{true})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{E-EqualFalse} \\
& o \neq o' \xrightarrow{p}{g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{false})
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 6. Non-concurrency-related evaluation rules.
E-New  
\[
\begin{align*}
  f_0 & = \text{Lock} \\
  (o, \text{Lock}) & \notin \text{Dom}(\mu) \\
  f_i & \text{ distinct} \\
  (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{new (} f_1, \ldots, f_n)) & \xrightarrow{p} (\mu([o, f_i]) \mapsto ([\{0\}, 0] \mid 0 \leq i \leq n); \theta; \kappa; o)
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{E-Read} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \mu(o.f) & = (\{w\}, o') \\
  w & \in \kappa(p) \\
  f & \notin F_V
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \mu'(o.f) & = (\{w\}', o') \\
  w' & \text{ arbitrary}
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \kappa' & = \kappa[p \xhookrightarrow{\mu} \{w\}]
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  (\mu; \theta; \kappa; o.f : w) & \xrightarrow{q} (\mu'; \theta; \kappa'; o')
\end{aligned}
\]

E-Write  
\[
\begin{align*}
  \mu(o.f) & = (\{w\}', o') \\
  w & \in \kappa(p) \\
  f & \notin F_V
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \mu'(o.f) & = (\{w'\}', o') \\
  w' & \text{ arbitrary}
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \kappa' & = \kappa[p \xhookrightarrow{\mu} \{w'\}]
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  (\mu; \theta; \kappa; o.f : w) & \xrightarrow{q} (\mu'; \theta; \kappa'; o')
\end{aligned}
\]

\[\text{E-ReadV} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \mu(o.f) & = (W, o') \\
  W & \notin F_V
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \kappa' & = \kappa[p \xhookrightarrow{\mu} W]
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  (\mu; \theta; \kappa; o.f : w) & \xrightarrow{q} (\mu'; \theta; \kappa'; o')
\end{aligned}
\]

E-WriteV  
\[
\begin{align*}
  \mu(o.f) & = (W, o') \\
  W & \notin F_V
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \mu'(o.f) & = (W \cup \kappa(p), o')
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \kappa' & = \kappa[p \xhookrightarrow{\mu} \{w\}]
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  (\mu; \theta; \kappa; o.f : w) & \xrightarrow{q} (\mu'; \theta; \kappa'; o')
\end{aligned}
\]

\[\text{E-Fork} \quad \begin{aligned}
  (p, \text{Lock}) & \notin \text{Dom}(\mu)
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{fork } e) & \xrightarrow{p} (\mu([p', \text{Lock}) \mapsto (\{0\}, 0)]; \theta[p' \mapsto e]; \kappa[p' \mapsto \kappa(p)]; p')
\end{aligned}
\]

E-Join  
\[
\begin{align*}
  \theta(p') & = o \\
  (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{join } p') & \xrightarrow{p} (\mu; \theta; \kappa[p \xhookrightarrow{\mu} \kappa(p')]; o)
\end{align*}
\]

E-Enter  
\[
\begin{align*}
  \mu(o.\text{Lock}) & = (\emptyset, p) \\
  (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{synch } o \text{ do } e) & \xrightarrow{q} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; e)
\end{align*}
\]

E-Acquire  
\[
\begin{align*}
  \mu(o.\text{Lock}) & = (W, 0) \\
  W & \notin \emptyset \\
  \mu' & = \mu([o.\text{Lock}) \mapsto (\emptyset, p]) \\
  \kappa' & = \kappa[p \xhookrightarrow{\mu} W]
\end{align*}
\]

E-Release  
\[
\begin{align*}
  \mu(o.\text{Lock}) & = (\emptyset, p) \\
  \mu' & = \mu([o.\text{Lock}) \mapsto (\kappa(p), 0)]
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{E-Release} \quad \begin{aligned}
  \mu(o.\text{Lock}) & = (\emptyset, p) \\
  \mu' & = \mu([o.\text{Lock}) \mapsto (\kappa(p), 0)]
\end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned}
  (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{hold } o \text{ do } e) & \xrightarrow{q} (\mu'; \theta; \kappa'; \text{hold } o \text{ do } e)
\end{aligned}
\]

\[\text{Fig. 7. Remaining evaluation rules.}
\]

follows the JMM—default initialization synchronizes with the first action in 
every thread.) Every object is allocated with a mutex (special field Lock).

Field reads and writes of non-volatile fields (E-READ, E-WRITE) require that 
the thread has knowledge of the write that produced the value: \( w \in \kappa(p) \). For a 
write, an arbitrary write key \( w' \) is used to label the new write. In general, this 
may be one that no thread is aware of. Using such a key would cause the Race 
program in earlier Fig. 2 to get stuck when the second increment executes.

One way in which knowledge of writes can be transmitted is through volatile 
fields (E-READV, E-WRITEV). Writing a volatile field adds the thread’s knowl-
dge \( \kappa p \) to the memory with the written value. When the volatile field is read, 
the reading thread picks up this knowledge. This follows the JMM rule that says 
that writing a volatile field synchronizes with all following reads.

For E-FORK, the new thread gets the knowledge of the “forker.” This corre-
sponds to the JMM rule that a fork synchronizes with the first action in the new 
thread. An object is allocated to represent the thread. In E-JOIN, this thread
can only progress if the other thread has finished execution (down to a value). It gets a copy of all the thread’s knowledge. This follows from the JMM’s rule that the final action in a thread synchronizes with a thread that “joins” it.

During synchronization, the lock’s value is replaced with the number of the acquiring thread, and the knowledge is replaced by the empty set. In E-RE-ENTER, if we synchronize on a lock that this thread already has acquired, the body is simply executed without any effect on the lock. This last rule corresponds to Java’s re-entrant monitors; here, we avoid the need to count multiple entrances because the evaluation rule drops the release action as well as the acquire action.

If the lock is not held by any thread (E-ACQUIRE), the lock field is assigned the number of this thread, and we get the keys from the lock. The synchronization block is then converted into a hold block. When the body has finished evaluation (E-RELEASE), the lock is given the knowledge of the current thread. This knowledge is thus made available for the next thread which acquires the lock. These rules again follow from the JMM.

The semantics defined here is sequentially consistent, but if a thread lacks the necessary write key, it gets stuck. Thus if the program has race conditions, it may get stuck (but may not, for instance if an old key is chosen by E-WRITE). A type system for this language that enjoys progress and preservation for all executions will prevent this (and the other problems not mentioned). We have designed a type system \cite{5, 6} based on fractional permissions \cite{5, 6} that we believe will achieve this goal, but space precludes including it here.

5 Equivalence

Programs that execute in our operational semantics without ever blocking because of missing write keys are “correctly synchronized” according to (our variant) of the Java Memory Model and to the traditional definition of “race free.” In other words, we show a three-way equivalence.

In order to prove equivalence, we need to formally define the aspects we are showing equivalent. To start with, we restrict programs so that they do not include arbitrary object reference constants or partially executed synchronizations:

**Definition 1.** A program \( g \) is valid if every declaration \( m(\bar{x}) = e \) in \( g \) has no instance of hold nor any literal object reference except the null reference 0.

Execution starts by calling the main procedure in thread 0, which starts with no knowledge except write key 0.

**Definition 2.** The initial state \( I \) is the state

\[
I = ([0, \text{Lock}] \rightarrow ([0], 0)]0 \mapsto \text{main}(0)]0 \mapsto \{0\}).
\]

We formalize what it means for there to be a write key error in a program:

**Definition 3.** A program \( g = \tilde{d} \) has a write key error if for some execution \( I \xrightarrow{\delta} (\mu, \theta, \kappa) \) in which a read or write access on a non-volatile field \( o.f \) is ready to execute in thread \( p \) \( (\theta_p = T[o.f := o'] \) or \( \theta_p = T[o.f], \) where \( f \notin F_V \)), and the thread does not have the required write key: \( \mu(o.f) = (\{w\}, \_\) and \( w \notin \kappa_p \).
Definition 4. Two terms $t_1$ and $t_2$ are conflicting accesses of a non-volatile field $o.f$ ($f \notin F_v$) if one of them is a write to this field ($t_i = o.f := o'$) and the other is a write ($t_{3-i} = o.f := o''$) or a read ($t_{3-i} = o.f$) of the same field.

Next, we formalize what it means to have a “race condition”: a write access to a field happens at the “same time” as a read access to the same field, and that field is not volatile:

Definition 5. A program $g = \overrightarrow{d; e_0}$ exhibits a race condition if there is some execution $\overrightarrow{I \rightarrow (\mu, \theta, \kappa)}_{\rightarrow g}$ for two threads $p_1 \neq p_2$ we have $\theta(p_i) = T(t_i)$ and $t_1, t_2$ are conflicting accesses.

Before we can define what it means to be “correctly synchronized,” we must define an “action” and the “happens-before” relation for actions:

Definition 6. An action $\lambda$ is an evaluation $(\mu; \theta; \kappa; t) \overrightarrow{p \rightarrow g} (\mu'; \theta'; \kappa'; t')$. An evaluation sequence $\overrightarrow{I \rightarrow (\mu, \theta, \kappa)}_{\rightarrow g}$ induces the actions above the line for each instance of Eval: $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_n$.

Definition 7. Given an execution $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$, we define a happens-before (written $i \sqsubseteq j$) relation on the subset of natural numbers $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. It is smallest transitive relation that includes the following pairs:

1. $i \sqsubseteq j$ if $i < j$ and $\lambda_i$ is an instance of E-Release and $\lambda_j$ is an instance of E-Acquire on the same object.
2. $i \sqsubseteq j$ if $i < j$ and $\lambda_i$ is an instance of E-WriteV and $\lambda_j$ is an instance of E-ReadV on the same field.
3. $i \sqsubseteq j$ if $i < j$ and $\lambda_i = \overrightarrow{\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{fork} \ t} \overrightarrow{g} (\mu'; \theta'; \kappa'; q)$ and $\lambda_j = \overrightarrow{q \rightarrow g} (\mu'; \theta'; \kappa'; t)$.

5. $i \sqsubseteq j$ if $i < j$ and $\lambda_i = \overrightarrow{q \rightarrow g} (\mu; \theta; \kappa; \text{join} \ q) \overrightarrow{g} (\mu'; \theta'; \kappa'; t)$.

It can be easily shown that $\sqsubseteq$ is a partial order compatible with $\prec$.

Our final definition is for correctly synchronized in the style of the JMM:

Definition 8. A program $g = \overrightarrow{d; e}$ is correctly synchronized if for any execution of $g$: $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ and any $i$ for which $\lambda_i$ is an instance of E-Write and any $j$ for which $\lambda_j$ is an instance of E-Read or E-Write for the same field, then either $i \sqsubseteq j$ or $j \sqsubseteq i$.

It might seem that because our operational semantics detects race conditions, the conflicting access would never execute and thus could not demonstrate an incorrect synchronization, but because write keys are arbitrary, the write could use 0 and thus enable execution. The semantics does not ensure that all executions of a program with race conditions will get stuck, just that there will be some execution that does.

We now show the three-way equivalence between the three conceptions of race-freedom:
Theorem 1. The following statements about a valid program $g$ are equivalent:

1. $g$ exhibits a race condition;
2. $g$ has a write key error;
3. $g$ is incorrectly synchronized.

Proof. (Sketch)

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Suppose we have a program with a race condition. Starting with the execution state that exhibits the race condition, we choose to evaluate the write first. If this write cannot execute because of a missing write key, we are done. Otherwise we choose a new write key not known by the other thread, and we now have a write key error.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): We prove the contrapositive: if the program is correctly synchronized, there will be no write-key error. This is because if there is a happens-before connection between two actions, the thread knowledge of the second will include that produced by the first, and thus the second access will succeed. The connection between write key knowledge and happens-before follows from the fact that the knowledge never decreases (the first case for happens-before) and the other cases for happens-before involve the reader/acquirer getting all the write keys left by the writer.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Suppose we have an incorrectly synchronized program, in which the code of the first action $\lambda_i$ is a write executed in thread $p$ and the second action $\lambda_j$ is an access executed in thread $q$. (The case that $\lambda_i$ is a read and $\lambda_j$ is a write is analogous.)

If the actions are already consecutive, we have the required race condition in the state just before the first executed. Otherwise, we consider how evaluation actions can be reordered (between different threads, never within a thread) to get the accesses adjacent. We partition the intervening actions into those that happen before $j$ and those which do not. The second must include action $i$, from the definition of incorrect synchronization. We find the last action $\lambda_*$ in the second group. It cannot be “happens before” any in the first group, or a transitive happens-before relation would exist putting it in the first group. Now we reorder it step-by-step with all later actions until it is after $\lambda_j$. If $\lambda_*$ was $\lambda_i$, then the last reordering would have resulted in the required race condition. Otherwise, now that it is after $\lambda_j$ we have reduced the number of intervening instructions. This process must terminate at some point.

6 Extensions

Extending the simple language here to full Java is almost entirely just a matter of complex but uninteresting details. Static fields and static synchronization can be modeled using instance fields and instance synchronization of singleton objects. Types, primitive values and dynamic dispatch have no effect on concurrency. Java 5 adds a new library of synchronization primitives, but it has a reference implementation in core Java. Timeout and timing issues can be modeled by claiming that each step of execution takes 1 nanosecond.
The **Thread** class includes a number of deprecated methods that permit one thread to suspend or terminate another. These we can omit from the formalism. Other methods such as `holdsLock` (because one can only use it to query the current thread) can be implemented without affecting the proof substantially.

Java’s `wait/notify` system would require substantive changes to the formalism. When a thread calls `wait`, it first releases the object’s lock, then it waits to be “notified” and then it waits to re-acquire the lock. The lock release and acquisition lead to the corresponding standard happens-before relations. Another missing piece is thread interruption (and the corresponding interrupted exception). My guess is that the proof could be modified to handle `wait` and interruption.

## 7 Related Work

The current Java memory model is much more complex than what is modeled here. In particular it gives semantics for programs that are *not* properly synchronized. Since its publication, it has been generalized [18], Apsinall and Ševčík [1] formally prove the main guarantee—that correctly synchronized programs will have a sequentially consistent semantics (whereas the work described here assumes sequential consistency). The initialization of reference fields causes some concern which we avoid by using a universally known write key for initialization.

Cenciarelli, Knapp and Sibilio [8] give a vastly different semantics of the Java Memory Model based on configuration structures. As with the papers just reviewed, it handles all Java programs, not just properly synchronized ones, and does not assume sequential consistency. The present author must confess that he was unable to understand the details.

Type systems have been proposed that prevent race conditions and sometimes deadlocks in concurrent programming languages. Flanagan and Abadi [10, 11] define two separate type systems for avoiding races, both of which are accompanied by operational semantics. One is based on Gordon and Hankin’s concurrent object calculus [13] in which mutable objects are represented in the syntax as concurrent processes. The other uses a conventional store. Neither semantics directly detects race conditions, nor includes “volatile.” In either case, a race condition is defined as the (global) possibility that a write could occur at the same time as a read of the same field. (In one system [11], two “simultaneous” reads are also considered a race.) The type system maintains certain invariants that are shown to prevent data races.

Later work (such as Flanagan and Freund [12], Greenhouse [14] and Boyapati and Rinard [4, 3]) omit formal specification of operational semantics, implicitly following the same approach just outlined. Volatile fields, if they are handled at all, are simply regarded as loopholes in the type system.

Permandla and Boyapati [16] define a small-step semantics for a subset of Java virtual machine language (JVML) including synchronization (but not volatile fields) and show that well-typed programs are free of concurrency errors. The semantics however enforces an ownership model and uses method an-
notations that indicate required locking state. The operational semantics is not independent of the type system.

Guava [2] uses a type system to prevent races in a dialect of Java. Guava permits reader/reader parallelism, but omits volatiles. Guava is defined by (informally described) compilation to Java byte-code. Guava is intended as a practical programming language rather than as a minimal concurrent language.

Brookes [7] gives the semantics of a concurrent program by defining its set of “action traces.” Roughly this means that all possible interleavings are considered. A race condition in which a write to mutable state is directly interleaved with another access to the same state is “catastrophic,” in that this particular trace immediately aborts. The semantics omits “volatile.”

8 Conclusions

This paper defines an operational semantics of volatile fields that enables a type system to reason compositionally about them. It uses write keys to detect threading violations. It shows that write-key errors occur if and only if the program may exhibit a race condition, if and only if it is not correctly synchronized.
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