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Abstract

This work is multifold. We review the historical literature on the Lucid programming language, its dialects, intensional logic, intensional programming, the implementing systems, and context-oriented and context-aware computing and so on that provide a contextual framework for the converging Core Lucid standard programming model. We are designing a standard specification of a baseline Lucid virtual machine for generic execution of Lucid programs. The resulting Core Lucid language would inherit the properties of generalization attempts of GIPL (1999–2011) and TransLucid (2008–2011) for all future and recent Lucid-implementing systems to follow. We also maintain this work across local research group in order to foster deeper collaboration, maintain a list of recent and historical bibliography and a reference manual and reading list for students. We form a (for now informal) SIGLUCID group to keep track of this standard and historical records with eventual long-term goal through iterative revisions for this work to become a book or an encyclopedia of the referenced topics, and perhaps, an RFC. We first begin small with this initial set of notes.
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1 Introduction

This work gears toward a generalization on a number of previous results by various authors in terms of context specification in the Lucid programming language and the Core Lucid dealing with data types and have a virtual machine standard agreed to by SIGLUCID. Aside from various data types (primarily to address the hybrid computing paradigms uniformly of Lucid integrating with imperative dialects), the context definition should also be hierarchical for certain application domains to allow for context nesting. The notion of context is central to Lucid as an explicit meaning component that is specified as a first class-value. Traditional Lucid’s context specification was assuming tags and the corresponding values were simple – i.e. a collection of dimension names and the value pairs would denote a point in the context space. Then, the notion of point was not sufficient for some Lucid dialects that needed higher-order contextual notions, such as context sets to denote a context area or field instead of a point, as it was done in Lucx. Another way to traverse a more complex notion of the context definition was done in iHTML and related tools where nesting of the tags would denote the nesting of contextual expressions forming a sort of contextual tree, where the actual tag values were at the leaves of the tree. Then, a similar need arose in Forensic Lucid and MARFL to specify higher-order contexts representing evidence and witness stories or configuration details, but allowing evaluation at any level of the context tree rather than just the leaves. Thus, this work aims at unifying and standardizing various context specifications under one uniform intermediate form that all Lucid dialects can adhere to thereby making the community speak the same language and potentially
bring interoperability between various Lucid implementations and incarnations across University groups working in the intensional programming domain.

1.1 Motivation

Higher-order context specification is needed for nested-level context that traditionally decomposes a higher-order value into its components, and equivalently from the components get to the parent component. This is partitioned in any nested markup-like language, e.g. iHTML, any XML-based definitions and descriptions of data and databases, configuration management of a software system components, as well as domain-specific applications such as contextual specification of a cyberforensic case where evidential statement is comprised of observation sequences representing encoded stories told by evidence and witnesses, which in turn decompose into observations, and then into properties and duration components; which all-in-all comprise a context of evaluation of a cyberforensic case. Thus, the need for higher-order contexts is apparent as a fundamental pillar supporting higher-order intensional logic (HOIL).

Types other than the context also should be exposed to the programmer when needed and allow for a wider range of data types and type systems to allow hybrid dialect interaction easier as well as compiler optimization and run-time system parallelizations.

TODO

1.2 Proposed Solution

For the context specification, we propose to extend the notion of context to be a bi-directional tree with the operators from GIPL, Lucx, iHTML and MARFL to query, switch, and traverse the depth of the context hierarchy. The language that encompasses the new specification on the syntax and semantic level is proposed to be called Core Lucid or Standard Lucid or Nominal Lucid.

The type specification and code segments are augmented as presented in possible specification from the SIGLUCID meetings and others in Section 3.1 and Section 3.3.1.

TODO

1.3 SIGLUCID

SIGLUCID: Special Interest Group on Lucid, Ubiquity, Context, Intensionality, and multi-Dimensionality. SIGLUCID is a working group of researchers in Lucid, intensional programming, intensional logic, context-aware and context-oriented computing and the related application domains (see Figure 2.3). SIGLUCID currently is a loose affiliation of researchers, collaborators, and supporters in intensional logic, intensional programming, context-aware computing, etc. across Canada, Australia, and other places.

Should you wish to be a part and contribute, contact the people listed at the title page. This is a running draft to fill in the missing information as it becomes possible.
2 Historical Perspective, Context, Dialects, and Applications

The history of Lucid, multi-dimensional intensional programming and logic, context-orientation, parallel, concurrent, and distributed eductive evaluation aspects can be traced through different Lucid dialects, outlined in Section 2.1.

2.1 Lucid Dialects

Here we enumerate the Lucid dialects that came to be from either practical implementations and/or theoretical frameworks to study the intensionality properties, context, and mathematical and intensional logic foundations. We plan to make the list into a table or other presentation means with the status of each language and the related citations.

- Lucid
- GIPL
- TransLucid
- Lucx
- GLU
- GLU#
- Indexical Lucid
- Tensor Lucid
- Partial Lucid
- JLucid
- Objective Lucid
- Onyx
- Forensic Lucid
- JOOIP
- MARFL
- iHTML
- iPerl

2.1.1 Incomplete Brief History and The Family

From 1974 to Lucid Today (taken from [Mok05], incomplete, to be updated):

1. Lucid as a Pipelined Dataflow Language through 1974-1977. Lucid was introduced by Anchroft and Wadge in [AW76 AW77a]. Features:

   - A purely declarative language for natural expression of iterative algorithms.
- Goals: semantics and verification of correctness of programming languages (for details see [AW76, AW77a]).
- Operators as pipelined streams: one for initial element, and then all for the successor ones.

2. Intensions, Indexical Lucid, GGranular Lucid (GLU, [JD96, JDA97]), circa 1996. More details on these two dialects are provided further in the chapter as they directly relate to the theme of this thesis. Features:
   - Random access to streams in Indexical Lucid.
   - First working hybrid intensional-imperative paradigm (C/Fortran and Indexical Lucid) in the form of GLU.
   - Eduction or demand-driven execution (in GLU).

   - Partial Lucid is an intermediate experimental language used for demonstrative purposes in presenting the semantics of Lucid in [Paq99].
   - Tensor Lucid dialect was developed by Joey Paquet for plasma physics computations to illustrate advantages and expressiveness of Lucid over an equivalent solution written in Fortran.

4. GIPL, 1999 [Paq99].
   - All Lucid dialects can be translated into this basic form of Lucid, GIPL through a set of translation rules. (GIPL is in the foundation of the execution semantics of GIPSY and its GIPC and GEE because its AST is the only type of AST GEE understands when executing a GIPSY program).

5. RLucid, 1999, [GP99]
   - A Lucid dialect for reactive real-time intensional programming.

   - These dialects introduce a notion of hybrid and object-oriented programming in the GIPSY with Java and Indexical Lucid and GIPL, and are discussed great detail in the follow up chapters of this thesis.

7. Lucx [WAP05], 2003 - 2005
   - Kaiyu Wan introduces a notion of contexts as first-class values in Lucid, thereby making Lucx the true intensional language.

   - Peter Grogono makes an experimental derivative of Lucid – Onyx to investigate on lazy evaluation of arrays.

9. GLU# [PK04], 2004
   - GLU# is an evolution of GLU where Lucid is embedded into C++.
2.2 List of Tools and Implementing Systems

1. GIPSY [PMV+11]
2. GLU
3. TransLucid
4. pLucid
5. libintense

2.3 Application Domains

1. Context-Aware Computing
2. Scientific Computing
3. Distributed and Parallel Evaluation
4. Ubiquitous and Mobile Computing
5. Wiki
6. Forensic Computing
7. Multimedia and Configuration Management
8. Program Verification
9. Software Engineering
10. Aspect-Oriented Programming
11. Web OS
12. Reactive Computing
13. Pervasive Computing
14. Autonomic Computing
15. Modeling and Simulation
16. Model Checking

2.4 Related Work

There is a vast amount of related and past work done. Over time we will provide brief historical description of each or a group of works clustered by a specific theme either in this section or relevant other sections. For now, however, we begin by citing them first, so anyone looking for the references can look them up in a jiffy and make their choice accordingly. This is ideal for graduate students and researchers starting in the subjects or looking for what’s been done that they can benefit from.

Most recent on top:
• 2011
  - Ji11

• 2010
  - MP10a
  - MP10b
  - WPM10
  - HMP10
  - Han10
  - JMP11
  - Mok10
  - MPD10b
  - MPD10a
  - MVPD10

• 2009
  - Paq09
  - MPT09
  - Wu09
  - MPD09b
  - MPD09a
  - MV09
  - Mok09b
  - Mok09a
  - Mok09c

• 2008
  - Ham08
  - Pou08
  - Ton08
  - Mok08b
  - PMT08
  - PMDW08
  - RP08
  - PVP08
  - VP08
  - MP08
  - MPD08
– [Mok08a]

• 2007
  – [PVP07]
  – [TPM08]

• 2006
  – [Wan06]

• 2005
  – [WAP05b]
  – [MP05a]
  – [Mok05]
  – [MP05b]
  – [GMP05]
  – [PW05]
  – [VP05a]
  – [WP05]
  – [VP05b]
  – [Vas05]
  – [WAP05a]

• 2004
  – [Swo04]
  – [Lu04]
  – [SP04b]
  – [SP04a]
  – [Gro04]
  – [PGW04]
  – [Tao04]
  – [Din04]
  – [PK04]

• 2003
  – [LGP03]
  – [WPG03]
  – [Wad03]

• 2002
  – [Gro02]
- [Wu02]
- [Ren02]

• 2000
  - [SW00]
  - [PK00]

• 1999
  - [KP99]
  - [Ron99]
  - [Paq99]
  - [GP99]

• 1998
  - [WBSY98]

• 1997
  - [Zha97]
  - [JDA97]

• 1996
  - [Doc96]
  - [JD96]

• 1995
  - [Paq95]
  - [AFJW95]
  - [Ag95]

• 1994
  - [Ron94]
  - [PP94]
  - [Tao94]
  - [Du94]

• 1993
  - [PW93]
  - [PKL93]

• 1991
  - [Du91]
3 Core Lucid Standard Specification Design

The Core Lucid standard design and specification is an ongoing process influenced by the two core proposals: GIPL and TransLucid developed in 1999.
3.1 SIGLUCID Meetings
Here’s the brief summary of the SIGLUCID meetings at various workshops and conferences, attendees, and works contributing to the collaboration and developing the Core Lucid standard.

3.1.1 SECASA 2010 Meeting at SERA 2010, Montreal, Canada

Works  The following works were presented:

1. [HMP10]
2. [MP10a]
3. [WPM10]
4. [MP10b]

TODO

Attendees

1. Serguei A. Mokhov
2. Joey Paquet
3. Emil Vassev
4. Bin Han

TODO

3.1.2 SECASA 2009 Meeting at COMPSAC 2009, Seattle, USA

Works  The following works were presented:

1. [Paq09]

TODO
Attendees

1. Joey Paquet
2. John Plaice

TODO

3.1.3 SECASA 2008 Meeting at COMPSAC 2008, Turku, Finland

The first discussion about standardizing the types, evaluation, and overview of the current candidates for the Lucid Core from different research groups, such as GIPL, TransLucid. The needs of various in-progress Lucid dialects were discussed to be accommodated in the core, such as MARFL, Forensic Lucid. Below are the points from the meeting minutes.

Works  The following works were presented:

1. [PMT08]
2. [PMDW08]
3. [RP08]
4. [Mok08b]

Attendees

1. Weichang Du
2. Blanca Mancilla
3. Serguei A. Mokhov
4. Joey Paquet
5. John Plaice
6. Toby Rahilly
7. William W. Wadge

Notes

1. Constants appearing in the expressions:

   type<string> (const type -- int8<42> != int16<42>)
   [| string |]
   12
   true
   false
2. header – default types for integers, etc.

3. paren – see the sections on the GIPSY type system and a hybrid program example Section 3.3.1 and Section 3.3.2

4. Proposal of type (‘type’ is a keyword).
   - type<float 32>
   - uchar<> uchar<>
   - shorthand syntactical sugar:
     - [1.2] – 64 bit IEEE float
     - {1.2} – 32 bit float

5. special<...> – correspond to exceptions and error situations for handling later on

6. Joey: Dimensions syntactically are allowed to taken on default values other than always implicit default of zero.
   - special<undecl> special¡arith\_i = special¡undecl\_i+
     - lose details, e.g. where it happened in the code or even within the imperative code?
   - if(ispecial<undecl> E)
     then ...

7. Bill has done something like that with someone in pLucid, with well defined semantics, etc.

8. Bill complained about eagerness:
   
   \{E_1 : E_2, ..., E_n : E_{n_2}\}

   eager: only lefts (multithreaded [RP08]), else all —, but right-hand-sides are lazy.

9. Q: How to stop people from producing recursive/infinite contexts?

10. Bill: risky: \# a@{a:P, E:Q} != P ?? If E does not terminate or special – can’t prove it’s constant.

11. Toby: threading, sequential scheduling

12. Audience concluded: GIPL context-eager, TransLucid dimension-eager (LHS)

13. Variables
   
   variable x
   dimension d

   type of x is context-dependent.
   Future:
   id<x>
   dimension<d>
   expr<E>
14. Dynamic ranks analysis (Tony Faustini and Bill in the '80)

\((X, C)\)?

? = eduction evaluation engine

\(W?(X, \{\})\)
- \(\rightarrow 42\)
- \(\rightarrow \{d_1, \ldots, d_n\}\)?

\(v_1 = C(d_1)\)
\(v_n = C(d_n)\)
\(v'_1 = C(d'_1)\)
\(v'_m = C(d'_m)\)

\(W?(X, \{d_1:v_1, \ldots, \})\)
- \(\rightarrow 42\)
- \(\rightarrow \{d'_2, \ldots, d'_n\}\)?

\(x, W, C, Cs, C_i \# 3\)
\(W' = W U \{(X, Cs) | \rightarrow \{3\}\}\)

\(C_i\) – current internal context

15. Toby: optimization: demand grouping demands as early as possible, lifting up

16. optimization for constant vs. run-time dimensions thus

- dimension \(d\)
- is an optimization hint.

17. Binary representation (portable) ??? a-la Java byte-code

3.1.4 PLC 2005 Meeting at WORLDCOMP 2005, Las Vegas, USA

Works  The following works were presented:

1. [GMP05]
2. [MP05b]
3. [MP05a]
4. [VP05b]
5. [WP05]
6. [PW05]
7. [WAP05b]

TODO
Attendees

1. Weichang Du
2. Serguei A. Mokhov
3. Joey Paquet
4. Emil Vassev
5. William W. Wadge
6. Kaiyu Wan
7. Aihua Wu

TODO

3.2 TransLucid

TODO

3.3 GIPSY

3.3.1 Hybrid Interaction with Other Languages

GIPC Preprocessor The Preprocessor is something that is invoked first by the GIPC (see Figure) on incoming GIPSY program’s source code stream. The Preprocessor’s role is to do preliminary program analysis, processing, and splitting the source GIPSY program into “chunks”, each written in a different language and identified by a language tag. In a very general view, a GIPSY program is a hybrid program consisting of different languages in one or more source file; then, there has to be an interface between all these code segments. Thus, the Preprocessor after some initial parsing (using its own preprocessor syntax) and producing the initial parse tree, constructs a preliminary dictionary of symbols used throughout the program. This is the basis for type matching and semantic analysis applied later on. This is also where the first step of type assignment occurs, especially on the boundary between typed and typeless parts of the program, e.g. Java and a specific Lucid dialect. The Preprocessor then splits the code segments of the GIPSY program into chunks preparing them to be fed to the respective concrete compilers for those chunks. The chunks are represented through the CodeSegment class that the GIPC collects.

GIPSY Program Segments There are four baseline types of segments defined to be used in a GIPSY program. These are:
• **#funcdecl** program segment declares function prototypes written as imperative language functions defined later or externally from this program to be used by the intensional language part. The syntactical form of these prototypes is particular to GIPSY programs and need not resemble the actual function prototype declaration they describe in their particular programming language. They serve as a basis for static and dynamic type assignment and checking within the GIPSY type system with regards to procedural functions called by other parts of the GIPSY program, e.g. the Lucid code segments.

• **#typedef** segment lists all user-defined data types that can potentially be used by the
Figure 2: Example of Eductive Evaluation of Objective Lucid Program
intensional part; usually objects. These are the types that do not explicitly appear in the matching table in Table 1 describing the basic data types allowed in GIPSY programs.

- `<IMPERATIVELANG>` segment declares that this is a code segment written in whatever IMPERATIVELANG may be, for example #JAVA for Java, #CPP for C++, #FORTRAN for Fortran, #PERL for Perl, #PYTHON for Python, etc.

- `<INTENSIONALLANG>` segment declares that this is a code segment written in whatever INTENSIONALLANG may be, for example #GIPSY, #LUCX, #JOOIP, #INDEXICALLUCID, #JLUCID, #OBJECTIVELUCID, #TENSORLUCID, #ONYX [Gro04], #FORENSICLUCID [MP08], and #TRANSLUCID, etc. as specified by the available GIPSY implementations and stubs. An example of a hybrid program is presented in Listing 1. The preamble of the program with the type and function declaration segments are the main source of type information that is used at compile time to annotate the nodes in the tree to help both static and semantic analysis.

### 3.3.2 Introduction to the GIPSY Type System

The introduction of JLucid, Objective Lucid, and GICF [Mok05, MP05b, MP05a, GMP05] prompted the development of the GIPSY Type System as implicitly understood by the Lucid language and its incarnation within the GIPSY to handle types in a more general manner as a glue between the imperative and intensional languages within the system. Further evolution of Lucx introducing contexts as first-class values and JOOIP highlighted the need of the further development of the type system to accommodate the more general properties of the intensional and hybrid languages.

**Matching Lucid and Java Data Types**  Here we present a case of interaction between Lucid and Java. Allowing Lucid to call Java methods brings a set of issues related to the data types, especially when it comes to type checks between Lucid and Java parts of a hybrid program. This is pertinent when Lucid variables or expressions are used as parameters to Java methods and when a Java method returns a result to be assigned to a Lucid variable or used in an intensional expression. The sets of types in both cases are not exactly the same. The basic set of Lucid data types as defined by Grogono [Gro02] is int, bool, double, string, and dimension. Lucid’s int is of the same size as Java’s long. GIPSY and Java double, boolean, and String are roughly the same. Lucid string and Java String are simply mapped internally through StringBuffer; thus, one can think of the Lucid string as a reference when evaluated in the intensional program. Based on this fact, the lengths of a Lucid string and Java String are the same. Java String is also an object in Java; however, at this point, a Lucid program has no direct access to any String’s properties (though internally we do and we may expose it later to the programmers). We also distinguish the float data type for single-precision floating point operations. The dimension index type is said to be an integer or string (as far as its dimension tag values are concerned), but might be of other types eventually, as discussed in TPM08. Therefore, we perform data type matching as presented in Table 1. Additionally, we allow void Java return type which will always be matched to a Boolean expression true in Lucid as an expression has to always evaluate to something. As for now our types mapping and restrictions are as per Table 1. This is the mapping table for the Java-to-IPL-to-Java type adapter. Such a table would exist for mapping between any imperative-to-intensional language and back, e.g., the C++-to-IPL-to-C++ type adapter.
/*
 * Language−mix GIPSY program.
 * @author Serguei Mokhov
 */

#typedef

myclass;

#funcdef

myclass foo(int, double);
float bar(int, int):"ftp://newton.cs.concordia.ca/cool.class":baz;
int f1();

#JAVA
myclass foo(int a, double b)
{
    return new myclass(new Integer((int)(b + a)));}

class myclass
{
    public myclass(Integer a)
    {
        System.out.println(a);
    }
}

#CPP
#include <iostream>

int f1(void)
{
    cout << "hello";
    return 0;
}

#OBJECTIVELUCID

A + bar(B, C)
where
    A = foo(B, C).intValue();
    B = f1();
    C = 2.0;
end;

/
* in theory we could write more than one intensional chunk,
* then those chunks would evaluate as separate possibly
* totally independent expressions in parallel that happened
* to use the same set of imperative functions.
*

// EOF

Listing 1: Example of a hybrid GIPSY program.
Table 1: Matching data types between Lucid and Java.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return Types of Java Methods</th>
<th>Types of Lucid Expressions</th>
<th>Internal GIPSY Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>int, byte, long</td>
<td>int, dimension</td>
<td>GIPSYInteger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>float</td>
<td>float</td>
<td>GIPSYFloat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>GIPSYDouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boolean</td>
<td>bool</td>
<td>GIPSYBoolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>char</td>
<td>char</td>
<td>GIPSYCharacter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String</td>
<td>string, dimension</td>
<td>GIPSYString</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>GIPSYFunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>operator</td>
<td>GIPSYOperator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>GIPSYArray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>class</td>
<td>GIPSYObject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>GIPSYEmbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>void</td>
<td>bool::true</td>
<td>GIPSYVoid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Types Used in Lucid</th>
<th>Corresponding Java Types</th>
<th>Internal GIPSY Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>string</td>
<td>String</td>
<td>GIPSYString</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>float</td>
<td>float</td>
<td>GIPSYFloat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double</td>
<td>double</td>
<td>GIPSYDouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int</td>
<td>int</td>
<td>GIPSYInteger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dimension</td>
<td>int, String</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boolean</td>
<td>boolean</td>
<td>GIPSYBoolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>GIPSYObject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URL</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>GIPSYEmbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>GIPSYArray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operator</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>GIPSYOperator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>GIPSYFunction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the Design and Implementation of the Type System. While the main language of GIPSY, Lucid, is polymorphic and does not have explicit types, co-existing with other languages necessitates definition of GIPSY types and their mapping to a particular language being embedded. Figure 3 presents the detailed design of the GIPSY Type System.

Each class is prefixed with GIPSY to avoid possible confusion with similar definitions in the java.lang package. The GIPSYVoid type always evaluates to the Boolean true, as described earlier in Section 3.3.2. The other types wrap around the corresponding Java object wrapper classes for the primitive types, such as Long, Float, etc. Every class keeps a lexeme (a lexical representation) of the corresponding type in a GIPSY program and overrides toString() to show the lexeme and the contained value. These types are extensively used by the Preprocessor, imperative and intensional (for constants) compilers, the SequentialThreadGenerator, and SemanticAnalyzer for the general type of GIPSY program processing, and by the GEE’s Executor.

The other special types that have been created are either experimental or do not correspond to a wrapper of a primitive type. GIPSYIdentifier type case corresponds to a declaration of some sort of an identifier in a GIPSY program to be put into the dictionary, be it a variable or a function name with the reference to their definition. Constants and conditionals may be anonymous and thereby not have a corresponding identifier. GIPSYEmbed is another special type that encapsulates embedded code via the URL parameter and later is exploded into
multiple types corresponding to procedural demands (Java or any other language methods or functions) [Mok05, GMP05]. GIPSYFunction and its descendant GIPSYOperator correspond to the function types for regular operators and user-defined functions. A GIPSYFunction can either encapsulate an ordinary Lucid function (which is immutable as in functional programming) or a procedure (e.g., a Java method), which may often be mutable (i.e., with side effects). These four types (identifier, embed, function, and operator) are not directly exposed to a GIPSY programmer and at this point are managed internally. By the latter we mean we have not reached the stage when we can provide them for explicit use by programmers; however, the semantics of is still defined and specified at the requirements, design, and implementation levels. GIPSYContext and Dimension are a new addition to the type system implementation since [Mok05]. They represent context-as-first-class-values in the context calculus defined by Wan in [Wan06] and refined and implemented by Tong [Ton08]. The rest of the type system is exposed to the GIPSY programmer in the preamble of a GIPSY program, i.e., the #funcdecl and #typedec1 segments, which result in the embryo of the dictionary for linking, semantic analysis, and execution. Once imperative compilers of procedural demands return, the type data structures (return and parameter types) declared in the preamble are matched against what was discovered by the compilers and if the match is successful, the link is made. By capturing the types such as identifier, embed, function, operator, and context, dimension, the GIPSY type system lays down fundamentals the higher-order intensional logic (HOIL) support that combines functional programming, intensional logic, context calculus, and in some instances hybrid paradigm support, and the corresponding types. We describe various properties of the concrete GIPSY types and their more detailed specification in Appendix ?? and Appendix ?? . There we detail the inner workings of each type in more detail as well describe some of the properties through the notions of existential, union, intersection, and linear types. They have been excluded from the main body of the article due to size limitations.

3.4 The Core Lucid Standard

The Core Lucid standard specification, syntax, semantics, translation rules, type system, and verifications are to be placed in this section upon consensus of the SIGLUCID members.

TODO

3.4.1 Syntax

TODO

3.4.2 Semantics

TODO
4 Conclusion

We have laid out the first foundational notions of a practical Lucid standard at the 1st SECASA in 2008 in Turku, Finland, associated with COMPSAC 2008. Since then two (3) more SECASA’s happened: in 2009 in Seattle, 2010 in Montreal, and another one is planned in 2011. Prior that we are producing this first set of notes from the meeting and related work.

5 Future Work

We plan on further meet and refine these notes and the standards and further accrete the related work. Our eventual goal after the standard draft is complete publish it along with a comprehensive survey of the recent related work as well as historical review.
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