# Section 3 / Bit Fields / Without Bit Fields

#### Overview

Many C and C++ programmers have never seen bit fields.

Bit fields are a feature of the C and C++ language which completely hide what is often called "bit bashing".

Bit bashing is the manipulation of individual bits. Bit bashing goes to the very core of the C language. Remember that C is a high level assembly language, as we argue in Section 1 of this book. And C is the (later) language in which Unix was implemented and indeed, C was developed specifically to implement Unix.

Since an operating system directly interfaces with hardware - the C language grew to have features to aid Unix implementers.

With that said, consider this WARNING: the ordering of bits in a bit field is not guaranteed to be the same on different platforms and even between different compilers on the same platform.

Bit fields are implemented within a struct by appending a colon plus a number after the declaration of integer types.

For example:

```
struct BF {
   unsigned char a : 1;
   unsigned char b : 2;
   unsigned char c : 5;
};
```

The above declares a struct whose size is 1 byte. Members of the struct are a, b and c which are 1, 2 and 5 bits in size, respectively.

### Bit Fields Aren't Just For Hardware

Consider a data structure for which there will be potentially millions of instances in RAM. Or, perhaps billions of instances on disc. Suppose you need 8 boolean members in every instance. The C++ standard does not define the size of a bool instead leaving it to be implementation dependent. Some implementations equate bool to int, four bytes in length. Some implement bool with a char, or 1 byte in length.

Let's assume the smallest case and equate a bool with char. Our struct, for which there may be millions or billions of instances requires 8 bool so therefore 8 bytes. Times millions or billions.

Ouch.

Bit fields can come to your aid here by using a single bit per boolean value. In the best case, 8 bytes collapse to 1 byte. In a worse case, 8 x 4 = 32 bytes collapsed into 1.

#### Without Bit Fields

Before we examine using bit fields, let's look at what life would be like without them.

Let's assume we're working with a byte that is comprised of three fields laid out as in **struct** BF above. That is, a one, two and five bit field inside one byte.

Without bit fields, we would have to write this code to clear a to zero:

```
void ClearA(unsigned char * byte) {
    *byte &= ~1;
}
```

This function takes the address of the byte containing the a, b and c portions.

Good programming practice would check byte against NULL or nullptr.

The ~ operator is a bitwise negation. All the bits in the value are flipped from 0 to 1 or 1 to 0. ~1 in an unsigned char will produce 0xFE, or all ones except for bit 0. anding this value to \*byte ensures that its bit 0 is 0 and all other bits are left alone.

In assembly language, written *naively*, this would look like this:

```
// 1
                 w1, [x0]
ClearA: ldrb
                 w2, 1
                                                                              // 2
        mov
                 w2, w2
                                                                              // 3
        mvn
                 w1, w1, w2
                                                                              // 4
        and
                 w1, [x0]
                                                                              // 5
        strb
                                                                              // 6
        ret
```

x30 does not have to be backed up or restored as this function is a "leaf."

Line 3 uses the instruction mvn to flip all the bits in w2.

This code completely tracks the C / C++ code.

We have no obligation to follow the C / C++ code exactly. Instead we could write:

```
ClearA: ldrb w1, [x0] // 1 and w1, w1, 0xFE // 2 strb w1, [x0] // 3 ret // 4
```

Here, the OxFE literal takes the place of lines 2 and 3 in the previous version. We do this by pre-computing what the mov and mvn would have produced.

For setting the a bit, we would do this:

```
void SetA(unsigned char * byte) {
   *byte |= 1;
}
```

This is an anomaly for bit bashing. In almost all cases when setting bit values, the bits must be cleared first because an or instruction is responsible for setting any 1 bits to 1.

It is important you get that when needing to set a number of bits to a specific value, those bit must be cleared first so that an orr can do the right thing.

In this case, it is a single bit we're setting so we can just or it in.

In assembly language:

orr is one of several or instructions in AARCH64. It is the one that maps most closely to | in C and C++.

Moving onto the  $\mathfrak b$  field, things begin to get a little more interesting. To clear the  $\mathfrak b$  field we might do this in C | C++.

```
void ClearB(unsigned char * byte) {
    *byte &= ~6;
}
```

This could *naively* be written as:

```
ClearB: ldrb
                 w1, [x0]
                                                                              // 1
                 w2, 6
                                                                              // 2
        mov
                 w2, w2
                                                                              // 3
        mvn
                 w1, w1, w2
                                                                              // 4
        and
        strb
                 w1, [x0]
                                                                              // 5
        ret
                                                                              // 6
```

This code is essentially the same as the *naive* version of ClearA given above. Once again, we can pre-compute the results of lines 2 and 3 to make:

```
ClearB: ldrb w1, [x0] // 1 and w1, w1, 0xF9 // 2 strb w1, [x0] // 3 ret // 4
```

Turning to setting b, the code gets a little more complicated as for the first time, we have to accept a parameter for the value to place into b. And, b is more than one bit.

Line 2 is necessary to prevent stray 1's from being or'ed into \*byte.

Line 3 is necessary to squash the existing target bits to zero prior to being orr'ed

Notice value is being shifted left by 1 bit as the b field begins at bit index 1.

In *naive* assembly language we could write this:

```
SetB:
                 w3, [x0]
                                                                               // 1
        ldrb
                 w1, w1, 3
                                       // value &= 3
                                                                               // 2
        and
                 w1, w1, 1
                                                                               // 3
        lsl
                 w2.6
                                                                               // 4
        mov
                 w2, w2
                                                                               // 5
        {\tt mvn}
                 w3, w3, w2
                                       // B is cleared
                                                                               // 6
        and
                                                                               // 7
                 w3, w3, w1
         orr
                                                                               // 8
         strb
                 w3, [x0]
                                                                               // 9
```

The only interesting thing in this code is that we chose to perform the left shift (1s1) by one bit earlier in the code rather than later. There is ill no side effect to changing this order.

1s1 means "left shift logical" which fills the right side recently vacated bits with zero.

Now, we present a more sophisticated version of SetB:

Whoa. Nine instructions down to four! What the heck is bfi?

bfi dst, src, start, width copies width bits starting at 0 in src to bits starting at start in dst.

It obviates the need for line 2 in the naive code because it plucks only bits 0 and 1 and no others from the original value of w1.

The bfi then internally does the shift appropriate to move bit 0 of w1 to bit start along with width - 1 subsequent bits. Finally, the shifted bits overwrite the same bits in w3.

Some might argue that instructions like bfi (and ubfiz described below) is an example of ISA creep where ISA's get more and more cumbersome with the

latest instructions du jure. This is definitely true in the x86 ISA. Perhaps this is true in the AARCH64 ISA as well, but certainly not to the extent of the x86.

Remember that the ARM family of processors are examples of RISC machines - reduced instruction set architectures.

Finally, we come to handling field c. Recall c is 5 bits long starting at bit 3.

Clearing the bits in c is easily accomplished:

This is optimally implemented using:

```
ClearC: ldrb w1, [x0] // 1 and w1, w1, 7 // 2 strb w1, [x0] // 3 ret // 4
```

As for setting the value of c, we have this in C / C++:

In naive assembly language, this function would look like this:

```
SetC:
                 w3, [x0]
                                                                              // 1
        ldrb
                 w2, 0x1F
                                                                              // 2
        mov
                 w1, w1, w2
                                                                              // 3
        and
        lsl
                 w1, w1, 3
                                                                              // 4
                                                                              // 5
        lsl
                 w2, w2, 3
                 w2, w2
                                                                              // 6
        mvn
                 w3, w3, w2
                                                                              // 7
        and
                                                                              // 8
                 w3, w3, w1
        orr
                                                                              // 9
        strb
                 w3, [x0]
                                                                              // 10
        ret
```

Lines 1 and 2 in the assembly language performs line 1 of the C code.

Line 4 shifts value up to where c starts. Line 5 similarly shifts the mask up to where c starts. Its bits are negated on line 6. Line 7 squashes the upper five bits to zero followed by the orring on line 8.

A more sophisticated version of the assembly language, leveraging some fancy bit insertion / copying instructions, is far shorter.

```
SetC: ldrb w2, [x0] // put *byte into w2 // 1 ubfiz w1, w1, 3, 5 // zero new w1, copy bits 0..4 to 3..7 // 2
```

```
and w2, w2, 7 // preserve only 1st 3 bits in *byte // 3
orr w2, w2, w1 // or in value into *byte // 4
strb w2, [x0] // 5
ret // 6
```

Line 2 uses the instruction ubfiz which means Unsigned Bit Field Insert Zeroed. This instruction:

- Zeros out a new copy of value (w1), the destination and
- Copies 5 bits starting at bit 0 of the old value to bits 3 through 7 in the new version of value.

This one instruction does the work of lines 2, 3 and 4 in the naive version of the assembly language.

Line 3 of the new assembly language replaces lines 4, 5 and 6 in the naive. This works because the enlightened human saw an easier way to zero out *byte* except\* for the first 3 bits (where a and b live).

The remainder is as expected.

## Summary

In this chapter we saw was life was like without bit fields. We saw that we had to implement our own bit bashing functions to do things like:

- Ensure parameters are in the right range
- Shift values around to line up with their destination
- Zero out destination fields
- Or in new values, having been shifted to the right position

and more.

We brushed upon the idea that bit bashing and bit fields are critical to directly interfacing with hardware but are also useful in decreasing the size of data structures in memory and on disc.

#### Space Versus Time

In Computer Science there is an eternal tension between space and time. The following is a **law**:

If you want something to go faster, it will cost more memory.

If you want to save memory, what you're doing will take more time.

This law shows up here... recall the example of where we wanted to save memory by collapsing 8 bool into 1 byte? To save that memory we will slow down because

accessing the right bits takes a couple of instructions where overwriting a bool implemented as an <code>int</code> takes just one instruction.