CSC488
ASSIGNMENT 5
CODE GENERATOR

DANIEL BLOEMENDAL
OREN WATSON

CONTENTS

1. Enhancements

Before delving into the design of the code generator, it deserves noting that there are a few features that go somewhat beyond the assignment requirements and are therefore disabled by default. We will start with a brief discussion of the first one, bounds checking.

1.1. **Bounds checking.** Disabled by default, the code generator has the ability to add two different levels of array bounds checking. The first level is "simple" bounds checking. It can be enabled with the compiler flag "`-B s`". In both modes, array bounds are checked on array access. However, in the simple mode when an error occurs a simple error message with limited location information is provided. The second level is "enhanced" bounds checking, enabled with the compiler flag "`-B e`". It differs from the second mode in the level of detail provided in the location information contained in the error message. An example of an out of bounds error message is provided below.

Listing 1 Out of bounds error

```
db@vmbox ~/workspace/CSC488/A5 $ ./RUNCOMPILER.sh -B e testing/fail/runtime_bounds2d.488
...
Start Execution  pc = 0, msp = 311, mlp = 16383

testing/fail/runtime_bounds2d.488:7:5: subscript out of range
    a[1, 11] := 1
          ^^
...
```

One of the reasons bounds checking is disabled by default is due to the tendency of the feature to greatly increase the generated program size. This is mostly due to the emitted text strings in the constant string pool. Simple bounds checking reduces this problem somewhat, as the text strings are less complex and varied. Since identical strings resolve to the same address in the text constant section, this reduces program size a fair bit.

1.2. **Code dump & syntax highlighting.** The second feature we will discuss is syntax highlighting for dumped code. The code generator can be requested to dump code in two ways. The command line option "`-D x`" will prompt the generator to dump the generated code. However, the machine will also dump the final disassembly of the program. For only the IR assembly output use the command line option "`-T c`". To add syntax highlighting to the dump, coloured via ANSI colour codes, add the command line option "`--syntax-highlighting`".

1.3. **Tail call optimization.** The final and perhaps most interesting additional feature is tail call optimization. It can be enabled with "`-OPT t`". For our compiler we consider statements of the following form to be tail calls.

<div align="center">

`result FunctionCallExp`

</div>

In other words, only a result statement who's value expression is a function call expression will be considered to be a tail call. Furthermore we do not handle mutual recursion. The function call must be a self recursive call. If all those conditions are met, instead of emitting the usual function call, the code generator will emit code to evaluate the arguments of the function, store the evaluated arguments in the corresponding argument locals and jump to the start of the function, past the prolog.

Listing 2 Out of bounds error

```
%
```

```
% Passes with TCO enabled (-OPT t)
%

% Expected output:
% @output=20000

{
    func f(x : integer) : integer {
        if x >= 20000 then
            result x
        fi

        result f(x + 1)
    }

    put f(0)
}
```

2. Design

2.1. **Overview.** The overarching theme in the design of the code generator was to avoid exposing the code generator class `CodeGen` to the complexities and finer details of the underlying machine. To that end, an assembler was developed that hides the complexity of addressing code via a label system and provides an enhanced instruction set, simplifying the emitted code in `CodeGen`. It should be noted that the assembler is also entirely decoupled from the rest of the code generator and stands on its own. The assembler is covered in more detail in `doc/ASSEMBLER.pdf`. We made a distinction between 'major' and 'minor' scopes. A major scope is a whole program, a function, or a procedure, requiring its own stack frame; all other scopes are considered minor scopes. The complexities of managing major scopes, their displays, and ensuring that minor scopes are merged into their enclosing major scopes, are dealt with by the `Frame` and `Table` classes.

2.2. **Coalescing minor scopes.** One of the more involved parts of developing the code generator was to ensure that minor scopes were coalesced into their enclosing major scope. This is rather important as it avoids draining the rather limited resource of display registers, 16 in total. In addition, it reduces the size of the generated code as it avoids having to generate a prolog and epilog for every minor scope. The main class responsible for managing this is `Frame`. It lays out the combined locals of all minor scopes in a given major scope. It does so via an algorithm identical to the record layout algorithm discussed in class. A frame can be thought of as a record corresponding to a major scope where all minor scopes are sub-records. One important detail is that sibling minor scopes can be thought of as belonging to a union. The reason this is a reasonable thing to do is because only one sibling minor scope is alive at any one time. Therefore, it is safe to overwrite the locals used by any previously executed sibling minor scope.

We will now proceed to an example. We will define a small program and lay out the locals according to the algorithm in `Frame`.

Listing 3 Major scope in 488

```
{
    var a : integer a := 0
    { var b, c : integer b := 0 c := 0 }
    { var d, e, f : integer d := 0 e := 0 f := 0 }
    { var g : integer g := 0
        { var h : integer h := 0 }
        { var i, j : integer i := 0 j := 0 }
    }
}
```

We will proceed to lay out the locals. We will express our layout using a C structure.

Listing 4 Layout as C structure

```
struct major_1 {
    short a;
    union {
        struct { short b, c; } minor_1;
        struct { short d, e, f; } minor_2;
        struct {
            short g;
            union {
                struct { short h; } minor_4;
                struct { short i, j; } minor_5;
            } _siblings;
        } minor_3;
    } _siblings;
};
```

2.3. **Calling convention.** A key issue that we debated at length was the method by which function and procedure calls would be implemented. We decided that the most important thing in functions was for the calling code to have the result value at the top of the stack when it returns, with no cleanup, so that the result could immediately be worked with. Therefore, the function cleans up its own arguments and places its result into a reserved place at the bottom of the stack frame. We also decided that to avoid undue complexity, we would treat procedures identically to functions, even if this resulted in wasting space with an unused result value space.

To call a function, the calling code reserves a place for the result, pushes the return address and arguments, and then jumps to the function code. The function code then saves the display pointer for its level, sets the display, and allocates space for its locals. When returning, the function deallocates its locals, restores the display pointer to its previous state, pops its arguments off the stack, and finally returns, leaving the result as the only thing left. The frame therefore has the following structure, shown in figure 1, with the stack growing down. It should be noted that the

base address $D[LL]$ refers to the display set during the prolog of a function via the `SAVECTX LL` intermediate instruction. Here, LL refers to the lexical level of the major scope.

FIGURE 1. Stack frame

Result	$D[LL] - N - 3$
Return address	$D[LL] - N - 2$
Argument 1	$D[LL] - N - 1$
...	...
Argument N	$D[LL] - 2$
Previous display	$D[LL] - 1$
Locals	$D[LL]$

2.4. **Error handling.** There are a number of errors that can occur during code generation. All of them are due to machine limitations or language limitations. When any of these errors are encountered, the code generator gracefully handles them by printing the location of the error in code and suppressing code execution.

2.4.1. *Integer size.* It is considered an error when an integer literal is above or below the machine maximum, or minimum integer size.

2.4.2. *String size.* It is considered an error when a string literal is larger than 255 characters, the language limit.

2.4.3. *Array size.* It is considered an error when an array is declared with a size larger than the machine memory.

2.4.4. *Locals size.* It is considered an error when the locals in some major scope, here we assume it has been coalesced with its minor scopes, are greater than the available stack memory. The available stack memory is computed to be the total machine memory minus the size of the program.

3. CREDITS

src/compiler488/codegen/AssemblerThread.java	Daniel Bloemendal
src/compiler488/codegen/CodeGen.java	Daniel Bloemendal & Oren Watson
src/compiler488/codegen/CodeGenException.java	Daniel Bloemendal
src/compiler488/codegen/Frame.java	Daniel Bloemendal
src/compiler488/codegen/Library.java	Daniel Bloemendal & Mike Qin
src/compiler488/codegen/Table.java	Daniel Bloemendal
src/compiler488/codegen/Variable.java	Daniel Bloemendal
src/compiler488/codegen/visitor/PostProcessor.java	Daniel Bloemendal
src/compiler488/codegen/visitor/PreProcessor.java	Daniel Bloemendal
src/compiler488/codegen/visitor/Processor.java	Daniel Bloemendal
src/compiler488/codegen/visitor/Visitor.java	Daniel Bloemendal