## [bottom-bracket]

What if we didn't assume our abstractions; what if we derived them?

### **Abstract**

to anything through bottom-up abstraction via macros written in anything. It's intended to serve as a minimal top-down to bottom-up abstraction turnaround point at as

Bottom-bracket (BB) is a homoiconic language designed to express the compilation of anything

low of a level as possible. It is designed to be as unopinionated as possible. This is done with compilation of code to machine language in mind, but it's open-ended.

Using BB without any libraries, you start at machine language with macros. Programming

languages are just macro libraries. Example:

# [bb/with

[[data my-macro-expansion [a b c]]; Some data we'll reference

;; Macro - written in machine language - that expands to [a b c] by returning ;; a pointer to that structure.

[x86 64-linux [bb/barray-cat "\x48\xB8"[my-macro-expansion addr 8 LE] ; mov rax, data

;; Using our macro [foo bar [my-macro]]]

## Eventually the hope is to build a stable specification for everyone to implement.

Such that you're not flying completely blind, here are some anticipated breaking Parallelized macroexpansion where possible

Breaking changes should be expected for now. We need to get the core of the language

• Macro I/O details (inputs, return value etc). • Changes to parameters and interfaces of builtin functions Changes to which builtin functions are exposed

This doesn't mean don't build stuff with BB. This means use a pinned version of BB for

- 1. Introduction
- 3.1.1. barray 3.1.2. parray
- 6. Fully verifiable bootstrap is a goal 7. Getting started 7.1. Build an implementation of BB
- 1. Introduction
- When we create abstractions, one common approach is to begin with a top-level interface we'd
- This is top-down abstraction, and it's the default mode of operation for software

development today.

#### There's another way, though, one pioneered by languages like Lisp and Forth. Rather than starting from an ideal interface, we start with what exists now, pick a direction we'd like

move in that direction. This is the bottom-up approach. Many areas of science were formed using top-down abstraction by necessity. We made highlevel observations about the world (salt goes away in water!) and created abstractions for those observations. As we came to understand the underlying mechanisms, the high-level layer

less leaky design. Of course, it's never perfect. Every layer leaks to some degree - even with the bottom-up approach - and we just work to keep it to a minimum. The benefit of minimizing abstraction

start at a high-level of abstraction, but starts right at the machine-language level. 2. Bottom-bracket's lifecycle

(enabled by macros) to minimize abstraction leakage. In contrast to most lisps, it does not

# The data structure in memory is designed to represent a tree. There are only two data types,

3.1. The in-memory data structure

step would likely be an ELF .o file.

3. Language details

Print: Outputs result using printer macros

that's put together). 3.1.1. barray

Array of bytes. Prefixed with with the quantity of bytes in the barray.

platform-dependent (size\_t in principle, but will be made more clear in specification when

# 3.2. The default syntax Emphasis on default because users of bottom-bracket have control over this through reader

• All other characters besides whitespace placed next to eachother represent barrays • Double-quoted strings - byte strings - represent barrays and can use escape codes for

### Implementations of bottom-bracket itself are intended to be minimal. The version written in x86\_64 assembly currently sets around 5,500 lines total.

these macros is easily changed by the user of the language.

virtualization and other tricks. Portability is not a problem solved at the bottom bracket level, as bottom bracket is intended to be the minimal abstraction turnaround point. Portable languages built using

stages of bootstrapping much easier ▶ The moment you implement a tiny part of any assembler, you can use it. The x86\_64

• Implementing C in a language of this design is particularly transparent - everything is

• Reader macros allow you to turn C syntax into a bottom bracket structure (parrays and

7. Getting started

6. Fully verifiable bootstrap is a goal

This are in the impl/ subdirectory of this repository. Exact build process depends on the implementation, but usually the answer is just '\$ make'.

# 7.2. Run some code!

just a library.

barrays).

• barray: \$ echo 'abc' | build/bbr • parray: \$ echo '[a b c]' | build/bbr

7.1. Build an implementation of BB

Also try the example at the top of this README. Put it into a file and \$ cat my-file.bbr | build/bbr

8. Structure of this repository

- impl implementations of bottom-bracket.
- docs rendered docs for github pages (not user-facing) notes - almost anything

- [macro my-macro
- Expands to [foo bar [a b c]]
- Beware: it's not stable yet
  - right, and some iteration is inevitable.
  - changes:
  - anything you need to stay working, and be ready for migration work.
- 2. Bottom-bracket's lifecycle 3. Language details 3.1. The in-memory data structure
- 3.2. The default syntax 4. Bottom-bracket is a minimal core 5. What about portability?
- 7.2. Run some code! 8. Structure of this repository
- like to have, and then work down towards the layer below working out how to make it happen.
- to go, and start working our way up towards a particular problem we'd like to solve. The abstraction that we create is simply the abstraction that logically forms when attempting to

• Expand macros

3.1.2. parray

abstractions that don't logically map to eachother very cleanly. By contrast, mathematics has largely evolved in a more bottom-up fashion. Each abstraction is built upon the previous, and what resulted is a ruthlessly logical and clean system. These examples illustrate how bottom-up abstraction lends itself to a clean, well-mapped,

leakage is huge, though: the less each layer leaks, the higher we can stack abstractions

Bottom-bracket embraces the bottom-up philosophy. It is built for bottom-up abstraction

without accumulating frustrating behaviors and performance issues.

was already established - so we 'make it work' to make our abstractions logically map together as well as we can. It's never perfect though. This approach lends itself to

Upon execution, bottom bracket performs only 3 steps. Read  $\rightarrow$  expand macros  $\rightarrow$  print. • Read: reads user input using reader macros

Bottom bracket does nothing more. All behavior of the user's language is determined by

If you're implementing an ahead-of-time compiled language like C, the output of the 'print'

which can be differentiated by the length prefix: positive is barray, negative is parray. The size in bytes of the length values and the size of bytes of the pointers in parrays are

Square brackets [] deliminate parrays.

• [foo bar] - parray of two barrays (foo and bar)

• [foo [bar baz]] - parray containing nested parray

4. Bottom-bracket is a minimal core

5. What about portability?

they should expand into.

project.

Array of pointers to other elements (other barrays or parrays). Prefixed with the one's complement of the quantity of pointers. One's complement differentiates it from barrays but can still handle the case of zero-length parrays.

• ["foo" "bar"] - Exact same data structure using byte strings • "xFFx00d042n" - Byte string using escape codes - represents barray of what's described. • [] - empty parray

and printer macros.

bytes.

Examples:

Generally speaking, if it can be done inside the BB language and not as a builtin, it should be. The builtin macros simply serve as a bootstrapping tool. The language has no special operators whatsoever. All functionality provided by the builtin macros can be re-created using your own macros. This also means any opinion introduced in

Macros can provide multiple implementations - one per platform. Implementations of bottom bracket decide which implemention(s) they support based upon what they know how to execute. Usually that will only be the platform the implementation is running on, but it's open to

bottom bracket can reference the bb/platform macro to determine what type of machine code

The ultimate goal would be to implement C inside the language. • The ability to slowly "walk" up abstraction levels in tiny steps makes the lower level

This type of language is uniquely well-suited to solving certain bootstrapping problems, and

building a fully verifiable bootstrap route to the software ecosystem is a goal of this

assembler currently living in this repo is a great example of this.

- nested parrays: \$ echo '[a [b c]]' | build/bbr • builtin macro: \$ echo '[bb/platform]' | build/bbr
- programs misc programs written in BB