CSE 401 – Compilers

Code Shape I – Basic Constructs

Hal Perkins

Winter 2010

Agenda

- Mapping source code to x86
  - Mapping for other common architectures follows same basic pattern
- Now: basic statements and expressions
- Next: Object representation, method calls, and dynamic dispatch
- In section this week: specifics for codegen phase of our project
  - These slides include more than is specifically needed for the project

Review: Variables

- For us, all data will be in either:
  - A stack frame (method local variables)
  - An object (instance variables)
- Local variables accessed via ebp

```
mov  eax,[ebp+12]
```

- Instance variables accessed via an object address in a register
  - Details later

Conventions for Examples

- Examples show code snippets in isolation
  - Much the way we'll generate code for different parts of the AST in our compilers
- Register eax used below as a generic example
  - Rename as needed for more complex code using multiple registers
- A few peephole optimizations included below for a flavor of what's possible

What we’re skipping for now

- Real code generator needs to deal with many things like:
  - Which registers are busy at which point in the program
  - Which registers to spill into memory when a new register is needed and no free ones are available
    - (x86: temporaries are often pushed on the stack, but can also be stored in a stack frame)
  - Exploiting the full instruction set

Constants

- Source

```
17
```

- x86

```
mov   eax,17
```

  - Idea: realize constant value in a register
- Optimization: if constant is 0

```
xor   eax,eax
```

  - Machine instructions from a compiler writer's perspective: "I don't care what it was designed to do, I care what it can do!"

Assignment Statement

- Source

  var = exp;

- x86

  <code to evaluate exp into, say, eax>

  mov   [ebp+offset$_{var}$],eax

Unary Minus

- Source

```
-exp
```

- x86

```
<code evaluating exp into eax>
neg  eax
```

- Optimization
  - Collapse -(-exp) to exp
- Unary plus is a no-op

Binary +

- Source
  ```
  exp1 + exp2
  ```
- x86
  ```
  <code evaluating exp1 into eax>
  <code evaluating exp2 into edx>
  add eax,edx
  ```

Binary +

- Optimizations
  - If exp2 is a simple variable or constant

    ```
    add  eax,exp2
    ```
  - Change exp1 + (-exp2) into exp1-exp2
  - If exp2 is 1

    ```
    inc  eax
    ```

Binary -, *

- Same as +
  - Use sub for –   (but not commutative!)
  - Use imul for *
- Optimizations
  - Use left shift to multiply by powers of 2
  - (If your multiplier is really slow or you've got free scalar units and multiplier is busy, you can do 10*x = (8*x)+(2*x)
  - Use x+x instead of 2*x, etc. (often faster)
  - Use dec for x-1

Integer Division

- Ghastly on x86
  - Only works on 64 bit int divided by 32-bit int
  - Requires use of specific registers
- Source

```
        exp1 / exp2
```

- x86

```
        <code evaluating exp1 into eax ONLY>
        <code evaluating exp2 into ebx>
        cdq                   ; extend to edx:eax, clobbers edx
        idiv  ebx             ; quotient in eax; remainder in edx
```

Control Flow

- Basic idea: decompose higher level operation into conditional and unconditional gotos
- In the following, j_{false} is used to mean jump when a condition is false
  - No such instruction on x86
  - Will have to realize with appropriate sequence of instructions to set condition codes followed by conditional jumps
  - Normally wouldn’t actually generate the value “true” or “false” in a register

While

- Source

```
while (cond) stmt
```

- x86

```
test:    <code evaluating cond>
         j_false done
         <code for stmt>
         jmp  test
done:
```

- Note: In generated asm code we'll need to generate unique label for each loop, conditional statement, etc.

Optimization for While

- Put the test at the end

```
              jmp  test
     loop:    <code for stmt>
     test:    <code evaluating cond>
              jtrue  loop
```

- Why bother?
  - Pulls one instruction (jmp) out of the loop
  - Avoids a pipeline stall on jmp on each iteration
    - Although modern processors will often predict control flow and avoid the stall – x86 does this particularly well
- Easy to do from AST or other IR; not so easy if generating code on the fly (e.g., recursive descent 1-pass compiler)

Do-While

- Source

```
do stmt while(cond);
```

- x86

```
loop:   <code for stmt>
        <code evaluating cond>
        j_true  loop
```

If

- Source

```
    if (cond) stmt
```

- x86

```
            <code evaluating cond>
            j_false skip
            <code for stmt>
  skip:
```

If-Else

- Source

```
if (cond) stmt1 else stmt2
```

- x86

```
       <code evaluating cond>
       j_false else
       <code for stmt1>
       jmp  done
else:  <code for stmt2>
done:
```

Jump Chaining

- Observation: naïve implementation can produce jumps to jumps
- Optimization: if a jump has as its target an unconditional jump, change the target of the first jump to the target of the second
  - Repeat until no further changes

Boolean Expressions

- What do we do with this?

```
x > y
```

- It is an expression that evaluates to true or false
  - Could generate the value (0/1 or whatever the local convention is)
  - But normally we don’t want/need the value; we’re only trying to decide whether to jump

Code for exp1 > exp2

- Basic idea: Generated code depends on context:
  - What is the jump target?
  - Jump if the condition is true or if false?
- Example: evaluate exp1 > exp2, jump on false, target if jump taken is L123

```
<evaluate exp1 to eax>
<evaluate exp2 to edx>
cmp  eax,edx
jng   L123
```

Boolean Operators: !

- Source

  ```
  ! exp
  ```

- Context: evaluate exp and jump to L123 if false (or true)
- To compile !, reverse the sense of the test: evaluate exp and jump to L123 if true (or false)

Boolean Operators: && and ||

- In C/C++/Java/C#, these are *short-circuit* operators
  - Right operand is evaluated only if needed
- Basically, generate the if statements that jump appropriately and only evaluate operands when needed

Example: Code for &&

- Source

```
if (exp1 && exp2) stmt
```

- x86

```
          <code for exp1>
          j_false skip
          <code for exp2>
          j_false skip
          <code for stmt>
skip:
```

Example: Code for ||

- Source

```
        if (exp1 || exp2) stmt
```

- x86

```
          <code for exp1>
          j_true doit
          <code for exp2>
          j_false skip
doit:     <code for stmt>
skip:
```

Realizing Boolean Values

- If a boolean value needs to be stored in a variable or method call parameter, generate code needed to actually produce it
- Typical representations: 0 for false, +1 or -1 for true
  - C specifies 0 and 1; we'll use that
  - Best choice can depend on machine instructions; normally some convention is established during the primeval history of the architecture

Boolean Values: Example

- Source

```
var = bexp ;
```

- x86

```
          <code for bexp>
          j_false  genFalse
          mov  eax,1
          jmp  storeIt
genFalse:
          mov  eax,0
storeIt:  mov  [ebp+offset_var],eax   ; generated by asg stmt
```

Better, If Enough Registers

- Source

```
var = bexp ;
```

- x86

```
            xor   eax,eax
            <code for bexp>
            j_false   storeIt
            inc   eax
   storeIt: mov  [ebp+offset_var],eax   ; generated by asg stmt
```

  - Or use conditional move (movecc) instruction
  - Or use setcc instructions to set low byte of previously cleared register

Other Control Flow: switch

- Naïve: generate a chain of nested if-else if statements
- Better: switch is designed to allow an O(1) selection in usual case, provided the set of switch values is reasonably compact
- Idea: create a 1-D array of jumps or labels and use the switch expression to select the right one
  - Need to generate the equivalent of an if statement to ensure that expression value is within bounds

Switch

- Source

```
switch (exp) {
  case 0: stmts0;
  case 1: stmts1;
  case 2: stmts2;
}
```

- X86

```
  <put exp in eax>
  “if (eax < 0 || eax > 2)
       jmp defaultLabel”
  mov eax,swtab[eax*4]
  jmp eax
            .data
swtab       dd L0
            dd L1
            dd L2
            .code
L0:         <stmts0>
L1:         <stmts1>
L2:         <stmts2>
```

Arrays

- Several variations
- C/C++/Java
  - 0-origin; an array with n elements contains variables a[0]...a[n-1]
  - 1 or more dimensions; row major order
- Key step is to evaluate a subscript expression and calculate the location of the corresponding element

0-Origin 1-D Integer Arrays

- Source

```
exp1[exp2]
```

- x86

```
<evaluate exp1 (array address) in eax>
<evaluate exp2 in edx>
address is [eax+4*edx]   ; assumes 4 bytes
                         ;    per element
```

2-D Arrays

- Subscripts start with 1 (default)
- C, etc. use row-major order
  - E.g., an array with 3 rows and 2 columns is stored in this sequence: a(1,1), a(1,2), a(2,1), a(2,2), a(3,1), a(3,2)
- Fortran uses column-major order
  - Exercises: What is the layout? How do you calculate location of a(i,j)? What happens when you pass array references between Fortran and C/etc. code?
- Java does not have "real" 2-D arrays. A Java 2-D array is a pointer to a list of pointers to the rows

a(i,j) in C/C++/etc.

- To find a(i,j), we need to know
  - Values of i and j
  - How many *columns* the array has
- Location of a(i,j) is

  Location of a + (i-1)*(#of columns) + (j-1)
- Can factor to pull out load-time constant part and evaluate that at load time – no recalculating at runtime

Coming Attractions

- Code Generation for Objects
  - Representation
  - Method calls
  - Inheritance and overriding
- Strategies for implementing code generators
- Code improvement – optimization