CSE 401/M501 – Compilers

Static Semantics
Hal Perkins
Spring 2019

Administrivia

- Parser/AST/print visitors due next Thurs., 11pm
 - Usual late days if you (and your partner) need and (both) have them available
 - How's it going?
- HW3 covering first/follow and LR/LL grammars due Mon. 10/28
 - At most 1 late day allowed so we can get sample solutions out in time to study for the midterm
- Added office hours: Perkins, CSE548, Fridays after class

Midterm exam

- Friday, Nov. 1 in class
- Closed book, no notes; will include brief reference info on exam as needed
- Contents: up to basics of static semantics (i.e., review this week's lectures and know general issues, not detailed coding that is the next part of the project)
- Old exams and midterm topic list on the web shortly
- Review in sections Oct. 31

Agenda

- Static semantics
- Attribute grammars
- Symbol tables
- Types & type checking
- Wrapup

Disclaimer: There's (lots) more here than the what we need for the project

What do we need to know to compile & check this?

```
class C {
   int a;
   C(int initial) {
    a = initial;
   void setA(int val) {
    a = val;
```

```
class Main {
  public static void main(){
     C c = new C(17);
     c.setA(42);
  }
}
```

Beyond Syntax

- There is a level of correctness that is not captured by a context-free grammar
 - Has a variable been declared?
 - Are types consistent in an expression?
 - In the assignment x=y; is y assignable to x?
 - Does a method call have the right number and types of parameters?
 - In a selector p.q, is q a method or field of class instance p?
 - Is variable x guaranteed to be initialized before it is used?
 - Could p be null when p.q is executed?
 - Etc. etc. etc.

What else do we need to know to generate code?

- Where are fields allocated in an object?
- How big are objects? (i.e., how much storage needs to be allocated by new)
- Where are local variables stored when a method is called?
- Which methods are associated with an object/class?
 - How do we figure out which method to call based on the run-time type of an object?

Agenda

- Static semantics
- Attribute grammars
- Symbol tables
- Types & type checking
- Wrapup

Semantic Analysis

Main tasks:

- Extract types and other information from the program
- Check language rules that go beyond the context-free grammar
- Resolve names connect declarations and uses
- "Understand" the program well enough for synthesis
- Key data structure: Symbol tables
 - Map each identifier in the program to information about it (kind, type, etc.)
 - Later: assign storage locations (stack frame offsets) for variables, add other annotations
- This is the final part of the analysis phase (front end) of the compiler

Some Kinds of Semantic Information

Information	Generated From	Used to process
Symbol tables	Declarations	Expressions, statements
Type information	Declarations, expressions	Operations
Constant/variable information	Declarations, expressions	Statements, expressions
Register & memory locations	Assigned by compiler	Code generation
Values	Constants	Expressions

Semantic Checks

- For each language construct we want to know:
 - What semantic rules should be checked
 - Specified by language definition (type compatibility, required initialization, etc.)
 - For an expression, what is its type (used to check whether expression is legal in the current context)
 - For declarations, what information needs to be captured to use elsewhere

A Sampling of Semantic Checks (0)

- Appearance of a name: id
 - Check: id has been declared and is in scope
 - Compute: Inferred type of id is its declared type

- Constant: v
 - Compute: Inferred type and value are explicit

A Sampling of Semantic Checks (1)

- Binary operator: exp₁ op exp₂
 - Check: exp₁ and exp₂ have compatible types
 - Either identical, or
 - Well-defined conversion to appropriate types
 - Compute: Inferred type is a function of the operator and operand types

A Sampling of Semantic Checks (2)

- Assignment: exp₁ = exp₂
 - Check: exp₁ is assignable (not a constant or expression)
 - Check: exp₁ and exp₂ have (assignment-)compatible types
 - Identical, or
 - exp₂ can be converted to exp₁ (e.g., int to double), or
 - Type of exp₂ is a subclass of type of exp₁ (can be decided at compile time)
 - Compute: Inferred type is type of exp₁

A Sampling of Semantic Checks (3)

- Cast: (exp₁) exp₂
 - Check: exp₁ is a type
 - Check: exp₂ either
 - Has same type as exp₁
 - Can be converted to type exp₁ (e.g., double to int)
 - Downcast: is a superclass of exp₁ (in general this requires a runtime check to verify; at compile time we can at least decide if it could be true)
 - Upcast (Trivial): is the same or a subclass of exp₁
 - Compute: Inferred type is exp₁

A Sampling of Semantic Checks (4)

- Field reference: exp.f
 - Check: exp is a reference type (not primitive type)
 - Check: The class of exp has a field named f
 - Compute: Inferred type is declared type of f

A Sampling of Semantic Checks (5)

- Method call: exp.m(e₁, e₂, ..., e_n)
 - Check: exp is a reference type (not primitive type)
 - Check: The type of exp has a method named m
 - (inherited or declared as part of the type)
 - Check: The method m has n parameters
 - Or, if overloading is allowed, at least one version of m exists with n parameters
 - Check: Each argument has a type that can be assigned to the associated parameter
 - Same as "assignment compatible" check for assignment
 - Overloading: need to find a "best match" among available methods if more than one is compatible – or reject if result is ambiguous (e.g., full Java, C++, others)
 - Compute: Inferred (result) type is given by method declaration (or could be void)

A Sampling of Semantic Checks (6)

- Return statement: return exp; or: return;
- Check:
 - If the method is not void: The expression can be assigned to a variable that has the declared return type of the method – exactly the same test as for assignment statement
 - If the method is void: There is no expression

Agenda

- Static semantics
- Attribute grammars
- Symbol tables
- Types & type checking
- Wrapup

Attribute Grammars

- A systematic way to think about semantic analysis
- Formalize properties checked and computed during semantic analysis and relate them to grammar productions in the CFG (or AST)
- Sometimes used directly, but even when not,
 AGs are a useful way to organize the analysis and think about it

Attribute Grammars

- Idea: associate attributes with each node in the (abstract) syntax tree
- Examples of attributes
 - Type information
 - Storage location
 - Assignable (e.g., expression vs variable/location same as: rvalue vs lvalue in C/C++ terms)
 - Value (for constant expressions)
 - etc. ...
- Notation: X.a if a is an attribute of node X

Attribute Example

- Assume that each node has a .val attribute giving the computed value of that node
- AST and attribution for (1+2) * (6 / 2)

Inherited and Synthesized Attributes

Given a production $X := Y_1 Y_2 \dots Y_n$

- A synthesized attribute X.a is a function of some combination of the attributes of the Y_i's (bottom up)
- An inherited attribute Y_i.b is a function of some combination of attributes X.a and other Y_j.c (top down)
 - Often restricted a bit: example: only Y's to the left can be used (has implications for attribute evaluation)

Attribute Equations

- For each kind of node we give a set of equations (not assignments) relating attribute values of the node and its children
 - Example: plus.val = $exp_1.val + exp_2.val$
- Attribution (evaluation) means finding a solution that satisfies all of the equations in the tree
 - This is an example of a constraint language

Informal Example of Attribute Rules (1)

Suppose we have the following grammar for a trivial language

```
program ::= decl stmt
decl ::= int id;
stmt ::= exp = exp;
exp ::= id | exp + exp | 1
```

 What attributes would we create to check types and assignability (Ivalue vs rvalue)?

Informal Example of Attribute Rules (2)

- Attributes of nodes
 - env (environment, e.g., list of known names and their properties)
 - synthesized by decl, inherited by stmt
 - Each entry maps a name to its type and kind
 - type (expression type)
 - synthesized
 - kind (variable [var or lvalue] vs value [val or rvalue])
 - synthesized

Attributes for Declarations

```
decl ::= int id;

decl.env = \{id \rightarrow (int, var)\}
```

Attributes for Program

```
program ::= decl stmt
stmt.env = decl.env
```

Attributes for Constants

```
exp ::= 1
exp.kind = val
exp.type = int
```

Attributes for Identifier Exprs.

```
exp ::= id
  (type, kind) = exp.env.lookup(id)
  error if id not found in env
  exp.type = type (i.e., id type)
  exp.kind = kind (i.e., id kind)
```

Attributes for Addition

```
exp ::= exp_1 + exp_2
   exp_1.env = exp.env
   exp_2.env = exp.env
   error if exp<sub>1</sub>.type != exp<sub>2</sub>.type
       (or error if not compatible, depending on language rules)
   exp.type = exp_1.type (or exp_2.type)
       (or whatever type the language rules specify)
   exp.kind = val
```

Attribute Rules for Assignment

```
stmt ::= exp<sub>1</sub> = exp<sub>2</sub>;
  exp<sub>1</sub>.env = stmt.env
  exp<sub>2</sub>.env = stmt.env
  error if exp<sub>2</sub>.type is not assignment compatible with exp<sub>1</sub>.type
  error if exp<sub>1</sub>.kind is not var (can't be val)
```

Example

int x;
$$x = x + 1$$
;

Extensions

- This can be extended to handle sequences of declarations and statements
 - Sequences of declarations builds up larger environments, each decl synthesizes a new env from previous one plus the new binding
 - Full environment is passed down to statements and expressions

Example (slightly extended language)

int x; int y; y = 1; x = y + 1;

Observations

- These are equational computations
 - Think functional programming, no side effects
- Solver can be automated, provided the attribute equations are non-circular
- But implementation problems:
 - Non-local computation
 - Can't afford to literally make/pass around copies of large, aggregate structures like environments

In Practice

- Attribute grammars give us a good way of thinking about how to structure semantic checks
- Symbol tables will hold environment information
- Add fields to AST nodes to refer to appropriate attributes (symbol table entries for identifiers, types for expressions, etc.)
 - Put in appropriate places in AST class inheritance tree and exploit inheritance so nodes have appropriate fields. Most statements don't need types, for example, but all expressions do.

Same example (with symbol table)

int x; int y; y = 1; x = y + 1;

Agenda

- Static semantics
- Attribute grammars
- Symbol tables
- Types & type checking
- Wrapup

Symbol Tables

- Map identifiers to
 <type, kind, location, other properties>
- Operations
 - Lookup(id) => information
 - Enter(id, information)
 - Open/close scopes
- Build & use during semantics pass
 - Build first from declarations
 - Then use to check semantic rules
- Use (and augment) in later compiler phases

Aside: Implementing Symbol Tables

- Big topic in classical (i.e., ancient) compiler courses: implementing a hashed symbol table
- These days: use the collection classes that are provided with the standard language libraries (Java, C#, C++, ML, Haskell, etc.)
 - Then tune & optimize if it really matters
 - In production compilers, it really matters
 Up to a point...
- In Java:
 - Map (HashMap) will handle most cases
 - List (ArrayList) for ordered lists (parameters, etc.)

Symbol Tables for MiniJava

 We'll outline a scheme that does what we need, but feel free to modify/adapt as needed

Mix of global and local tables

 A few more features here than needed for our MiniJava project

Symbol Tables for MiniJava: Global

- Global Per Program Information
 - Single global table to map class names to per-class symbol tables
 - Created in a pass over class definitions in AST
 - Used in remaining parts of compiler to check class types and their field/method names and extract information about them

Symbol Tables for MiniJava: Class

- One symbol table for each class
 - One entry per method/field declared in the class
 - Contents: type information, public/private, parameter types (for methods), storage locations (later), etc.
- Reached from global table of class names
- For Java, we actually need multiple symbol tables (or more complex symbol table) per class
 - The same identifier can be used for both a method name and a field name in a single class
 - We will support this in our MiniJava project

Symbol Tables for MiniJava: Global/Class

- All global tables persist throughout the compilation
 - And beyond in a real compiler...
 - Symbolic information in Java .class or MSIL files, linktime optimization information in gcc .o files)
 - Debug information in .o and .exe files
 - Some or all of this information in library files (.a, .so)
 - Type information for garbage collector

Symbol Tables for MiniJava: Methods

- One local symbol table for each method
 - One entry for each local variable or parameter
 - Contents: type info, storage locations (add later), etc.
 - Needed only while compiling the method; could discard when done if a single pass compiler
 - But if type checking and code gen, etc. are done in separate passes, this table needs to persist until we're done with it
 - And beyond: may need type info for runtime debugging, memory management/GC, exception handling try/catch block info, etc.
 - For our MiniJava compiler we will have multiple passes

Beyond MiniJava

- What we aren't dealing with: nested scopes
 - Inner classes
 - Nested scopes in methods reuse of identifiers in parallel or inner scopes (most languages); nested functions (ML etc. ...)
 - Lambdas and function closures (Racket, JavaScript, Java, C#, , ...)
- Basic idea: new symbol table for inner scopes, linked to surrounding scope's table (i.e., stack of symbol tables, top = current innermost scope, bottom = global scope)
 - Look for identifier in inner scope (top); if not found look in surrounding scope (recursively)
 - Pop symbol table when we exit a scope
- Also ignoring static fields/methods, accessibility (public, protected, private), package scopes, ...

Engineering Issues (1)

- In multipass compilers, inner scope symbol table needs to persist to use in later passes
 - Can't really delete symbol tables on scope exit
 - Retain tables and add a pointer to the parent scope table (effectively a reverse tree of symbol tables for nested scopes with root = global table)
 - Keep a pointer to current innermost scope (usually a leaf but could be interior node) and start looking for symbols there

Engineering Issues (2)

- In practice, often want to retain O(1) lookup or something close to it
 - Would like to avoid O(depth of scope nesting), although some compilers assume this will be small enough not to matter
 - When it matters, use hash tables with additional information (linked lists of various sorts) to get the scope nesting right
 - Usually need some sort of scope entry/exit operations
 - See a compiler textbook for ideas & details

Error Recovery

- What to do when an undeclared identifier is encountered?
 - Goal: only complain once (Why?)
 - Can forge a symbol table entry for it once you've complained so it will be found in the future
 - Assign the forged entry a type of "unknown"
 - "Unknown" is the type of all malformed expressions and is compatible with all other types
 - Allows you to only complain once! (How?)

"Predefined" Things

- Many languages have some "predefined" items (constants, functions, classes, namespaces, standard libraries, ...)
- Include initialization code or declarations to manually create symbol table entries for these in an outermost scope when the compiler starts up
 - Rest of compiler generally doesn't need to know the difference between "predeclared" items and ones found in the program
 - Possible to put "standard prelude" information in a file or data resource and use that to initialize
 - Tradeoffs?

Agenda

- Static semantics
- Attribute grammars
- Symbol tables
- Types & type checking
- Wrapup

Types

- Classical roles of types in programming languages
 - Run-time safety
 - Compile-time error detection
 - Improved expressiveness (method or operator overloading, for example)
 - Provide information to optimizer
 - In strongly typed languages, allows compiler to make assumptions about possible values
 - Qualifiers like const, final, or restrict (in C) allow for other assumptions

Type Checking Terminology

Static vs. dynamic typing

- static: checking done prior to execution (e.g. compile-time)
- dynamic: checking during execution

Strong vs. weak typing

- strong: guarantees no illegal operations performed
- weak: can't make guarantees

Caveats:

- Hybrids common
- Inconsistent usage common
- "untyped," "typeless" could mean dynamic or weak

	static	dynamic
strong	Java, SML	Scheme, Ruby
weak	С	PERL

Type Systems

- Base Types
 - Fundamental, atomic types
 - Typical examples: int, double, char, bool
- Compound/Constructed Types
 - Built up from other types (recursively)
 - Constructors include records/structs/classes, arrays, pointers, enumerations, functions, modules, ...
 - Most language provide a small collection of these

How to Represent Types in a Compiler?

One solution: create a shallow class hierarchy

Example:

```
abstract class Type { ... } // or interface class ClassType extends Type { ... } class BaseType extends Type { ... }
```

Should not need too many of these

Types vs ASTs

- Types nodes are not AST nodes!
- AST = abstract representation of source program (including source program type info)
- Types = abstract representation of type semantics for type checking, inference, etc. (i.e., an ADT)
 - May include information not explicitly represented in the source code, or may describe types in ways more convenient for processing
- Be sure you have a separate "type" class hierarchy in your compiler for typechecking that is not part of the AST class hierarchy

Base Types

- For each base type (int, boolean, char, double, etc.)
 create a single object to represent it (singleton!)
 - Base types in symbol table entries and AST nodes are direct references to these objects
 - Base type objects usually created at compiler startup
- Useful to create a type "void" object for the result "type" of functions that do not return a value
- Also useful to create a type "unknown" object for errors
 - ("void" and "unknown" types reduce the need for special case code in various places in the type checker; don't have to return "null" for "no type" or "not declared" cases)

Compound Types

- Basic idea: use a appropriate "compound type" or "type constructor" object that contains references the component types
 - Limited number of these correspond directly to type constructors in the language (pointer, array, record/struct/class, function,...)
 - So a compound type is represented as a graph
- Some examples...

Class Types

(MiniJava note: May not want to represent class types exactly like this. Depending on how class symbol tables are represented, the class symbol table(s) might be a sufficient representation of a class type.)

Array Types

 For regular Java this is simple: only possibility is # of dimensions and element type (which can be another array type or anything else)

```
class ArrayType extends Type {
   int nDims;
   Type elementType;
}
```

Array Types for Other Languages

 Example: Pascal allowed arrays to be indexed by any discrete type like an enum, char, int subrange, or other discrete type
 array [indexType] of elementType

```
array [indexType] of elementType (fantastic idea – would be nice if it became popular again)
```

Element type can be any other type, including an array (e.g., 2-D array = 1-D array of 1-D arrays)
 class GeneralArrayType extends Type {
 Type indexType;
 Type elementType;
 }

Methods/Functions

Type of a method is its result type plus an ordered list of parameter types

```
class MethodType extends Type {
    Type resultType;  // type or "void"
    List parameterTypes;
}
```

Sometimes called the method "signature"

Type Equivalance

- For base types this is simple: types are the same if they are identical
 - Can use pointer comparison in the type checker if you have a singleton object for each base type
 - Normally there are well defined rules for coercions between arithmetic types
 - Compiler inserts these automatically where required by the language spec or when written explicitly by programmer (casts) – often involves inserting cast or conversion nodes in AST

Type Equivalence for Compound Types

- Two basic strategies
 - Structural equivalence: two types are the same if they are the same kind of type and their component types are equivalent, recursively
 - Name equivalence: two types are the same only if they have the same name, even if their structures match
- Different language design philosophies
 - e.g., are Complex and Rectangular2DPoint the same?
 - e.g., are Point (Cartesian) and Point (Polar) the same?

Structural Equivalence

- Structural equivalence says two types are equal iff they have same structure
 - Atomic types are tautologically the same structure and are equal if they are the same type
 - For type constructors: equal if the same constructor and, recursively, type components are equal
- Ex: atomic types, array types, ML record types
- Implement with recursive implementation of equals, or by canonicalization of types when types created, then use pointer/ref. equality

Name Equivalence

- Name equivalence says that two types are equal iff they came from the same textual occurrence of a type constructor
 - Ex: class types, C struct types (struct tag name), datatypes in ML
 - But: (special case) type synonyms (e.g. typedef in C) do not define new types, they introduce another name for an existing type
- Implement with pointer equality assuming appropriate representation of type info

Type Equivalence and Inheritance

- Suppose we have class Base { ... }
 class Extended extends Base { ... }
- A variable declared with type Base has a compile-time type or static type of Base
- During execution, that variable may refer to an object of class Base or any of its subclasses like Extended (or can be null), often called the the runtime type or dynamic type
 - Since subclass is guaranteed to have all fields/methods of base class, type checker only needs to deal with declared (compile-time) types of variables and, in fact, can't track runtime types of all possible values assigned to variables

Type Casts

- In most languages, one can explicitly cast an object of one type to another
 - sometimes a cast means a conversion (e.g., casts between numeric types)
 - sometimes a cast means a change of static type without doing any computation (casts between pointer types or (in C/C++) pointer and numeric types)
 - for objects, can be a upcast (free and always safe)
 or downcast (requires runtime check to be safe)

Type Conversions and Coercions

- In full Java, we can explicitly convert an value of type double to one of type int
 - can represent as unary operator in the AST
 - typecheck, codegen as usual
- In full Java, can implicitly coerce a value of type int to one of type double
 - compiler must insert unary conversion operators into AST, based on results of type checking

C and Java: type casts

- In C/C++: safety/correctness of casts not checked
 - allows writing low-level code that's type-unsafe
 - C++ has more elaborate casts, and one of them does require runtime checks
- In Java: downcasts from superclass to subclass need runtime check to preserve type safety
 - static typechecker allows the cast
 - typechecker/codegen inserts runtime check
 - (same code needed to handle "instanceof")
 - Java's primary need for dynamic type checking

Various Notions of Type Compatibility

- There are usually several relations on types that we need to analyze in a compiler:
 - "is the same as"
 - "is assignable to"
 - "is same or a subclass of"
 - "is convertible to"
- Exact meanings and checks needed depend on the language spec.
- Be sure to check for the right one(s)

Useful Compiler Functions

- Create a handful of methods to decide different kinds of type compatibility:
 - Types are identical
 - Type t₁ is assignment compatible with t₂
 - Parameter list is compatible with types of expressions in the method call (probably uses assignment compatibility)
- Usual modularity reasons: isolate these decisions in one place and hide the actual type representation from the rest of the compiler
- Likely belongs in the same package (ADT) with the type representation classes

Implementing Type Checking for MiniJava

- Create multiple visitors for the AST
- First pass/passes: gather information
 - Collect global type information for classes
 - Could do this in one pass, or might want to do one pass to collect class information, then a second one to collect per-class information about fields and methods – you decide
- Next set of passes: go through method bodies to check types, other semantic constraints

Agenda

- Static semantics
- Attribute grammars
- Symbol tables
- Types & type checking
- Wrapup

Disclaimer

- This overview of semantics, type representation, etc. should give you a decent idea of what needs to be done in your project, but you'll need to adapt the ideas to the project specifics.
- You'll also find good ideas in your compiler book...
- And remember that these slides cover more than is needed for our specific project

Coming Attractions

- Need to start thinking about translating to target code (x86-64 assembly language for our project)
- Next lectures
 - X86-64 overview (as a target for simple compilers)
 - Runtime representation of classes, objects, data, and method stack frames
 - Assembly language code for higher-level language statements, method calls, dynamic dispatch, ...
- And there's a midterm in there somewhere...