Compiling Programs into our Bytecode

- Our goal is to compile Cuppa3 programs into Exp2Bytecode
- The big difference between the two languages is that Cuppa3 is a statically scoped language (supports nested scopes and statically scoped functions) and Exp2Bytecode has no notion of scope (all variables are global variables)
- We saw that in order to make recursion work in Exp2Bytecode we resorted to allocating function local variables in a frame on the runtime stack.

Compiling Global Code



- In terms of global code, nothing has changed from our strategy we developed when we compiled Cuppa2 programs into bytecode:
 - Every program variable that appears in the Cuppa3 program is compiled into a unique global variable in the bytecode





- For functions all local variables are stored on the stack
- The actual parameters are pushed on the stack in reverse order, and this is done before the function frame is created.
- Also, during a function call, the return address is pushed onto the stack before the stack frame is created



• Here is what the stack looks like during a function call:





• Consider the call add(3,2) to the function defined as



dd:		
	pushf 3;	
	store %tsx[0] %tsx[-4];	# init a
	store %tsx[-1] %tsx[-5];	# init b
	store %tsx[-2] (+ %tsx[0] %tsx[-1]);	# store temp
	store %rvx %tsx[-2];	
	popf 3;	
	return;	

• Now consider the following function:

```
// a program with nested functions that makes
// use of static scoping and generates a sequence
// of numbers according to the step variable.
declare seq(n) {
   declare step = 2;
   declare inc(k) return k+step;
   declare i = 1;
   // generate the sequence
   while(i<=n) {</pre>
     put(i);
     i = inc(i)
}
// main program
seq(10);
```



Nested function Declarations!

Our interpreter handles this correctly! Try it.



 To see the problem with nested function declarations for compilation, let's take a look at the compiled declare inc(k) return k+step; function



Note: 'step' is inaccessible from the nested function, 'step' is in the frame of the calling function.



 Compiling inc as a global function presents no problems as long as the function is statically scoped.

```
declare step = 2;
declare inc(k) return k+step;
declare seq(n) {
    declare i = 1;
    // generate the sequence
    while(i<=n) {
        put(i);
        i = inc(i)
        }
}
// main program
seq(10);
```



inc:	pushf 2; store %tsx[0] %tsx[-3]; store %tsx[-1] (+ %tsx[0] step\$0); store %rvx %tsx[-1];
	store %rvx %tsx[-1];
	popf 2;
	return;

Conclusion: we will disallow nested function declarations in our compiler.



- Compiling expressions that contain function calls presents a problem
 - Expressions are represented as terms
 - BUT function calls are statements in our bytecode
 - That means function calls cannot appear in expressions of the bytecode
- Solution: convert the evaluation of expressions into *three-address code* statements.

Three-Address Code



- Three-address code is an intermediate representation
- The name refers to the fact that in a single statement we access *at most* three variables, constants, or functions.
- Each statement in three-address code has the general form of:

$$x = y op z$$

where x, y and z are variables, constants or temporary variables generated by the compiler and op represents any operator, e.g. an arithmetic operator.

Three-Address Code



 Expressions containing more than one fundamental operation, such as:

w = x + y * z

are not representable in three-address code.

 Instead, they are decomposed into an equivalent series of three-address code statements, such as:

$$t1 = y * z$$

w = x + t1



- Consider the expression term: 3*2+6
- We turn this into three-address code statements by doing only one operation at a time and store the result in a *temporary variable*:



• That is exactly what the compiler will do:





store	t\$0	(*	3 2);	
store	t\$1	(+	t\$0	4)	;
print	t\$1	;			
stop ;	;				



- Now compiling expressions with functions is straightforward
 - Calling a function is just another operation whose result will be stored in a temp
- Consider: 3*2+inc(5)
- We can rewrite the expression term as the following three-address code statements:

T\$1 = 3*2 T\$2 = inc(5) T\$3 = T\$1+T\$2



declare inc(k) return k+1;

put 3*2+inc(5);



jump L32 ; # # Start of function inc # inc: pushf 2 ; store %tsx[0] %tsx[-3]; store %tsx[-1] (+ %tsx[0] 1); store %rvx %tsx[-1]: popf 2 ; return ; # # End of function inc # L32: noop ; store t\$0 (* 3 2); pushv 5 ; call inc ; popv ; store t\$1 %rvx ; store t\$2 (+ t\$0 t\$1); print t\$2 ; stop ;



Compiler: Cuppa3 → exp2bytecode

- The compiler has three phases:
 - frontend,
 - semantic analysis/tree rewrting,
 - code generation.
- The symbol table has the same structure as in the interpreter to enforce the semantics of Cuppa3
 - But the symbol table also has structures that support the generation of target code.





Compiler: Cuppa3 → exp2bytecode

- Let's look at some code:
 - cuppa3_cc_tree_rewrite.py
 - cuppa3_cc_codegen.py
- Look at Notebook for test suites for Cuppa3 compiler: 'Cuppa3 CC Tests'

