Instruction Selection

15-411/15-611 Compiler Design

Seth Copen Goldstein

September 9, 2021

Today

- Context
- Abstract Assembly
- AST → IR
- Maximal Munch
- Issues
- Simple SSA
- x86 and 2-adr Instructions

Cartoon Compiler



Simple Source Language

- A language of assignments, expressions, and a return statement.
- Straight-line code
- Basically lab1 subset of C0

Simple Source Language

program	:=	s_1 **;** s_2 **;** … s_n **;**	sequence of statements
s	:=	v **=** e	assignment
	|	**return** e	return
e	:=	c	constant
	|	v	variable
	|	$e_1 \oplus e_2$	binary operation
$\oplus$	:=	**+** | - | ***** | **/** | **%**	

Abstract Syntax Tree



Example

```
z = (x + 3) * (y - 5);
return z;
```



Other possibilites?

Today

- Context
- Abstract Assembly
- AST → IR
- Maximal Munch
- Issues
- Simple SSA
- x86 and 2-adr Instructions

Abstract Assembly as IR

- Lowering of AST
- Facilitate
  - Analysis & optimizations
  - Translation to actual assembly
- Features:
  - Unlimited number of "temporaries"
  - May not restrict how memory is used
  - Simple operations
  - May not restrict how constants are used
  - May specify certain "special registers"

In today's world
aka registers



Abstract Assembly as IR

- Features:
  - Unlimited number of “registers” (aka “temps”)
  - May (or may not) restrict how memory is used
  - Simple operations
  - May not restrict how constants are used
  - May specify certain “special registers”
- Form:

  dest ← src_1 operator src_2

  dest ← operator src_1

  operator

src can be:
- constant
- temp
- special register
- memory

Abstract Assembly

program	:=	$i_1\ i_2\ \ldots\ i_n$	seq of instructions
i	:=	$d \leftarrow s$	move
	|	$d \leftarrow s_1 \oplus s_2$	binop
	|	**return**	return what is in **`rax`**
s	:=	c	intermediate
	|	t	temporary
	|	r	register
d	:=	t	
	|	r	
$\oplus$	:=	**+** | - | ***** | **/** | **%**	

Example Goal

```
z = x + 3 * y - 5;
return z;
```




```
t1  ← x + 3
t2  ← y - 5
z   ← t1 * t2
rax ← z
      return
```

Today

- Context
- Abstract Assembly
- AST → IR
- Maximal Munch
- Issues
- Simple SSA
- x86 and 2-adr Instructions

Cartoon Compiler



Alternatives abound

Translating AST to IR

- Converting from tree structured IR to sequence of instructions
  - Create temporary locations to store values
  - choose which operations we want
    - can combine or
    - breakup original operations
- Match portions of tree and convert to triple

Tree Patterns (aka Tiles)



d ← s



rax ← s
ret

Tree Patterns



$? \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$

Tree Patterns



$d \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$



$d \leftarrow c$

Tiling a Tree



Better Tiles



Better or worse?

```
rax ← s
      return
```

Today

- Context
- Abstract Assembly
- AST → IR
- Maximal Munch
- Issues
- Simple SSA
- x86 and 2-adr Instructions

Maximal Munch

- recursively match tree
- At each step, pick “best” tile

Maximal Munch

- recursively match tree
- At each step, pick "best" tile



$d \leftarrow c$



$t_1 \leftarrow 5$



$d \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$



$d \leftarrow s$

Maximal Munch

- recursively match tree
- At each step, pick “best” tile



$d \leftarrow c$





$d \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$

$t_1 \leftarrow 5$

$t_2 \leftarrow x + t_1$



$d \leftarrow s$

Maximal Munch

- recursively match tree
- At each step, pick "best" tile



$d \leftarrow c$





$d \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$

$t_1 \leftarrow 5$

$t_2 \leftarrow x + t_1$

$z \leftarrow t_2$



$d \leftarrow s$

Maximal Munch

- recursively match tree
- At each step, pick "best" tile



$d \leftarrow c$





$d \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$

$t_1 \leftarrow 5$

$t_2 \leftarrow x + t_1$

$z \leftarrow t_2$



$d \leftarrow s$

Maximal Munch

- recursively match tree
- At each step, pick “best” tile
- need to indicate what destinations are
  - choose either to supply destination
  - or generate a destination

codegen

e	codegen(d, e)
c	$d \leftarrow c$
v	$d \leftarrow v$
$e_1 \oplus e_2$	codegen(t_1 , e_1) codegen(t_2 , e_2) $d \leftarrow t_1 \oplus t_2$

s	codegen(s)
v = e	codegen(v, e)
return e	codegen(rax, e) return

Example



e	codegen(d, e)
c	d ← c
v	d ← x
$e_1 \oplus e_2$	codegen(t_1 , e_1) codegen(t_2 , e_2) d ← $t_1 \oplus t_2$

s	codegen(s)
v = e	codegen(v, e)
return e	codegen(rax, e) return

Result



$t_3 \leftarrow x$

$t_4 \leftarrow 3$

$t_1 \leftarrow t_3 + t_4$

$t_5 \leftarrow y$

$t_6 \leftarrow 5$

$t_2 \leftarrow t_5 * t_6$

$z \leftarrow t_1 * t_2$

$rax \leftarrow z$

ret

How Can we Improve this?



$t_3 \leftarrow x$

$t_4 \leftarrow 3$

$t_1 \leftarrow t_3 + t_4$

$t_5 \leftarrow y$

$t_6 \leftarrow 5$

$t_2 \leftarrow t_5 * t_6$

$z \leftarrow t_1 * t_2$

$rax \leftarrow z$

ret

How Can we Improve this?

- Investigate generating a source operand
- Special cases
- Don’t bother?

Generating Sources

e	codegen(d, e)	up
c		c
v		v
$e_1 \oplus e_2$	t_1 = codegen(e_1) t_2 = codegen(e_2) $t \leftarrow t_1 \oplus t_2$	t

s	codegen(s)
v = e	v ← codegen(e)
return e	rax ← codegen(e) return

Example



e	codegen(d, e)	up
c		c
v		v
$e_1 \oplus e_2$	t_1 = codegen(e_1) t_2 = codegen(e_2) t ← $t_1 \oplus t_2$	t

s	codegen(s)
v = e	v ← codegen(e)
return e	rax ← codegen(e) return

Special Cases

e	codegen(d, e)
c	$d \leftarrow c$
v	$d \leftarrow x$
$c \oplus e_2$	codegen(t_2 , e_2) $d \leftarrow c \oplus t_2$
$e_1 \oplus c$	codegen(t_1 , e_1) $d \leftarrow t_1 \oplus c$
$v \oplus e_2$	codegen(t_2 , e_2) $d \leftarrow v \oplus t_2$
$e_1 \oplus v$	codegen(t_1 , e_1) $d \leftarrow t_1 \oplus v$
$e_1 \oplus e_2$	codegen(t_1 , e_1) codegen(t_2 , e_2) $d \leftarrow t$

Generally not recommended

The "don't bother" case

- What should we really do?

$t_3 \leftarrow x$

$t_4 \leftarrow 3$

$t_1 \leftarrow t_3 + t_4$

$t_5 \leftarrow y$

$t_6 \leftarrow 5$

$t_2 \leftarrow t_5 * t_6$

$z \leftarrow t_1 * t_2$

$rax \leftarrow z$

ret

Constant Propagation

Copy Propagation

e	codegen(d, e)
c	$d \leftarrow c$
v	$d \leftarrow x$
$c \oplus e_2$	codegen(t_2 , e_2) $d \leftarrow c \oplus t_2$
$e_1 \oplus c$	codegen(t_1 , e_1) $d \leftarrow t_1 \oplus c$
$v \oplus e_2$	codegen(t_2 , e_2) $d \leftarrow v \oplus t_2$
$e_1 \oplus v$	codegen(t_1 , e_1) $d \leftarrow t_1 \oplus v$
$e_1 \oplus e_2$	codegen(t_1 , e_1) codegen(t_2 , e_2) $d \leftarrow t_1 \oplus t_2$

Constant Propogation

$t_3 \leftarrow x$

~~$t_4 \leftarrow 3$~~

$t_1 \leftarrow t_3 + t_4$ ~~3~~

$t_5 \leftarrow y$

~~$t_6 \leftarrow 5$~~

$t_2 \leftarrow t_5 * t_6$ ~~5~~

$z \leftarrow t_1 * t_2$

$rax \leftarrow z$

ret

Copy Propogation



Have to be careful

- Constant propagation:

```
x ← 5
y ← x - 4
x ← y + 7
z ← x
```

- Copy Propagation:

```
x ← y
y ← u - 4
z ← x + 7
```

Have to be careful

- Constant propagation:
  - Can't just replace all x's with 5
  - Stop if x is redefined

```
x ← 5
y ← x - 4
x ← y + 7
z ← x
```

- Copy Propagation:

```
x ← y
y ← u - 4
z ← x + 7
```

Have to be careful

- Constant propagation:
  - Can't just replace all x's with 5
  - Stop if x is redefined

```
x ← 5
y ← x - 4
x ← y + 7
z ← x
```

- Copy Propagation:
  - Can't just replace all x's with y's
  - Stop if x or y is redefined

```
x ← y
y ← u - 4
z ← x + 7
```

Today

- Context
- Abstract Assembly
- AST → IR
- Maximal Munch
- Issues
- Simple SSA
- x86 and 2-adr Instructions

Static Single Assignment

- Must keep track of what definition each use refers to in order to properly do constant/copy propagation.
- Much simpler if only one definition for each name.
- SSA: Each name is assigned in only one location.

Static Single Assignment

- Must keep track of what definition each use refers to in order to properly do constant/copy propogation.
- Much simpler if only one definition for each name.
- SSA: Each name is **assigned** in only one location.
- Easy for fresh temporaries

e	codegen(d, e)
$e_1 \oplus e_2$	codegen(t_1 , e_1) codegen(t_2 , e_2) $d \leftarrow t_1 \oplus t_2$

Static Single Assignment

- Must keep track of what definition each use refers to in order to properly do constant/copy propogation.
- Much simpler if only one definition for each name.
- SSA: Each name is **assigned** in only one location.
- Easy for fresh temporaries
- What about variables?

SSA for Straight-line code

- Give each variable a version number.
- Scan code in program order
- Whenever we encounter a definition, increment the version number
- Whenever we encounter a use, use the most recently assigned version number.

$x \leftarrow 5$	$x_0 \leftarrow 5$
$y \leftarrow x - 4$	$y \leftarrow x - 4$
$x \leftarrow y + 7$	$x \leftarrow y + 7$
$z \leftarrow x$	$z \leftarrow x$

SSA for Straight-line code

- Give each variable a version number.
- Scan code in program order
- Whenever we encounter a definition, increment the version number
- Whenever we encounter a use, use the most recently assigned version number.

$x \leftarrow 5$	$x_0 \leftarrow 5$
$y \leftarrow x - 4$	$y \leftarrow x_0 - 4$
$x \leftarrow y + 7$	$x \leftarrow y + 7$
$z \leftarrow x$	$z \leftarrow x$

SSA for Straight-line code

- Give each variable a version number.
- Scan code in program order
- Whenever we encounter a definition, increment the version number
- Whenever we encounter a use, use the most recently assigned version number.

x	$\leftarrow 5$	x_0	$\leftarrow 5$
y	$\leftarrow x - 4$	y_0	$\leftarrow x_0 - 4$
x	$\leftarrow y + 7$	x	$\leftarrow y + 7$
z	$\leftarrow x$	z	$\leftarrow x$

SSA for Straight-line code

- Give each variable a version number.
- Scan code in program order
- Whenever we encounter a definition, increment the version number
- Whenever we encounter a use, use the most recently assigned version number.

x	$\leftarrow 5$	x_0	$\leftarrow 5$
y	$\leftarrow x - 4$	y_0	$\leftarrow x_0 - 4$
x	$\leftarrow y + 7$	x_1	$\leftarrow y_0 + 7$
z	$\leftarrow x$	z	$\leftarrow x$

SSA for Straight-line code

- Give each variable a version number.
- Scan code in program order
- Whenever we encounter a definition, increment the version number
- Whenever we encounter a use, use the most recently assigned version number.

x	$\leftarrow 5$	x_0	$\leftarrow 5$
y	$\leftarrow x - 4$	y_0	$\leftarrow x_0 - 4$
x	$\leftarrow y + 7$	x_1	$\leftarrow y_0 + 7$
z	$\leftarrow x$	z_0	$\leftarrow x_1$

Now easy

- Constant propagation:
  - Can replace all x_0 with 5.

$$x_0 \leftarrow 5$$
$$y_0 \leftarrow x_0 - 4$$
$$x_1 \leftarrow y_0 + 7$$
$$z_0 \leftarrow x_1$$

- Copy Propagation:
  - Can replace all x_0 with y_0

$$x_0 \leftarrow y_0$$
$$y_1 \leftarrow u_0 - 4$$
$$z_0 \leftarrow x_0 + 7$$

Today

- Context
- Abstract Assembly
- AST → IR
- Maximal Munch
- Issues
- Simple SSA
- x86 and 2-adr Instructions

Real Assembly on x86

- x86 doesn't have 3 address instructions!

$$d \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$$

Real Assembly on x86

- x86 doesn't have 3 address instructions!

$$d \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$$

Triples	2-adr	x86
$d \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$	$d \leftarrow s_1$ $d \leftarrow d + s_2$	MOVx s_1, d ADDx s_2, d

Real Assembly on x86

- x86 doesn't have 3 address instructions!

Triples	2-adr	x86
$d \leftarrow s_1 + s_2$	$d \leftarrow s_1$ $d \leftarrow d + s_2$	MOVx s_1, d ADDx s_2, d

- All kinds of special register requirements

$$d \leftarrow s_1 * s_2$$

What about edx?

Triples	2-adr	x86

$d \leftarrow s_1 * s_2$	$d \leftarrow s_1$
	$d \leftarrow d * s_2$
		MOVL s_1, rax
		IMUL s_2
		MOVL rax, d

From AST to Machine Assembly

- Implied Approach:
  - AST $\rightarrow$ Triples using unlimited temporaries
  - Map temporaries to registers/memory
  - Lower Triples to real assembly
- What about Interaction between registers and instructions?
- Cost model?
- KISS:
  - Keep things simple, but
  - Prepare for other passes to fix things up.