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THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FORMULA ALGOL IN FSL

Note: A prerequisite for reading "The Implementation of Formula Algol in FSL" is to have read Jerome A* Feldman's doctoral dissertation entitled, "A Formal Semantics for Computer Languages".


## CORRECTION

add label 'CHG' to first production delete ' + ' from end of word 'TYPE'
add ',' after words 'Identifier list'
insert $\left.{ }^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}$ after ${ }^{\prime} 1_{p o n}$-1owerbound ${ }_{n}$ '
switch CLA 1 to read IXP L,RO
LXP L,RO CLA 1
should be 'TRA V48'
delete ','
replace ', at end of line with word 'fs:
change 'm' to 's'
insert words 'is produced' after
insert word 'position' after RIGHT2
should be 'STD $T$ '
should be 'ADD 0 1'
'ADD $03^{\prime}$
delete commas
replace "cell' with 'cells"
change 'run-' to 'compile-'
delete commas surrounding 'therefore'
delete commas surxounding 'therefore'
Insert 'the' between 'of' and 'code'
delete coma after 'label'
change ${ }^{\prime} T \leftarrow$ LAB[LeFT2 . . . . $\$ 1$; ${ }^{\prime}$


|  | page | LOCATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 20 | line 8 |
|  | 20 | line 14 |
|  | 22 | 7th line from bottom |
| - | 23 | line 6 |
|  | 23 | line 12 |
|  | 23 | lines 19 and 20 |
|  | 24 | line 4 |
| $\cdots$ | 25 | 3rd line from bottom |
|  | 25 | last line |
| - | 26 | 11ne 13 |
|  | 26 | line 15 |
|  | 26 | 3rd line from bottom |
| - | 27 | line 1 |
|  | 27 | line 7 |
| - | 27 | 11ne 16 |
| $\cdots$ |  |  |
|  | 29 | line 2 |
| - | 29 | 1fine 5 |
|  | 30 | line 12 |
| - | 31 | 1ine 19 |
|  | 32 | line 17 |
|  | 32 | 7th Ifne from bottom |
| - | 33 | directly beneath page |


| CORRECTION |
| :---: |
| delete commes surrounding 'therefore |
| add hyphen to 'code' at end of line |
| change 'EXEC 45' to read 'EXEC 15' |
| change 'EXEC 35' to read 'EXEC 15' |
| change 'mark txansfex to a routine X35' to 'transfer to a switching routine $V 48$ indirectly through X35* |
| underitne 'for' |
| underline 'for' |
| underline 'for' |
| underline 'ELor' |
| insert 'CODELOC' before arrow ' $\rightarrow$ ' |
| change ' P ' to 'E' |
| replace ' $\mathrm{T} \leftarrow \mathbf{4 ' ~}^{\text {' }}$ with ${ }^{\mathbf{t}} \mathrm{T} \leftarrow \mathrm{E5}$ ' |
| replace 'a - E' with 'an E. |
| insert ', in turn, ' after 'This' |
| Insert before 'EXEC $26^{\prime}$ 'Except for additions needed to handle recursion which are discussed in the sequel,' |
| replace ' $\beta$ CLA $\beta^{\prime}$ ' with ' $\beta$ CLA $\mathrm{B}^{\text {' }}$ |
| insert '0' between 'LXP' and 'VCP' |
| insert 'the' after 'in' |
| change 'identifier' to identifiers' |
| delete 'm' in 'LENGTHOF(-CRADLE)' |
|  |
| add parenthesis to line 'identifier with tagged with class' |

LOCATION
lower left hand corner
lower right hand corner
lines 7, 8 and 9

1ine 17
line 19
line 4
line 1
line 23
line 8
line 11
2nd line from bottom
line 3
line 2
1ine 6
line 9
1ne 7
6th 1ine from bottom

5th line from bottom
line 9
line 10
line 16

## CORRECTION

add 'TRM' beneath word '(parameter)'
add arrow from box $A \leftarrow B$
down to bottom line
sentence beginning in line 7 is incomplete and is repeated in complete form beginning in line 9. Remove incomplete sentence.
delete ' $x$ ' from 'TYPE PROCEDURE $x \mid$ '
delete 'X' from 'SECX' to get 'SEC'
remove '(' before ' (FPL' to get 'FPL'
change 'contest' to 'context'
change Sonow' to ' (So now'
change 'page $39^{\prime}$ to 'page 29'
change 'pages 4 and 5' to 'page 4'
change 'A 2 FALSE' to 'A 2 TRUE'
change 'exec' to 'EXEC'
delete '(' after 'MARKJUMP[DECLARE];'
change 'see page 40 ' to 'see page 30 '
put ',' between $\alpha$ and 2 in '005 $\alpha, 2^{\prime}$
change ',' to ';'
insert ';' after 'CODE (JUMP[V202])' and change 'p46' to 'p35'
change 'pp 44-45' to 'pp 33-34'
change 'this' to 'This'
change 'page 46' to 'page 35'
change 'p53' to 'p40'


## THE FLOW OF SYSTEMS


#### Abstract

Three separate operations are needed to produce the Formula Algol conpiler. First, the productions defining the syntax of the language are processed by means of a GATE program called the production loader. The output of this program is a set of syntax tables which are stored on tape for later use. Second, the formal semantic routines defining the semantics of the language are processed in the FSL system producing, as output, a set of semantic tables. These tables are also stored on tape for later use. Third, and finally, a system called MAGIC reads in the syntax tables and the semantic tables, and by use of these tables operates as a compiler for source language statements. The source language statements are read in by MAGIC and translated into an object program. The object program is then run provided no errors have been detected during compilation. During the initialization of the object program a collection of run-time routines is read into the memory. These run-time routines constitute a set of welldefined actions that are executed upon call by the object program. Figure 1 on page two shows this flow of systems diagramatically.



figure 1

## REGJLAR ALGOL

Definition: Regular Algol as discussed here constitutes all of Algol 60 excluding procedures which will be discussed separately.

DECLARATIONS

The productions are so constructed that they expect to find declarations at the beginning of blocks and in procedure headings. The first 1tem to be processed in a declaration is the declarator. Suppose we meet REAL $X, Y$; in the source language. By a discrimination process which branches on the various configurations of declarators that it finds in the source language, various semantic routines are executed which set the stage for processing the variables, arrays, or switches to be declared. In the above case, REAL $X, Y$, the type REAL is detected, and control in the productions passes to a closed subroutine CHG with the following structure:

| REAL | $\mid \rightarrow$ | TYPE | EXEC 146 | RET |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| INTE | $\mid \rightarrow$ | TYPE | EXEC 147 | RET |
| BOOL | $\rightarrow$ | TYPE+ | EXEC 148 | RET |
| LOEI | $\rightarrow$ | TYPE | EXEC 149 | RET |
| HALF | $\mid \rightarrow$ | TYPE | EXEC 150 | RET |
| FORM | $\rightarrow$ | TYPE | EXEC 151 | RET |
| SYMB | $\rightarrow$ | TYPE | EXEC 152 | RET |

The effect of subroutine CHG, as can be seen, is to transfer to a different EXEC routine for each of the possible types it tests againat. The EXEC corresponding to a given type sets an internal variable in FSL to a value which is the FSL "title" corresponding to the syntactic "type". Thus, "types" in the syntax correspond directly with "titles" in the semantics. The type REAL in the above example would be replaced with the word TYPE in the syntax
stack, and a transfer to EXEC 146 would be made causing an internal FSL variable to have its value set to the value of the title REAL.

If the declarator is a type an identifier list of variables to be declared of that type will follow. The productions are written so that all identifier lists, no matter the context in which they occur, are processed by a common subroutine of the form:

| ID | I | -> | EXEC 190 | *AID |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <SG> | -> | ERROR 190 | A.ID |
| AID | , | -> |  | *ID |
|  | <SG> | -> | RETURN |  |

As is seen, this production subroutine transfers control to EXEC 190 with the postfix integer corresponding to the identifier on the top of the stack It does this for every identifier in the list. Now it so happens that identifier lists can occur in the source language in such roles as formal parameter lists in procedures, array name lists preceding bound pair lists in array declarations, and variable lists in variable declarations. In each of these different contexts it is required to process the same syntactic object, the identifier list in a different manner from the others. To accomplish this EXEC 190 is made into a variable capable of containing transfers to other EXEC's. When, in FSL, the statement XEQ $190<-X E Q 2$ is encountered, it means that the next time EXEC 190 is called, EXEC 2 will be executed. This will cause an identifier list to be processed as a variable list by the semantics. Similarly the statement XEQ 190 <-XEQ 3 will cause EXEC 190 to call EXEC 3, thus allowing an identifier list to be processed as a list of array names. By this mechanism one can treat the same syntactic construct differentially in the semantics on the basis of context.

THE SYMBOL TABLE
When variables in Regular Algol are declared they cause no code to be


#### Abstract

compiled. Rather an entry is made in a symbol table corresponding to each variable. The symbol table, declared by the FSL statement $\operatorname{SMMB}[400,4]$, is fixed to contain four columns which contain respectively: a postfix integer assigned by subscan to represent the identifier, an ordered pair consisting of a "type" and a "class", a machine address representing the storage location of the variable, and a context which represents the static procedure level. Each time a variable is declared a storage location pointer is incremented by one (or by two in the case of real and formula variables), and a line corresponding to that variable is entered in the symbol table. This declaration process is embedded in a block administration process which permits storage reclamation upon exit from a block by a standard push down technique (to be discussed later).

ARRAY DECLARATIONS Array declarations are more complicated than variable declarations since not only are entries made in the symbol table, but also code is produced. During the processing of an array declaration a dimension counter is initially set to zero and is incremented each time a bound pair is encountered. The number in this counter at the termination of the count is the dimension of the array and this is known at compile time. In addition, each member of a bound pair may be an arithmetic expression so code must be produced at compile time to compute the upper and lower bounds correspondIng to each bound pair. These code pieces are further embedded in code which, given a starting location, creates the head of a dope vector in the direction of descending memory addresses from that starting location. The starting location is associated with the array name by indirect addressing using the symbol table. The mechanism and form of the dope vectors is found in an article by Kirk Sattley called "Allocation of Storage for


Arrays in Algol 60" [Comm.ACM, vo1.4, no.1,Jan.1961,page 60ff.]. The only departure from Sattley's mechanism is that in Formula Algol the direction of memory addresses is decreasing in the dope vectors instead of increasing. Very briefly, one saves in the head of each dope vector the dimension of the array and corresponding to each subscript a lower bound and a size [the size being the difference between the upper and lower bounds in the bound pair computed at run-time]. To access an array element $a\left[i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{n}\right]$ one uses an accessing function of the form (...((i) -lowerbound $\left._{1}\right) \times$ lize $_{1}+$ $\left(i_{2}\right.$-lowerbound $\left.\left.{ }_{2}\right)\right) \times$ size $\left._{2} \ldots\right)+\left(i_{n}\right.$-lowerbound $_{n}$. Thus, the accessing function can be computed from a knowledge of the subscripts and from the contents of the head of a dope vector. For array declarations involving lists of array names attached to the same bound pair list the mechanism of declaration is more complicated. For example, the code corresponding to the array declaration ReAL ARRAY A,,$C$ [ $1: 6]$; would appear as follows:

```
        CLA LOC[A]
        TRM \alpha
        CLA LOC[B]
        TRM }\quad
        CLA LOC[C]
        TRM < <
        TRA 0
    \alpha: Here we have a closed subroutine which computes the head of
        of a dope vector starting at the location given in the accumu-
        lator upon entry to the subroutine. It looks as follows:
        ENT
    _ -TRM_ _ V40 _ _[which sets switches for V41]
        Compute Lower Bound
        STD T There are N of these code
        Compute Upper Bound
```



```
        pieces, one for each of
        the N bound pairs.
    0:
```

Here the transfer to V 40 corresponds to meeting "[" in A, B,C[1:6], the transfer to V 41 corresponds to "," and the transfer to V 42 corresponds to meeting "]".

SWITCH DECLARATIONS
Upon meeting SWITCH $S \leftarrow \mathrm{~L} 1, \mathrm{~L} 2, \ldots, \mathrm{Ln}$ in the source code the following
takes place: $\mathrm{n}+1$ locations are taken from array memory:
$\beta \quad:$
$\beta+1:$
$\ldots$
$\beta+n:$

In addition, $n$ consecutive code pieces of the following form are produced:
CLA A3
STL $\quad \beta+i$
TRA A2
TRA $\mathrm{Li} \rightarrow$ note: Li is chained and therefore filled in prior to execution with the proper address.

Executing these n consecutive code pieces fills in the switching table. Thus, the table is filled in at the point in the program corresponding to the declaration of the switch. Later in the program, when we encounter a statement such as GO TO L[i], the following code is produced:

CLA i
LXP L,RO
TRM V--
This code piece looks up the $i$ th entry in the switching table and executes a transfer to it.

The discussion of procedure declarations, formula declarations, and symbol declarations are deferred until later.

COMPILATION OF EXPRESSIONS
Within the syntax analyzer there is a closed subroutine called the Expression Scanner whose function it is to compile code for all arithmetic and Boolean expressions in regular Algol. Later in the discussion of Formula Manipulation we will see that the expression scanner recognizes and compiles code for formula expressions, also. The expression scanner is used anytime an expression is expected in any part of the Formula Algol syntax. It is used to compile code for expressions in array subscripts, in assignment statements, in actual parameter lists, and so on.

Upon entrance to the expression scanner a discrimination is performed on the various symbols with which an expression may begin legally, and a branch is made to subsequent tests or to subroutines to compile code. For example, designational expressions must begin with IF, so if the expression scanner detects IF as the initial character of an expected expression it transfers control to a production subroutine which analyzes designational expressions. During the course of this analysis of designational expressions, arithmetic expressions or Boolean expressions may, in turn, be encountered. At the point when they are encountered control is passed back to the expression scanner. Thus, the expression scanner has been called within itself. It is important to have the expression scanner correspond to a well-defined unit of action so that it may be called by other routines any time it is necessary to recognize an expression and so that it may be called within itself. This well-defined unit of action is as follows. In the syntax stack the expression which is the input to the scanner is replaced with the single chaxacter $E$ as the output upon return from the call. In the semantic stack corresponding to the $E$ in the syntax stack is a description containing the type of the expression and the fact that it is to be
found in the run-time accumulator. In addition, a code piece has been compiled which computes the value of the expression and which leaves the answer in the run-time accumulator,

Let us now treat some specific cases. We will examine what happens in the expression scanner when we compile code for (1) arithmetic expressions, (2) Boolean expressions, and (3) array accesses.

## Single Variables

If the arithmetic or Boolean expression is a single variable this is detected immediately upon entrance to the expression scanner by a production of the form:

$$
\mathbf{I}|\rightarrow \quad \mathrm{E} \quad| \quad * \mathrm{E} 2
$$

The productions at E2 must now test the character following the identifier. If the following character is an arithmetic or Boolean operator, then the expression must be arithmetic or Boolean, respectively. In this case, control is transferred to a subroutine $C O M$ in the productions, which subroutine, responsible for compiling code for arithmetic and Boolean expressions. If, on the other hand, the following character is non-arithmetic or non-Boolean, then a further discrimination is required to determine what is to be done. For example, if an assignment operator "' follows the identifier, then control passes to EXEC 9 whose responsibility it is to determine the location of the variable and to produce a semantic error if the variable was not single. If, as is also possible, the identifier is followed by the operator "[", then it is to be treated as an array identifier, and control passes to EXEC 65, which will be discussed presently. If the identifier is followed by such operators as "," ";" "THEN" "STEP" "WHILE" and others, control passes to subroutine COM in the productions. Subroutine COM, thus, lies at the heart of the compilation process for expressions. We will examine it briefly

## now. The routine is reproduced on pages 10 a and 10 b . Subroutine COM, Arithmetic Expressions

Subroutine COM is equipped with a mechanism for sorting on the hierarchies of operators so that, for example, in the expression $A+B * C$, code is compiled to perform the multiplication first and the addition second, even though the order in which these operators are encountered in the syntax stack is the reverse. To accomplish this, one transfers control to subroutine COM with the syntax stack looking like $E+E * \mid$. The first production to match is production COM+5 which transfers control to H30. The productions starting at H30 will detect multiplication, division, exponentiation and unary functions SIGN, ENTIER, SQRT, EXP, LN, SIN, COS, and ABS. Thus, when $*$ is on top of the syntax stack, the only operations that will be compiled among the elements in the second, third, and fourth positions of the stack will be those of a tighter binding power or higher hierarchy than multiplication. Note that + has a lower hierarchy than $*$, so nothing is compiled at this stage.

Let us now consider a complete example. Suppose we meet the statement $L \leftarrow \leftarrow A+B * C$; in the source language. The expression scanner converts the first four characters of this statement to $E \leftarrow \leftarrow E+\mid$ and transfers control to subroutine $C O M$. Here, production $C O M+7$ matches and a transfer to H28 occurs. Nothing matches from H28 until the end, so control returns to the expression scanner which recognizes the next two characters and returns to subroutine COM with $E \leftrightarrow \leftarrow E+E * \mid$ in the syntax stack. Then production COM+5 matches the stack, control passes to production H 30 , nothing matches until the end of subroutine $C O M$, control returns to the expression scanner, two more characters are recognized, and a final transfer is made back to subroutine COM. At this point the configuration of the syntax


stack is

$$
E \leftarrow \leftarrow E+E * E ; \mid
$$

Here the metacharacter $\langle 0 D\rangle$ matches the semi-colon on top of the stack at production $C O M+15$, and control passes to production $H 16$. The first production to match the stack is production H30. This is the first instance of any compilation in the processing of the statement. Allprevious actions up until this point have consisted of postponements. The compilation is accomplished by transfers to EXEC 100 and to EXEC 125, which compile code to multiply $B$ and $C$. In the case of axithmetic operands CLA B MPY C is constructed. In the case of formula operands, code to construct the formula tree ${ }_{B}$ ' $_{C}$. The semantic routines used to accomplish this, test the types of the operands and compile the appropriate code. At the completion of this compilation the syntax stack is altered to look like $E \leftarrow E+E$; because the terminal $E * E$ has been replaced by a single $E$, as is seen in production H 30 . The semantic routines also set the description of the topmost $E$ to contain the type of the expression and the fact that it is in the run-time accumulator. Control now passes back to the beginning of subroutine COM for another iteration of the process. Subroutine COM will be seen to reenter itself iteratively until the entire expression is consumed, until code for it has been compiled, and until its external representation in the syntax stack has been replaced by $E$ in the case of pure expressions and nothing in the case of statements, some of which are handled by subroutine COM.
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We are now at the point where the syntax stack looks like $E \leftarrow \leftarrow E+E ; \mid$ and where we have reentered COM. On this pass production COM+15 matches and passes control to H16 where successive productions fail to match the syntax stack until production H 28 , at which point $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{E}$ is compiled by EXEC 100


and EXEC 123. The routines in MAGIC at compile time inspect the descriptions of the operands and are smart enough in this case to complle

| CLA | $B$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| MPY | C |
| ADD | $A$ |

in the case of arithmetic expressions since the description of the second operand in LEFT2 contains the information that the result of the current compilation is in the run-time accumulator, Again the semantic routines analyze the types of LEFT2 and LEFT4 to determine whether code should be compiled to add numerical expressions or to add formula expressions. After compilation the stack configuration is changed to $E \& \in E$; and control pagses back to the beginning of subroutine COM. On this final trip through subroutine COM production H16 constructs code to perform the assignment of LEFT2 to LRFT4 and subroutine COM is exited with only the semi-colon remaining in the syntax stack, the statement having been consumed entirely. In the case of expressions, rather than statements, an $E$ is left upon exit in the RIGHT2 with its semantic description set to contain its type and the fact that it resides in the run-time accumulator.

## The Administration of Temps

During the compilation of arithmetic expressions and Boolean expressions it is occasionally necessary to use temporary storage to save the partial result of a computation while another partial result is being prepared in the accumulator. In Formula Algol temps come from normal storage where they may participate automatically in the mechanisms of recursion. Temps are reclaimed when a block is exited just as is normal storage private to the same block. All temps are used only once per block and then thrown away. This is a trade off of a small amount of space for a large amount of compile time efficiency since no stacking and no memory system need be

## used to administer which temps are assigned and which are free.

## Boolean Expressions

Boolean expressions are compiled in exactly the same manner as arithmetic expressions by subroutine COM. The only difference is that different binary and unary operators are involved and that the types of the operands are different. The semantic routines perform tests to ascertain that the types of operands involved in Boolean expressions are Boolean and not arithmetic. Likewise, type checking ascertains that operands in arithmetic expressions are not Boolean, and that operands on the right and left sides of assignment arrows are legal. If illegal combinations are detected, semantic errors or "Faults" are printed out at compile time. Array Accesses

Suppose we are asked to compile the following statement:

$$
\mathrm{B}[\mathrm{I}] \leftarrow \mathrm{A}[\mathrm{I}+1, \mathrm{~J}+\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{I}]+3 ;
$$

We immediately see that there are two cases to consider. The array element on the left hand side of the assignment statement is to be stored into whereas the array element on the right is to have its value accessed. In the first case we need code to produce an address. In the second case we need code to produce a value. To discriminate between the two cases we use the fact that the array element on the left hand side can be detected upon entrance to the Statement Scanner [ to which control is transferred in the syntax analyzer at the beginning of the analysis of every statement] whereas the second array element on the right hand side will be processed by the expression scanner. Thus, embedded in the statement scanner at the very beginning is the following structure:

| S1 | $F$ | $I$ | $\mid \rightarrow$ | $E$ | $* S 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S2 | $E$ | $[\mid$ |  | Ca11 to an EXEC to produce |  |

In the other case in the expression scanner we have
E2 E 1 Call to an EXEC to produce

LXP 0 1,R0
Then both cases converge by producing a transfer to a subroutine in the syntax analyzer to process expression lists [which are subscript lists for the array elements]. At the time of this convergence another instruction. is inserted in the code compiled:

| LXP 0 | $k, R 0$ | where $k=0,1$ for the |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TRM | $V 44$ | left and right sides |
| respectively. |  |  |

The productions that process the subscripts compile the following code:

[code piece to compute last subscript and to leave result in run-time accumulator]
TRM V46

Here

V44 Saves the contents of $R 0$ in a switch available for later use by W46 which will need to know whether an address ox a value is needed, and administrates a push down stack for array subscripts for array calls within array calls.

V45 Constructs code for partial accessing of an array element using the information in the head of the dope vector according to the formula (subscript - lower bound)t size.

V46 Looks at the switch set by V44 and knows whether to produce code accessing the address or the value of the array element.

Hence, the code compiled for the statement

$$
B[I] \leftarrow A[I+1, J * K, L]+3 ; \quad \text { is as follows: }
$$

| LXP | 0 | 0,RO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TRM |  | V44 |
| CLA |  | I |
| TRM |  | V45 |
| TRM |  | V46 |
| STD |  | T? |
| LXP | 0 | 1,R0 |
| TRM |  | V44 |
| CLA |  | I |
| ADD | 0 | I |
| TRM |  | V45 |
| CLA |  | J |
| MPY |  | K |
| TRM |  | V45 |
| CLA |  | I |
| TRM |  | V45 |
| TRM |  | V46 |
| STD | 1 | T1 |

Push Down Mechanism in Formula Algol
The following mechanism for pushing down, saving, and restoring variables is used throughout Formula Algol at run-time. For example, it is used in the print routine, in the evaluation routine, and in all routines that call themselves or each other recursively. It is, therefore, important to know about it and it is introduced here for that reason.


#### Abstract

There is a region of safe cells $S 0, S 1, \ldots, S 100$, and, in addition, a long push down stack, the top of which is saved as an address in index register R6. There are also two routines, V25 and V26, which push and pop this stack, respectively, Suppose the first $N$ cells in the $S$ region contain information which is to be saved. The number $N$ and a return address to be transferred to upon pop up are comanicated as input parameters to V25.


The number of locations of the $S$ region to be saved is inserted in the index register $R 1$, and the location to return to is inserted in index register R0. Then V25 is called. This transforms the push down stack by appending the contents of the first $N$ cell in the $S$ region to the stack, and by adding a word pair containing the following three items: a chaining address for use in popping up the stack, the return address, and $N$. The following figure depicts this transformation.


Before


After
figure 2
Executing V26 restores the top $N$ variables on the push down stack to the first $N$ cells in the $S$ region, pops up the stack by changing the contents of R6, and executes a transfer to the return address saved on the stack.

Thus, recursive exits $=$ TRA V26.
Conditional Expressions
Suppose we wish to compile conditional expressions of the form:
IF B THEN E1 ELSE E2 ;
This is accomplished by a subsystem of the productions which has the follow-
ing structure:


Here EXEC 30 produces code to push a flad.
PUSH [FLAD1,0 ]; CODE ( -LEFT2 $\rightarrow$ JUMP[FLAD1]);
This creates code to transfer to an as yet undefined address if the Boolean expression of LEFT2 is false. In EXEC 31 we have to create code to correspond to case when the first expression has been computed and when we want to jump around the code to compute the second expression. To do this we need a second flad. The code for EXEC 31 looks as follows:

PUSH[FLAD2,0]; CODE (JUMP[FLAD2]); ASSIGN[FLAD1];
The last statement assigns the current codeloc to be the address to which the transfer is made in the event that the Boolean condition is false. Finally, at EXEC 32 all that remains to be done is to assign flad2, which will be the address to which the transfer is made after computing the first expres~ sion in the conditional. EXEC 32 looks like:

ASSIGN[FLAD2];
The code produced from this process corresponding to the entire conditional statement then looks as follows:

FUO TRUE
TRA $\alpha$
[ codepiece to compute E1]
TRA $\beta$
$\alpha$ [ codepiece to compute E2 ]
$\beta$ whatever else is compiled next in the program
The situation for conditional expressions not involving ELSE is much simpler.

We just have a production which looks like

where in EXEC 33 we do
ASSIGN [FLAD1]
to create a jump around the code which computes the value of the expression or which executes a statement, Decause conditionals may be nested it is important to have flads which are push down stacks. Actually EXEC 30 is a bit more complicated than indicated here because of the necessity of merging with Formula manipulation. The Boolean expression in LEFT2 could possibly be an EVAL expression which upon execution at run-time could either collapse to a Boolean value or could fail to collapse to such. To handle this situation at compile-time one sets the type of an EVAL expression to "TRUMP" and EXEC 30 tests for type TRUMP. Upon finding type TRUMP code is produced to transfer to a run-time routine to check the type of the result left by the EVAL expression. If the type is Boolean, then the situation is the same as that explained above. If the type is not Boolean, then a runtime error is printed.

## Designational Expressions

Statements may, of course, be labelled, and, therefore, upon entrance to the statement scannex, whose job it is to analyze all possible ways in which a statement may begin legally, the presence of $\mathrm{L}:$ is detected by a production of the form

E: $: \rightarrow$ EXEC 91 *Si.
As is seen the $E$ : is eliminated fron the syntax stack and the statement scanner is reentered, EXEG 97 is, therefore, totally responsible for processing the labels that occur attached to statements. Refexences in designational expressions may be of two types: (l) those which transfer to an undefined label which has not yet occurred in the source program, and (2)
those which transfer to a label already defined which has occurred previously. The compiler must discriminate between these two cases. The first requires that all references to the undefined label be chained. The second merely requires compilation of a transfer from information given in a label table, the stratagem being to store in the label table the address of code location corresponding to the beginning of the labelled statement once such information becomes available during the compilation. In Formula Algol the label table has five pieces of information in it (in contrast to the symbol table, which has four). The name of the label table is LAB, and we might picture its structure as follows:

LAB [ postfix integer for the label, or switch, title which is either LABEL or SWITCH, location in code corresponding to label, level, $\operatorname{tag}=0$ for defined and 1 for undefined $]$

We now turn our attention to EXEC 91. A flow chart for it is as follows:


The FSL translation of this flowchart is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{T} \leftarrow \mathrm{LAB}[\text { LEFT2 } \ldots \text {. }] ; \\
& \text { SIGNAL } \rightarrow T=0 \rightarrow \text { FAULT } 91:
\end{aligned}
$$

$\operatorname{LOC}[\operatorname{LAB}[0,,,, \$] \leftarrow 0 ;$
ASSIGN [ LOC [ LAB [ 0 ,., $\$, \mathrm{l}, \mathrm{]}]$ \$
$\mathrm{T} \leftarrow \operatorname{CODELOC} ; \quad$ ENTER $[$ LAB ; LEFT2,LABEL, $T, L E V, 0] \$$
The main idea of the FSL code is this. Tis a temporary into which the extracted tag Ls placed, During the extraction if the postifx identifier LEFT2 can't be found in the table LAB, the SIGRAL is get false; otherwise It is set true, A test is next made on SIGNAT, and if it is true, then the postfix integer LEFT2 was already in the table. It must, therefore, have been either uged or defined. If $1 t$ was defined, $i$.e. if $T=0$, then this Is the second time the label is being defined, so we priat FAUKT 91; othexwige we get the tag in the line where it was registered undefined to 0 to denote that it has just become defined, We further place the curxent code Iocation in the third colum of the tabie, In the event that the label was not in the table, then we entef the postfix integer, the curient code lac, a tithe LABEL, a tag of 0 , and the current level into the labed table.

Now suppose we have the statement $G O \mathrm{TO} \mathrm{L}$ wivere L is a labed rather than g switch. In the productions we will find the following subsystem:
 The second of these productions completely eliminates the GO TO L statement from the stack and transfers to EXEC 44. A flow chart of EXEC 44 is as follows:


The FSL code for this is:
'ALPHA ${ }^{\prime}$

$$
T \ll-L A B[\text { LEFT2, , , } \$] \text {; }
$$

SIGNAL ->
LAB [ 0, \$, , , ] = LABEL ->
COMT2 +-LOC [ LAB [ $0, ~ \$, ~, ~] ~ ; ~$
$T=0->$

COMT3 <-<COMT2>; CODE (JUMP[COMT3]):
CODE ( JUMP [ CHAIN [COMT2] ] ) \$ :

FAULT 44 :
ENTER [ LAB; LEFT2, LABEL, 0,LEV, 1];

JUMP [ ALPHA ] \$

A verbal analysis of this FSL code is as follows. First one looks up the label LEFT2 in the label table and extracts the tag if it is there. If the label is there, SIGNAL is set true and the tag extracted is placed in $T$. Otherwise SIGNAL is set false. Suppose the label was in the table and that
the tag has been placed in $T$. This means the label was used, and the tag will tell whether the label is defined or undefined. We first check to see if the title of the postfix integer found was LABEL. If it wasn't we print FAULT 44. If it was we extract the location in the table of the place where the code location is to be stored and store this table location in COMT2. Then we test the tag to see $1 f$ the label was previously defined. If it was, we extract the code location from the table (which was entered when the label became defined) and place this in CoMT3, Then we code a transfer to COMT'3. If, on the other hand, the label was undefined, we must chain an undefined reference to the position in the table where the location will later be entered. In the event that SIGNAL was set false, the label wasn't in the table, so the last lines of the FSL code enter the label in the table and reenter the routine to process the label in the same fashion as defined labels. One should notice at this point that the ASSIGN statement on the top of page 20 assigns all undefined forward references to the label, if any, by means of the chain set up in EXEC 44.

A final topic in the discusgion of designational expressiona is the processing of statements involving transfers to switches. E.G. GO TO $\mathrm{SW}[\mathrm{K}+4]$; A production of the form

$$
\begin{array}{lllll|ll}
\text { GOTO } & E & {\left[\left.\begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{E} & ] & \rightarrow
\end{array} \right\rvert\, \operatorname{EXEC} 45\right.} & * \mathrm{Sl}
\end{array}
$$

handles all such designational expressions. Since switches must be declared, they are always in the label table, otherwise it is a semantic error. We have already treated the declaration of switches in the discussion of declarations, and we saw there that switch declarations cause code to be compiled which, when executed, builds up a switching table in the space used for dynamic array storage. This switching table is of the form:
T: ..... n
TRA LITRA L2

- . . .
TRA $\quad \mathrm{Ln}$
Thus, EXEC 35 has the following atructure:
[some tests to see that things are declared, etc.] $\rightarrow$

T $\leftarrow$ LAB[LEFT4, , $\$$, ] ;


This produces code to place the value of the subacript expression in the run-time cell Y 1 , to place the location of the awitching table in the accumulator, and to mark transfer to a routine X 35 . This routine is executed at run-time and compares the value of the subscritt expression with the number n stored in the head of the switching table to see if the subscript has exceeded the switching tabie dimension, and if it hasn't, executes the appropriate transfer. If it has, it prints a run-time error.
This completes the diacussion of designational expressions.
FOR STATEMENTS
In the processing of for statements the crucial mechanism concerns the compilation of code to correspond to each of the several poasible for list elements. This is done by a case analysis. The cases are:
A. El,
B. E2 Whille E3
C. E4 STEP E5 UNTIL E6
D. E7 STEP E8 WHILE E9
For these cases, code is produced as follows:

CASE A

> I $\leftarrow \mathrm{E}$ (I 1s the control variable in these examplea)
> TRM $S \quad$ (hexe $S$ is a closed subroutine corrasponding to the body of the for statement)

CASE B

| $\alpha \mathrm{I} \leftarrow \mathrm{E} 2$ | (We are using a mixture of Algol |
| :---: | :---: |
| IP $\sim$ E3 THEN GO TO | and machine language to deacribe |
| TRM S | the code, Substitute code for |
| TRA $\alpha$ | the Algol if you want to be pure.) |

日. .
CASE C
I $\leftarrow \mathbf{E} 4$
TRM $\beta 1$
TRA ${ }^{2} 2$

```
    81 ENT (compute step)
```

        \(T \leftarrow E 5\)
        TRA I B1
    \(\beta 2\) IF (I-E6)*SGN(T) >0 THEN GO TO 日3 (exit condition)
        TRM S
        TRM 81
        \(I \leftarrow I+T\)
        TRA 12
    B3...
    CASE D

I K E 7
TRM $\quad \mathrm{BI}$
TRA $\beta 2$

```
        B1 ENT
    T}\leftarrowE
    TRA 1 81
    \beta3 TRM &1
    I}\leftarrowI+
    \beta2 IF -F9 THEN GO TO }
    TRM S
    TRA 83
    \delta . . .
```

Here we will discuss the case where we produce code for the STEP UNTIL case
(case C). The others will not be discussed as the reader versed in FSL will
be easily able to generalize the process for himself.
Let's take a specific example:
FOR I $\leftarrow 3$ STEP 4 UNTIL 19 DO PRINT(I) ;

Upon seeing FOR as the initial character of a statement, the statement scanner transfers control to the expression scanner to recognize and to process the control variable. The expression scanner reduces the control variable to $E$ and scans the assignment arrow $\leftarrow$ Control is then transferred to a utility routine of the expression scanner, routine E5, whose second production is

```
FOR E \leftarrow| | FOR E & | EXEC 211 *E1
```

This production converts the single assignment arrow $\leftarrow$ to a double assignment arrow $\leftarrow$ representing a destructive store. EXEC 211 finds the location of $E$ and saves it for later use in the processing of each for list element. Control then returns to the expression scanner. The expression scanner picks up the lower bound for the for variable, compiles, by means of subroutine

COM the assignment $E \leftarrow E$, producing the code

$$
I \leftarrow 3
$$

then following this a STEP is pleked up upon return from COM and control is transferred to utility routine Fl0 where the production

FOR STEP $\mid \rightarrow$ STEP FOR | EXEC 40 FiOA
matches. EXEC 40 is as follows:
PUSH[FLAD1; 0]; PUSH[FLAD2,0]; CODE(MARKJUMP[FLAD1];
JUMP[FLAD2]); ALFA $\leftarrow$ CODELOC; ASSIGN[FLAD1]; TALLYECODELOC];
This produces the following code:

```
TRM BT
TRA 82
```

B1 ENT
$\rightarrow$
The production at FiOA inserts $E \leftarrow$ into the stack.
F10A $\quad<\mathrm{SG}\rangle \quad \rightarrow\langle\mathrm{SG} \mathrm{H} \leftarrow| \operatorname{EXEC} 60 \quad * E 1$
EXEC 60 assigns RIGHT2 the semantics of a temporary and stores its location and description in the semantic stack. Control then returns to the expression scanner which scans the step function and compiles an assignment into the temp inserted into the stack by the production F10A. Next the unTIL is detected, and control transfers to $F 15$, where the following production matches:

STEP FOR INTTLL | $\rightarrow$ UNTIL FOR | EXEC 41 F15A
EXEC 41 is as follows:
CODE (JUMP[<ALFA>]); ASSIGN[FLAD2];
The following code is thus added to the codestack:
$\mathbf{T} \leftarrow 4$
TRA 1 B1
[The reader should refer to the example of code on page 24 for Case $C$ to
see how this code fits in with the previous code]. At F15A a - E is inserted into the stack by the following production:

Here EXBC 61 assigns the semantica of the control variable to E and puts its location in the semantic stack. This allows the expression acanner to compile ( $\mathrm{I}-19$ ) for use in determining the termination conditions for the for statement. This allows the code for IF (I-19)*SGN(T) to be produced automatically using the mechanisme of subroutine COM. Finally, when control is transferred from subroutine COM back to the expression scanner, and when the expression scanner picks up DO on top of the stack, control is passed to production aubroutine F31, where the following production matches the stack:

F31 UNTIL FOR E DO $\quad \rightarrow$ DO F $\mid$ EXBC 26
EXEC 26 is the final EXEC in the processing of the for statement (except, of course, for those responsible for making the body of the for statement a closed subroutine). EXEC 26 looks like this:

PUSH [FLAD1,0]; CODE (T*LEFT2 $>0$; JUMP[FLAD1]; MARKJUMP[FLAD2];
MARKJUMP [ALFA] ; $\operatorname{CODE}(T T \leftarrow T T+T) ; \operatorname{CODE}$ (JIMP[BETA]) ;
Here MARKJUMP[FLAD2] produces TRM S , MARKJUMP[ALFA] produces TRM 1 and CODE (TT $\leftarrow T T+T$ ) produces $I \leftarrow I+T$ where $T$ has been assigned the semantics of $I$, the control variable, and where $T$ has been assigned the semantics of the step expression. Finally, $\operatorname{CODE}$ ( JUMP[BETA]) produces a transfer TRA 82 . Here $\beta 2$ was assigned in EXEC 61.

This completes the discussion of for statements.

## PROCEDURES IN FORMULA ALGOL

```
    We will first discuss procedure calls. Suppose we meet the procedure
statement
    P(A,B + 1, C* D ) ;
in the source language text. The statement scanner picks up the procedure
identifier with a production of the form
```



```
Thus, control is transferred to production subroutine col, where the list
of actual parameters is processed. The expression scanner contains a nearly
identical subsystem of productions of the form
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline El & I & -> & E & * E 2 \\
\hline E2 & ( & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
This subsystem transfers control to production subroutine CAL. The differ-
ence between subroutine CAL and subroutine COL is that CAL corresponds to
the use of a procedure as an operand in an expression, whereas col corresponds
to the use of a procedure as a statement. These two routines allow control
to be returned to the expressions scanner from CAL and to the statement
scanner from COL after the list of actual parameters has been processed in
each case. Upon entrance to both CAL and COL a transfer is made to EXEC 11,
which compiles a transfer around the thunks which will be inserted in the
code corresponding to the actual parameters, and which marks the thunk stack
ACT with a special marker to delimit the thunks corresponding to the current
actual parameter list being processed. The code corresponding to the pro-
cedure call P ( A,B+1,C*D ) will look as follows:
```



THUNKS
During the actual parameter scan transfers are made to EXEC 11 by productions of the following form:

| E, | $\mid \rightarrow$ | $\mid$ | EXEC | 12 | *E 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E, | $\mid \rightarrow$ | $\mid$ EXEC | 12 |  |  |

Here EXEC 12 creates a thunk corresponding to each actual parameter and stacks it in a compile time stack called ACT. When all of the actual parameters have been scanned, i.e. when ) is hit in the syntax stack, all thunks are unloaded into the code and a return is made via CAL or COL to E2A in the expression scanner or to $S 2 A$ in the statement scanner to compile a call to the procedure. Of course there can be arbitrary nesting of calls in the actual parameter list, and so the stack ACT has to be set up to handle this possibility. Stack markers are used for this purpose. A marker is pushed onto the stack when a new list of actual parameters is encountered, and when dumping
the thunks into code one pops back to the previous marker. The table for the various types of thunks is as follows:

| 1 | mmm | m m | n n n n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $\frac{1}{2} 00$ | $\mathfrak{n}$ | กn n n $n$ |
| 0 | 001 | 0 b | n n n n n |
| 0 | 002 | 0 b | n n n n |
| 0 | 003 | 00 | n n n n |
| 0 | 004 | $\lambda \lambda$ | nnnn $n$ |
| 0 | 105 | m m | n $n$ n $n$ n |
| 0 | 006 | 00 | n $n$ n $n$ |
| 0 | 007 | 00 | nnnnn |

dynamic variable
aigned integer
variable or abcon array
code plece
label
formal parameter
procedure
switch
$10 c=M+\infty D$

$$
\mathrm{val}= \pm \mathrm{N}
$$

$$
\mathrm{loc}=\mathrm{bN}
$$

head $=\mathrm{bN}$
start $=\mathrm{N}$
$\mathcal{C}_{\text {dest }}=\mathrm{N}$
target level $=\Lambda$
position $=M$
procedure $=\mathbf{N}$
name $=\mathbb{N}$
name $=\mathrm{N}$

Having compiled the thunks and baving inserted them in code corresponding to the actual parameter list one is now in a position to complie the procedure calla. This must be accomplished by a chaining algorithm which is sensitive to static block levels. When the calls are encountered we chain them through the code and upon exiting a block we asaign all calls within that block that are atill in the chain. For example: Given a plece of source language text with the structure

## BEGIN

PROCEDURE P....
BEGIN
Q()$; \quad \mathrm{F}(\mathrm{Q})$;
END
procedire Q
BEGIN
END

Here the call of $Q$ comes before the declaration of $Q$, forward chaining is needed. The first call $Q($ ) causes two words to be inserted in code (at position $\alpha$ in the code sample on page 29) which two words have the following structure:


CRADLE


The stack called LADLE stacks all calls on procedures which occur in a block. Upon entrance to the block a zero is stacked in LADLE, and each call is stacked as part of a word pair in this stack. At the end of a
block the assignment algorithm assigns all calls corresponding to the procedures in the stack and terminates upon reaching a zero. The assignment algorithm extracts the chains from the table CRADLE and by arithmetic comparison on the block level information contained in each call in the chain can determine whether a call should be assigned at that block level or not. All assigned cails are removed from the chain and those which cannot be assigned are left in the chain. These remaining calls in the chain may then be assigned at higher block levels.

To enter things in the chain corresponding to a given procedure there is a routine called HEAD (I). HEAD finds or creates an entry in CRADLE. If the identifier is found in the first column it gives the location of the head of the chain found. If the identifier is not found it puts it there and gives the location of the head of a chain which it creates. The following FSL code does this:
$\mathrm{T} \leftarrow \mathrm{LOC}$ [CRADLE [LEFT2, \$]];
$\rightarrow$ SIGNAL $\rightarrow$ ENTER [CRADLE; LEFT2, CHAINEND ];
$T \leftarrow$ LOC [CRADLE] - LENGTHOF (-CRADLE) ; (this puts the location of the head of the chain In T)

We can now use this routine to create the chain corresponding to a call. This is done by a routine CALL (I) which looks as follows:

MARKJUMP[CALL (I)]; <CODELOC $<$ CHAIN ( $<$ D $>$ ) + LEVEL;
TALLY[CODELOC]; TT $\leftarrow<\mathcal{D}\rangle ;\langle\mathrm{D}\rangle \leftarrow \mathrm{CODELOC}$;
<CODELOC $\leftarrow T \mathrm{~T}+$ Level ; TALLY[CODELOC] ;
This routine CALL(I) is executed for procedure calls both as expressions and as statements and for procedure identifiers occurring as actual parameters. It remains to disouss the assignment algorithm executed upon block exit. A flow chart for this appears on the next page.
1

ASSIGNMENT
ALGORITHM

(identifter tagged with class TRM V201 for procedures TRM V203 for formal param. TRM V207 for labels ( = TT + class ) (get identifier only)
IV $\leftarrow$ THINK CLbAR [T]

$\mathrm{B} \leftarrow \mathrm{C}$
$C \leftarrow 10 c$ (successor of B )


ASSIGNMENT ALGORITHM
This assignment algorithm is realized by a routine called ATHAS, and its broad strategy is this: ATLAS pops the successive procedure names from the stack LADLE and processes these one by one. When it cones to a zero in LADLE the processing is finished. For each procedure name in LADLE it looks this procedure name up in the association table CRADLE and finds the chain of calls on that procedure. It then steps down the chain making arithmetic comparisons on each item in the chain to determine if a call on that particular procedure. It then steps down the chain making arithmetic comparisons on each item in the chain to determine if a call on that particular procedure is legal at the current block level. It then assigns those which are legal by substituting in the code pair TRM V201 followed by the procedure address [or in the case of thunks a procedure address with the appropriate thunk code]. Those calls that get assigned are deleted from the chain. Those that are not assigned remain in the chain to be assigned at higher block levels with some possibly different meaning.

In a similar fashion ATLAS assigns labels and formal parameters. These items are also stacked in LADLE and the same chaining algotithm with minor variations is used on them. Likewise, with minor variations from the case discussed above, they are assigned by ATLAS.

Having discussed procedure calls we now turn to procedure declarations.

The code corresponding to a series of procedure declarations looks as follows:


```
up the procedure identifier and change it to P-ID in the stack.
PRI PROC I | \(\rightarrow\) P-ID | EXEC 160 FND
FND TYPE P-ID | -> P-ID | EXEC 161 PSB
    <SG> | -> | PSB EXEC 162 *(FPL
One sees from this subsystem of productions that EXEC }160\mathrm{ gets executed
for all procedures, that EXEC's 161 and 162 get executed for functions, but
that only EXEC 162 is executed for pure procedures since pure procedures
are not preceded by types. In fact, EXEC 160 does everything common to
procedures and to blocks. What we see, therefore, is that a division of
labor is made between the several EXEC's handling these declarations so that
labor common to several different compilation requirements is performed by
a single routine. This organizational principle is found throughout the
compiler. We have seen it before in the productions in the case of the
production subroutine to process identifier lists. The structure of EXEC 260
is as follows:
```

```
RIGHT2 <-RIGHT3 CXT ; (where CXT is current context)
```

RIGHT2 <-RIGHT3 CXT ; (where CXT is current context)
CXT <-CODELOC;
CXT <-CODELOC;
<CXT> <-0 ; TALLY[CODELOC]: (zero out context if procedure
<CXT> <-0 ; TALLY[CODELOC]: (zero out context if procedure
<CODELOO <~LEV + INC ;
<CODELOO <~LEV + INC ;
(here we won't know the block level nor will we know the
(here we won't know the block level nor will we know the
increment [INC] until the end of the procedure declara-
increment [INC] until the end of the procedure declara-
tion so a chaining mechanism is required. Here we have
tion so a chaining mechanism is required. Here we have
oversimplified the presentation.)
oversimplified the presentation.)
LEV <^-LEV + 8R1000000; (increments level count)
LEV <^-LEV + 8R1000000; (increments level count)
T <- FUNCTION ; (sets up type for later entry into symbol table)
T <- FUNCTION ; (sets up type for later entry into symbol table)
RIGHT1 «-LEFT1 ; SET[LEFT1, FUNCTION];
RIGHT1 «-LEFT1 ; SET[LEFT1, FUNCTION];
(LEFT1 had the procedure identifier saved in it. We
(LEFT1 had the procedure identifier saved in it. We
transfer this description to RIGHT1, set the descrip-
transfer this description to RIGHT1, set the descrip-
tion of LEFT1 to type FUNCTION, and push this de-
tion of LEFT1 to type FUNCTION, and push this de-
scription onto the LADLE stack).
scription onto the LADLE stack).
PUSH[LADLE,LEFT1]; PUSH[LADLE,CXT]; (we also push onto LADLE

```
PUSH[LADLE,LEFT1]; PUSH[LADLE,CXT]; (we also push onto LADLE
```

the address of the first word in code where the contest will be stored. This corresponds to $\alpha$ in the code sample on page 35.)

PUSH[LADLE, 0]; (finally, we put 0 on top of LADLE to delimit the code for the procedure body which ensues.)

We are now ready to do EXEC 161 for functions only and EXEC 162 for both functions and pure procedures. EXEC 161 says this:
$F \leftarrow$ STORLOC ; (Save the head of the storage block in $F$ )
TALLY[STORLOC]; (Save a word where value of procedure will be stored)

TYPE $=$ DOUBLE $\rightarrow$ TALLY[STORLOC]; (If it was a real procedure save two words for a double precision result.)
$T \leftarrow T Y P E+$ PRCEDR ; (Save type and title of procedure for later entry into symbol table.)

EXEC 162 does the following:
ENTER[SYMB; RIGHT1, T, F, CXT]; (Here we enter into the symbol table the postfix identifier for the procedure, a type $T$ set to function or procedure, a relative address $F$ of the storage block for that procedure, and an address CXT where the run-time dynamic context will be located (this being $\alpha$ ))

PUSH [STAB, 8L2+LOC[SYMB] ]; SOnow in the stack STAB there are two words STORLOC where storage was interrupted and made relative, and the 2 flagged location in the symbol table where the procedure was stored causing that interruption of normal storage allocation.)

At this point in the productions we are about to scan the formal parameter list. Control in the productions is transferred to FPL where the following productions are encountered:


CCA ( ; | $\rightarrow$

EXEC 157
 EXEC 163 *s 1
*CCA5
(to treat parameter comment convention)
*VAL (look for value list)

EXEC 163 does nothing of significance to this discussion. It treats the case of parameterless procedures. EXEC 157 is entered before processing a formal parameter list to set things up properly. It looks as follows:

Here FLST has code which looks as follows, and which is executed upon processing each formal parameter in the LEFT1 position:
'FLST' ENTER[FPT; LEFT1, FNO, FALSE ]; (Thus the postfix integer
for the formal parameter, an integer used to access its
thunk from the mark of the procedure call, and the
Boolean value false are entered into the formal para-
meter table. The Boolean false will be set true for
all formal parameters called by value as we will see
soon.)
FNO $\leftarrow$ FNO +1 ; (here we tally the formal parameter number)

Next in the productions we expect to encounter the VALUE specifier telling us which, if any, of the formal parameters are to be called by value. This accurs in the productions at the label VAL. Before considering what happens at VAL we pause briefly to look at an example and to show what is built up so far.
real procedure $P(A, B)$; Value $A ;$ real $A, B$;

$$
\text { IF } A<0 \text { THEN } P \leftarrow B+1 \text { ELSE } P \leftarrow P(A-1, B+3) \text {; }
$$

Up until the processing of the value list the FPT table for formal parameters

looks 1ike this: | $A$ | 2 | FALSE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B | 3 | FALSE |

After the processing of the value list the FPT table for formal parameters

looks like this: | A | 2 | FAJSE |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $B$ | 3 | FALSE |

We see, therefore, that the processing of the value list consists of marking a TRUE in the third colum of the formal parameter table opposite the formal parameter in column 1. The following productions and exec routines accomplish this.
VAL VALUE $\quad$ | EXEC 172 SUPR SID VLU

EXEC 172 does XEQ $190 \leftarrow V L S T$; to set $u p \operatorname{EXEC} 190$ to process the identifier 1ist as a value list, whence for each identifier on the value list we do
'VEST' FPT[LEFT], $\$$ ] $\leftarrow$ TRUE ;
-SIGNAL $\rightarrow$ FAULT 5 \$
At VLU in the productions we expect to have finished procesaing the value lists and we turn to the specifier 1fsts:

| V.J | VALUE ; \| $\rightarrow$ | *SP (for specifiers) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <S@ \| | ERROR |  |
| SP | <SG> \| | SUBR CHG | SPA |
| SPA | TYPE $\mid$ | EXEC 167 | *SP2 |
| SP2 | I 1 | ISP SUBR ID | SPT |
| [more productions are inserted here to treat other kinds of speciffers like array, procedure, label, etc. We will discusa only one case.] |  |  |  |

In EXEC 167 we set up EXEC 190 to process specifier lists.
XEQ $190 \leftarrow$ SLST ;
The code at SLST being as follows:

```
'SLST' FNO ↔FPT[LEFT1, $ , ]; (retrieve formal parameter
                                    number from table)
SIGNAL }->\mathrm{ FAULT 6 ; (if don't find it in tabie then error)
FPT[ 0,,$] }->\mathrm{ (Here if was true then had call by value,
                                    so write code to compute formal parameter
                                    by value and to store it away as follows)
```

```
T &ABVAR; (set up type for later table entry)
MARKJUMP[ DECLARE ]; (
CODE (MARKJUMP[V203]);
<CODELOC>}\leftarrow(THUNK +FNO)\timesSHIFT +CXT
(here we code a word with the appropriate
thunk code [see page 40], 005 in this case,
plus the formal parameter number and the
address in code where context is located =
005 < 2)
TALLY[CODELOC];
LEFT4}\leftarrow\mathrm{ LEFT2 ;
RIGHT2 \leftarrowTYPE + RZ; (Where RZ is a storage constant)
JUMP [STORE]; (here STORE compiles code to store
                                    the formal parameter called by
                                    value whose value has just been
                                    computed by V203.)
```

The code produced by this call by value process looks as follows:
$\alpha$ CONTEXT WORD
LEV INC
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { TRM V203 } \\ 005 \alpha, 2\end{array}\right\}$ - Compute value of first formal parameter
CLA 3 RO $\left.\begin{array}{ll}\text { STD } 3 & / 77\end{array}\right\}--\begin{aligned} & \text { Get value from standard location } \\ & \text { where left by V203 and store } \\ & \text { indirectly, /77 giving local } \\ & \text { context. }\end{aligned}$

We now return to the code for SLST. For formal parameters not called by value we have:

ENTER [ SYMB; LEFT1, TYPE+THUNK,FNO, CXT ];
Thus, information about the processing of formal parameters has been entered in the symbol table so that upon encountering the formal parameters in the body of the procedure the correct accesses are compiled to the thunks in the call of the procedure. The productions determine the scope of the body of


#### Abstract

the procedure and techniques are used to remove the formal parameters from view in the symbol table upon completion of the processing of the procedure body. These techniques involve opaquing certain entries in the table by scatter repeat chaining.




```
        code, i.e. control can come only via
        transfers from the run-time routines for
        procedure administration)
    LEV ↔LEV - 1; (decrement atatic block level)
```

Upon exit we see that CXT contains the address of the head of the code generated upon entrance to the procedure declaration just processed. EXEC 165 , now, says the following:

CLUTCH $\rightarrow$ ASSIGN[PLAD4] ; CLUTCH $\leftarrow$ FALSE;
this marely assigns the transfer coded around the batch of declarations produced. It corresponds to the command TRA $\theta$ in the code sample on page 46.

Let us now take a look at the code produced corresponding to the formal parameters found in the procedure body. Recall that all formal parametara have been entered in the symbol table aftex the processing of the formal parameter 11st and after the processing of the specifiers. Corresponding to each formal parameter is a line in the symbol table which has in it POSTFIX INTEGER, TYPE + THUNK, FNO, CXT (世-cf.p53).

The EXEC responsible for producing accesses to variables which do not occur on the left hand side of assignment statements is EXEC 7. It is called by the following subsystem of the productions in the expression scanner.

and so we see that EXEC 7 is called only in the event that we have a simple identifier not followed by a storage operator, $\rightarrow$ a right bracket, (or [, or a comma. EXEC 7 reads the information about the identifier in the symbol table and analyzes what code to produce (to access that variable). EXEC 7
calls the semantic subroutine FIND which looks up the identifier in the symbol table, puts its class in the accumulator, its relocation base in RELOC, its relative address in KEY, and its type in TYPE. It then returns to EXEC 7 where its ciass is placed in the OA register and used to select a transfer command in a switching table, which switching table transfers to different routines to process the different kinds of variables classified, Let's take the case of an integer variable. EXEC 7 sets up information in the semantic stack and in a special stack called BASE, which stack has one entry for each expression $E$ in the syntax stack. In the semantic stack corresponding to the inceger variable it puta RIGHT2 $\leftarrow \mathrm{KEY}+\mathrm{MODE}+\mathrm{TYPE}+$ TEMP to set the types and addresses for the MAGIC compiler. Here, KEY gives the relative address, MODE gives the mode of the access to the variables, TYPE gives the type of the variable, and TEMP has a bit in it specifying whether or not the variable is relocatable or fixed. These items make up the description of the variable. A further statement BASE $\leftarrow$ RELOC puts the current relocation base [ 0 outside of all procedures, and nonzero inside procedures ] in the BASE stack. The code compiled for accessing integer variables will then be the following for the following three cases:
(1) CLA KEY $1 f \cdot$ RELOC $=0$ and we are outside all procedures
(2) CLA KEY, /77 for variables where RELOC $=$ current local context, the local context coming from /77
(3) OCA RELOC for variables where RELOC $\neq$ current local conCLA 2 KEY

A flow chart expressing the discrimination between these three cases is found on the top of the next page.

```
        RELOC = 0 ? alse
            RELOC = CXT ?
        true
                                    false
    true
```



```
To see this in more detail let's consider a specific example.
Suppose we want to compile code for a program with a structure as follows:
BEGIN REAL A
20200___7>BEGIN PROCEDURE X
            r BEGIN INTEGER B
21100
```

$\qquad$

``` PROCEDURE Y
            < CBEGIN HALF C
                        END
            ^ END
            END
END
When compiling the expression B + AxC in the innermost block the syntax
stack will, at some point, contain E + E x E. By the time this is built
up entries for all of the identifiers have been made in the symbol table as
follows:
```

$\qquad$

| ID | TYPE | CLASS | KEY | CONTEXT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | REAL | VARIABLE | 40000 | 0 |
| B | INTE | VARIABLE | 1 | 20200 |
| C | HALF | VARIABLE | 3 | 21100 |

Furthermore, EXEC 7 will have inserted descriptions in the semantic stack corresponding to each variable, and it will have built up the BASE stack with relocation bases. The picture of these various stacks is as follows:


The routines to compile code for arithmetic operations, which are the EXEC's in subroutine $C O M$, have the capability of analyzing the information in the semantic and BASE stacks and of being able to produce the correct code. This code will look as follows:

| CLA | 40000 | ACC $\leftarrow \mathrm{A}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MPY | 3,77 | ACC $\leftarrow \mathrm{AXC}$ |
| OCA | 20200 | ACC $\leftarrow \mathrm{ACC}+\mathrm{B}$ |
| ADD 2 | 1 |  |

Notice that this example uses all three cases discussed on the bottom of page 43.

BLOCK ADMINISTRATION
There are two cases that must be considered. The first is the case when blocks are outside of procedures. In this case we push the STORLOC onto a stack at entrance to a block and reset it upon exit from the block. The stacking mechanisms allows us to handle nested blocks. The second case

Is when blocks are internal to procedures. Here block administration must be set up to handle recursion. The mechanism must be set up to store in the code itself the storage requirementa for a given block. of necessity, things become more complicated, Let us try to get an understanding of the problern first by considering the example below.


In conciae and abbreviated form what we are going to do is this. We will keep STORLOC in a stack at the entrance to each block, and we will reset 1t to the value saved upon exit from that block. We augment STORLOC whenever we hit declarations which require storage or whenever we require temps to compute an expreasion within a block. The storage required for a block is, therefore, computed by subtracting from the value of STORLOC at the instant of exit from the block, the vaiue of STORLOC at the instant of exit from the block of level one lower in which the given block is fmbedded. Since these quantities are not known at entrance to each block, a chaining
mechanism must be set up to compute them. The storage requirement of the procedure in which all of these blocks are imbedded is the value of STORLOC upon exit from the procedure.

To see this more clearly, let's take a look at block 2 in the example on page 46. Before entering block 2 the value of STORLOC is 5 . When we enter, three cells are needed for the declaration REAL A; INTEGER B; . This augments STORLOC to 8. Then we hit the imbedded block 3 which increments STORLOC to 11 for its own storage requirements, but which resets it to 8 upon exit, thus having no incremental effect on the STORLOC counter for block 2. Next, we hit an expression which is in block 2, and which requires 2 temps, and we see that STORLOC is incremented to 10 . Processing block 4 and its imbedded block 5 have no effect on STORLOC for block 2, since STORLOC is reset to the same value upon exit from block 4 that it had upon entrace to block 4; namely, it is reset to 10 . After processing block 4 we process another statement in block 2 requiring temps, and this increments STORLOC to 12. The value 12 is thus the value of STORLOC upon exit from block 2. The inner blocks in block 2 have had no incremental effect on this value of STORLOC by the time we exit block 2 . The total storage requirements for block 2 can thus be determined by subtracting from 12 the value STORLOC will have upon exit from the procedure [i.e. the block in which 2 is imbedded, which has level one less than that of block 2]. The resulting difference is the difference between the storage reserved for the procedure and the storage required for block 2 . This difference is the increment to storage which must be reserved at run-time every time the run-time flow of control leads us to enter block 2, be it recursively or otherwise. The increment is thus stored in the code in order to be processed by the run-time routines that handle dynamic storage allocation. Thus, we see that $12-5$
gives 7 words required for block 2, so the number 7 is stored in the code near the entrance to block 2 , and 7 additional words of dynamic memory space will be reserved at run-time every time we enter block 2 . Let us now take a look at block 3 embedded in block 2. We see that three words will be required for block 3, but that among the seven words reserved upon entrance to block 2, four are needed for expressions which are evaluated after leaving block 3. Thus, the storage requirements for block 3 are overlapped on the storage requirements saved by block 2. This means that no words are required for block 3. We see that by subtracting the value of STORLOC upon exit of block 2 from the value of STORLOC upon exit of block 3 we get 11-12, or -1. Thus, our algorithm can conclude that enough storage is reserved for block 2 to completely suffice for the requirements of block 3 and no storage need be reserved for block 3. In a similar fashion, we see that four words of storage are required for block 4, and that 4 words of storage are required for block 5. If the reader has understood thus far the problem and the fundamental method of determining the storage requirements for blocks inside procedures he will be prepared to understand the following algorithm in FSL used to implement the solution by means of chaining.

The FSL solution is as follows. For each procedure and for each block we reserve one word in code with a left half and a right half


LH points to the next block word on the chain of block words unless it is zero (which indicates the end of the chain).

RH before end of block, points to chain of inner block words, and after end of block, indicates value of STORLOC at end of block.

We further have the following table of cells relevant to the semantic routines.

```
    CSS is a cell pointing to the current block size word.
    LSS is a stack containing previous block size word locations
        (which stack is used as backward links on the chain of
        block size words, enabling us to back up on the chain).
    CODSTK is CODELOC except it is of type LOGIC.
    X is the address extractor 8R77777.
    SHIFT is left shift 15 bits, 8R100000.
    R15 is right shift 15 bits, 8F1 10-5.
    LEV is the current block level required in proc. size word.
    X85 is the block entry routine.
    LXPRO is the opcode and index register required on the final command.
We now have four semantic routines to accomplish the chaining:
    \downarrowprocedure entry\
        PUSH[LSS,CSS]; CSS ↔CODELOC;
        CODSTK \leftarrowLEV; TALLY[CODELOC];
        (here we put the previous current storage setter, pointing to
        previous block size word on the chain of reverse links, LSS,
        set CSS to CODELOC obtaining a new block size word, save the
        static level in CODSTK and tally CODELOC)
\downarrowblock entry\
    CXT }->\mathrm{ CODSTK }\leftarrow(CSS>^x7) x SHIFT
    <ESS> \leftarrow (<CSS> ^\negX7) + CODELOC;
    PUSH[LSS,CSS]; CSS ↔CODELOC;
    CODE (MARKJUMP [X85]);
    (here if CXT is non-zero we are inside a procedure, and we
        execute the ensuing statements inside procedures only. We
        then extract the address from the previous value of the cur-
        rent storage setter, shift it left 15 and store it in CODSTK.
        Then we chain the right half of the last block size word to
        the present codelocation. This present codelocation becomes
        the new block size word, and we push CSS onto LSS and reset
        it to CODELOC.)
\downarrowblock exit\downarrow
        CXT }->\mathrm{ MARKJUMP[SASS] $
        (here if we are inside a procedure we markjump to SASS).
\ellprocedure exit\downarrow
    MARKJUMP[SASS];
"SASS" T \leftarrow<CSS>NX7; <CSS> \leftarrow(<CSS>^-X7) + STORLOC;
\SAS' T }->\mathrm{ TT }\leftarrow<\textrm{I}>\timesR15; < D> \leftarrow(<T>NX7) - STORLOC
    T\leftarrowTT; JUMP[SAS] $; POP[LSS[CSS]; JUMP[<SASS>];
```

(As is seen this routine is shared by procedure endings and by block endings for blocks inside procedures. First we save the address portion of CSS in T. Then we replace the contents of CSS with the same left half and assign the right half the current value of STORLOC. If the right half was non-zero, then we are not at the end of the chain of inner blocks (the right half having been stored in $T$, which is tested for a non-zero status) and the previous right half pointed to the next block size word on the chain of inner blocks. Thus, we shift the address of this next block size word to the right 15 places and store it in TT. Then we subtract the current STORLOC from the previous STORLOC stored in the right half of the block size word which right half contained the value of STORLOC upon exit from that inner block. This difference is the storage requirement [a line should be inserted above at this point to set this storage requirement to zero if the difference is negative]. Finally, we place the contents of TT in $T$ and iterate the cycle at SAS to compute all of the differences on the chain of inner blocks and to assign them as storage increments in the block size words. If, on the other hand, $T$ was, or becomes, zero at any stage of the loop SAS, we pop LSS onto CSS to return to an outer block one level up in which the current block is embedded. Then we leave SASS. Thus, the stack LSS contains the reverse of the history of descent into blocks, and it allows us to ascend back out when inner blocks become processed.)

The reader is advjesed to work through an example of this chaining
mechanism to get a really clear understanding of it. To help,a diagram
is provided following below, with different dotted lines showing various
stages of evolution in the chaining process.


This example shows the state of the storage size chains at the point in the compilation when CODELOC is as indicated. All possible variations of the storage size words are represented in this example. We see that cSS 18 pointing to the current block size word. Further, JSS, the stack contalning the history of descent into the block structure, is pointing to the procedure head. Each block size word must be assigned twice. The comments on the right indicate each of the four possible gtates of assignment. As is seen, the right hand linkages point to the last block within the current block, and the left hand linkages point to previous block at the same level. (This last statement 18 genera1.)

RUN-TIME RECURSION ROUTINES
There are two stacks used at run-time to administer storage allocation, the STORAGE stack itself, and the HISTORIAN, which, among other things, keeps a trace of procedure calls. The current context cell in the head of a procedure will point to a location in STORAGE which is the current base of storage for the most current call on the procedure.


One resets storage on the way out of procedures by using infoxmation stored In the historian. When one enters a procedure, one stacks a word pair on
the HISTORIAN which contains [procedure name, address of first word of code for procedure] $=$ first word, and [previous storage pointer for that procedure] $=$ second word. When one enters a block one stacks a single word on the HISTORIAN containing [static level, beginning of dynamic storage for that block]. A third possibility in addition to procedure entries and block entries is a parameter call entry. Here the HISTORIAN is manipulated to simulate the state of the call where the formal parameter is to be computed. The manipulation consists of inserting a marker in the stack, of copying certain information and of putting a two-flagged link in the stack which opaques part of it to scatter repeat searches causing the re* suit to simulate the proper state of the machine for the formal parameter call. Later, tine two-flagged link is removed, and the previous state restored. On the way out of procedures and blocks storage is reset using information stored in the HISTORIAN.

To see with clarity what is going on we need to consider an example* Suppose with the call statement we call procedure $P(X)$ where $X$ is a formal parameter $\mathbf{P}(Y+Z)$. Suppose further that within the declaration $\mathbf{P}(X)$ there is a call on $R$, and that within that call on $R$ there can occur another call oh $R$ followed by a use of the formal parameter $X$. Ther suppose that at rum-time this calling patterm happens. When $\mathbf{P}(Y+Z)$ is called the HISTORIAN is augmented to look like $\quad \mathbf{P} \quad * \quad$ where $\mathbf{P}$ is the location of the procedure head in code, and where $p$ is the previous storage pointer for the most recent use of $P$. Upon procedure entry the context of $\mathbf{P}$ is set to the current top of STORAGE, and the current top is incremented by the INCRMENT to storage required by the procedure (which increment is stored in the head of the procedure at compile time). Upon entering $R$ the HISTORIAN is changed to look like << R $\quad$, $\mathbf{R} \quad \mathbf{p}$ * * the
previous storage pointer corresponding to the most recent call of $R$. Upon entering $R$ the second time (within itgeif) the HISTORIAN is changed to look 1ike

where $r_{2}$ is storage pointer used for the call of R just mentioned. Now we must compute the value of the actual parameter $Y+Z$ corresponding to its use in place of the formal parameter $X$. The object code gives us the thunk number, and the procedure call location corresponding to the actual parameter Y+Z. But to execute this thunk we muat return to the state of STORAGE that prevalled at the entry to $P$. But before returning we must make provision to restore the HISTORIAN to the present state. Suppose the current context of $P$ is $p^{\prime}$, and that that of $R$ is $X^{1}$ and that the location in code where we are calling $X$ is $t$. Then we put -t in the HISTORIAN as a boundary marker, and we stack $R \quad r^{\prime}$ and $P \quad P$ fon top while changing the contexts of $R$ and $P$ to $r_{1}$ and $p$, respectively. The HISTORIAN now looks like this

| $\leftarrow$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{p}^{\prime}$ | R | $r^{\prime}$ | -t | $\mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{r}_{2}$ | R | $r_{1}$ | P | P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

with the current contexts of $R$ and $P$ set to $r_{1}$ and $p$. We finally stack a 2-flagged link around this entire stack to make it look like


At this point the HISTORIAN looks exactly like it did at the point before entering $P$, and we now compute the thunk for the formal parameter and deliver the address of the value. Thus, we see that the environment in STORAGE where the actual parameter is computed is identical to the environment outside of the procedure call [as it should be in the definition of ALGOL 60. Consider $X+P(X)]$. Now, having computed the value of the actual parameter we must restore the environment in STORAGE that existed prior to computing the
actual parameter. This means popping the HISTORIAN back to the marker $-t$, resetting contexta as we go to $P^{\prime}$ for $P$ and $r^{\prime}$ for $R$. Everything back to and including mt $1 s$ popped off. Thus, the propex environment is restored, and we continue executing object code at the address $t$. Within the procedures $P$ and $R$ we could have crossed block boundaries resulting in the stacking on the HISTORIAN of block gtorage pointers, and in the removal of such pointerg. The above manipulations of the HISTORIAN are not altered by the stacking of block storgge pointers since the search processes ignore them. When one leaves a block or a procedure by a normal exit (1.e. by going across the begin-end boundary rather than by leaving by means of a designational expression) one resets STORAGE (in the case of blocks) or resets the context (in the case of procedures) to its previous value by means of the most current entry in the HISTORIAN corresponding to the block or procedure. Exits by means of designational exprassions are accomplighed by storing destination address and destination level in the code and by transferxing to a run-time routine which pops the HISTORIAN until it finds the proper target Level (level information being stored in the HISTORIAN along with each entry). Notice that for formal parameterg which can be designational expressions and for actual parametets which concain function calls where the result of the call is a go to, the opaquing feature congtruct ed in the HISTORIAN during the process of actual parameter evaluation will result in a proper search for the target level during the execution at run-time of a designational expression. [This is a pretty hard thing to notice without working through an example. The reader is adviged to do this.]

## FORMULA MANIPULATION

## data structures for formulas

There are two kinds of formulas, standard and special. The standard formulas comprise those made from binary or from unary operators with two or one operands respectively. These are constructed from word pairs taken from the 11at of available space, and linked together. For binary operators the building block looks like


For unary operators the building block looks like


The operator portion of each word pair contains the following information:


The operands $A$ and $B$ consist of a tag and an address:

| TAG | ADDRESS |
| :--- | :--- |

The tag is a bit pattern giving the type of the object referred to by the address. These types include integer, floating point number, formula, text, chain, logic, and atomic formula. For an integer tag the address points to a word containing the integer if the integer is greater than 15 bits, otherwise the integer is stored as the address. For a floating point number the address points to a word pair containing the number in double precision form. For a formula the address is the address of the head of the formula. For the text tag the address is the relative address of the print name of the text. For the chain tag the address is the address of the head of the chain. For a logic tag the address is the address of the logic word. Finally, for the atomic formula tag the address is the relatie address of the print name of the atom. The routines to construct formulas from these building blocks are fairly straight forward. They take their operands in a fixed locations, such as the accumulator and various index registers, and they construct the formula using word pairs taken from available space by setting up the operands and operators of the building blocks so that they contain the proper information and link to the proper successors.

The special formulas correspond to the source language constructs . ARRAY, .PROCEDURE, $\leftarrow$ and $|o p|$. These correspond to data structures using chains as operands. Chains will be explained later in the list processing section. Suffice it to say, for the present, that parameter lists for postponed array accesses or for postponed procedure calls are stored
as chains.

## OPERATIONS ON FORMULAS

The syntax of formula manipulation is straightforward and not wor th commenting on in detail. For an understanding of the syntax of formula manipulation the reader may look at the syntax listing. He should have built up enough feeling for the system by this point to understand the syntax of formula manipulation without difficulty. The semantics is also relatively straight forward and the same remarks apply.

The crucial powers of formula manipulation lie in the run-time routines. This is the case because most actions involving formulas are either interpretive at run-time or involve manipulations which cannot be compiled into the object code as macros because of the size of the code involved. We shall examine here four main run-time routines communicating their actions by means of flow charts. These four routines lie at the heart of the run-time system. The reader will recall that one crucial mechanism used in handling recursion for the run-time routines was discussed on pages 15 and 16. The use of this mechanism will be implicit in the flow charts discussed.

The Print Routine
The print routine is discussed because it involves a switching mechanism found ubiquitously in the run-time routines for formula manipulation. Upon entry to the routine an operand, consisting of a tag + an address, is found in the accumulator. One executes a mark transfer to V6 which routine saves the address portion of the accumulator, analyzes the tag, and provides a return jump to the mark plus the tag. This provides a rapid discrimination on tags, each tag producing a jump to a separate portion of the run-time code for processing.

| TRM | V6 | save address and come back with jump to appropri- <br> ate entry point |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LWD | E1 | entry point for integer printing |
| LWD | E2 | entry point for f.p. number printing |
| LWD | E3 | entry point for formula printing (recurgive) |
| LWD | E4 | entry point for cext printing |
| LWD | E5 | entry point for chain printing |
| LWD | E6 | entry point for logic word printing |
| LWD | E7 | entry point for atonic formula printing |

The respective entry points are addresses in assembled code where the printing instructions for a given type of data are to be found. In the case of formula printing the code can call the entire routine recursively. The sequence of actions for this is:

E3 set up recursion, print operator if unary,
save second operand if operator binary, save operator if binary, print first operand recursively, pop up, if had binary case print binary operator, then print second operand recursively.

## The Eval Routine

There are two cases in the syntax of the source language which call the evaluation routine. The first of these cases is transformed into an instance of the second.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I. } \quad G \leftrightarrow E V A L\left(X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{n}\right) F\left(E_{1}, E_{2}, \ldots, E_{m}\right) ; \\
& \text { II. } \quad G \leftrightarrow E V A L([T]) F([S]) ;
\end{aligned}
$$

where $T$ is a chain of formal parameters and $S$ a chain of actual parameters.

As far as the semantics are concerned we check the type of $F$, and if it is other than a formula we compile a normal assignment statement $G \in F$. For the first case above we compile code to construct the chains of formal parameters and actual parameters. The cells to construct these chains are taken from available space. They are discarded afterwards. For the second case the code produced will be:

| CLA | T |
| :--- | :--- |
| STD | Y 3 |
| CLA | S |
| STD | Y 4 |
| CLA | F |
| TRM | EVAL |

The flow chart for the eval routine is found on the next page. Notice that it performs simultaneous substitution of actual for formal parameters.

The Pattern Routines
Consider the expression $F=P$ where $F$ is a formula, say $F \leftarrow 3.8+A \times 2$, and where $P$ is a pattern, say $P \leftrightarrow A: R E A L+X: F O R M$. The colons in the pattern $P$ are treated as binary operators. Thus, $P$ might be represented as:


When it is determined that an operator in the pattern is binary, that operator is checked to see $1 f$ it is the extractor operator ':'. If this is the case the left hand operand is saved, the test is performed on the right hand operand, and should the result of the test be true the formula (or subformula) of $F$ matching the right hand operand of the pattern is assigned to be the contents of the variable which is the left hand operand of the extractor. The flow chart for the exact identity pattern routine $V 60$ appears on page 61.

The flow chart for the routine to perform $F>P$ appears on page 62. Notice that it uses V60.


Create chain 7.
Get next element $=\mathrm{X}$.
Compute Y. $=\mathrm{V} 55$ (X:)
Insert *.'aftarjfcajt gi
Is next of X nil?



The Interpreter
As our last topic in the treatment of formula manipulation we mention a very neat interpreter which is implemented using the XEQ instruction. For interpreting formulas with arithmetic operands of the form $A$ op $B$ we have a mapping taking the operator into an integer, which integer is stored in the index register $R 1$. Then we do

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { CLA } & \mathrm{A} \\
\text { XEQ } & \mathrm{ZO}, \mathrm{R1}
\end{array}
$$

Here $Z O$ is the address of the head of a table of interpretive arithmetic commands:

```
ZO ADD B
SUB B
MPY B
TRM Exponents
```

The command performed by $X E Q$ is that located at $Z 0+$ the contents of RO. The integer in RO thus awitches the XBQ to the proper operation.

## LIST PROCESSING

DATA STRUCTURES FOR LISTS

The data structures for lists are sequences of word pairs, the second member of each pair containing a 2-flagged address to its successor pair in the sequence, and the last pair being linked to a special cell NIL. Pictorially this looks like:


The address $\alpha$ of the first word of the first pair in the chain is the address of the chain. Given this address we can scatter repeat down the chain searching for some property of the contents of the first word of each pair in the chain. If we further place in the cell NIL an object we are searching for, we are guaranteed to find it either on the chain or in the cell NIL. If we find it in the cell NIL this means it wasn't on the chain. Every chain is a description list containing a sequence of attributes and values. Each attribute is followed by a list of values associated with it. There are always two standard attributes on a chain, the contents attribute CONT, and the print name attribute NAME. The contents attribute is always the first on the chain, and the print name attribute is always last. Other arbitrary attributes are placed in intermediary positions in the chain by the system. If + stands for attribute and - for value, then a typical chain looks as follows:


The items stored in a chain as values may be any of the operands legal in a formula (c.f. pages 55 to 56 ) as an operand. These are called data terms and are so marked. In addition, we may store symbol variables and local
chains. Each of these possibilities is stored in the first word of a pair on the chain. The second pair is reserved entirely for the link to the next pair or to NLL.

## the chain accumulator

At the heart of the list processing system lies a stack of word pairs called the chain accumulator. It holds pairs of pointers pointing to the right and left hand ends of chains or subchains. For example, the first pair on top of the chain accumulator in figure 3 below is ( $a_{1}, a_{2}$ ). This is a pair of addresses pointing to the head and tail of a chain. Likewise with the pair $\left(b_{1}, b_{2}\right)$. To concatenate these two chains we must link the tail of the second to the head of the first and fix up the chain accumalator. Figure 4 shows the result after concatenation has been performed.

figure 3


Thus, concatenation has consisted of putting the address a, in the link of the word pair pointed to by $b_{2}$, of replacing the address $b_{2}$ by $a_{2}$, and of popping the chain accumulator. The use of the chain accumulator is ubiquitous in the list processing operations discussed here. The symbolism $|\phi \rightarrow A| \phi$ means that $A$ was stacked on top of the chain accumulator. The symbol $\phi$ represents whatever was in the chain accumulator previously. CONSTRUCTIVE OPERATIONS

When the declaration SYMBOL $S$; is processed the following code is compiled:

| CLA | postfix integer for $S$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| TRM | CREATE CHAIN |
| STL | STORLOC | The routine to create a chain for $S$ takes cells from available space and constructs a chain of the form /[CONT:][NAME:S]. As the value of the attribute NAME the relative address of the print name of $S$ is inserted. This relative address is obtained by a transformation on the postfix integer found in the accumulator upon entrance to the routine. The output of the routine is the address of the head of the chain created. The code then stores this address in the location in memory reserved by the compiler for the symbol $S$. Thus, the value of a symbol variable is the address of the head of its chain.

To construct a list, such as the one in the following example, the compiler produces code as given. For the assignment $S \leftarrow[A, B, C, D]$ the code is:

|  | code | effect on chain accumulator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TRM | STACK S | $\phi \rightarrow S \mid \phi \rightarrow$ |
| TRM | STACK A | A \| S | $\phi \rightarrow$ |
| TRM | STACK B | B \| A | S | $¢ \rightarrow$ |
| TRM | CONCATENATE | $\mathrm{A} \cap \mathrm{B}\|\mathrm{S}\| \boldsymbol{\phi} \rightarrow$ |
| TRM | STACK C | $\mathrm{C}\|\mathrm{A} \cap \mathrm{B}\| \mathrm{S} \mid \boldsymbol{\phi} \rightarrow$ |
| TRM | CONCATENATE | $\mathrm{A} \cap \mathrm{B} \cap \mathrm{C}\|\mathrm{S}\| \boldsymbol{\beta} \rightarrow$ |
| TRM | STACK D | $\mathrm{D}\|\mathrm{A} \cap \mathrm{B} \cap \mathrm{C}\| \mathrm{S} \mid \phi \rightarrow$ |
| TRM | CONCATENATE | $\mathrm{A} \frown \mathrm{B} \cap \mathrm{C} \cap \mathrm{D}\|\mathrm{S}\| \boldsymbol{\phi} \rightarrow$ |
| TRM | STORE | \| $\varnothing$ |

The last command stores the chain on the top of the chain accumulator into the contents of the item second from the top in the chain accumulator. After the operation $S$ has a value which is the chain /[CONT:A, $B, C, D][N A M E: S]$.

To construct and assign the description list $S \leftarrow /[$ COLOR:RED][TYPES:MU,RHO]; the following code is produced.

| TRM | STACK S |
| :--- | :--- |
| TRM | STACK COLOR |
| TRM | MAKE TOP OF CHAINACC AN ATTRIBUTE |
| TRM | STACK PURPLE |
| TRM | CONCATENATE |
| TRM | STACK TYPES |
| TRM | MAKE IT ATTRIBUTE |
| TRM | CONCATENATE |
| TRM | STACK MU |
| TRM | CONCATENATE |
| TRM | STACK RHO |
| TRM | CONCATENATE |
| TRM | DESCRIPTION LIST STORE |

The result of the description list store operation is to change $S$ from $/[\operatorname{CONT:A,B,C,D][NAME:S]}$ into /[CONT:A,B,C,D][COLOR:RED][TYPES:MU,RHO][NAME:S].

A final type of constructive operation to be considered is the construc-

```
tion of list structures. Suppose we have the statement
    S <- [ 3,8, TRUE, FxG, J, [A,B,C], <S> ],
where F and G are formulas and where }J\mathrm{ is an integer. Then the code pro-
duced will be:
    TRM STACK S
    CLA }3.
    TRM Make ACC into a REAL data term. Leave address in ACC
    STACK <ACO
    CLA TRUE
    TRM Make ACC into a Boolean data term. Leave address in ACC
    STACK <ACO
    CONCATENATE
    Code Piece to construct formula FxG and to leave address of head
    of resulting formula in accumulator
    STACK <ACO
    CONCATENATE
    CLA J
    TRM Make ACC into integer data term. Leave address in ACC
    STACK <ACO
    CONCATENATE
    STACK A
    STACK B
    CONCATENATE
    STACK C
    CONCATENATE
    TRM Make top chain in chain accumulator into a local chain and
                                    leave address of local chain stacked on top of chain
                                    accumulator.
CONCATENATE
STACK S
TAKE CONTENTS
CONCATENATE
STORE
```

It is worthwhile to note that in the absence of the chain accumulator $N_{X}(N+1) / 2$ search operations are required to build up a chain of length $N$ (assuming as the alternate scheme that we have the address of the head in the accumulator, that we search to the end, and that having found it we append a new element). With the chain accumulator no search operations are needed to find the end of the chain since we have it already stored. The chain accumulator also proves useful when given a chain, we wish to focus some search operation on a subchain whose boundaries we wish to have precisely delimited.

## SELECTION EXPRESSIONS

When writing code for selection expressions one must first stack on top of the chain accumulator the chain on which the selection is to be performed, then one mist perform the selection leaving the selected subchain on top of the chain accumulator. Now it happens that the order in which these two operations must be performed is the reverse of the order in which they are specified in the source language. For example, if one were parsing the expression $N T H$ OF $S$ one would first recognize the selector $N$ TH OF and, second, one would recognize $S$; yet $S$ must appear on the chain accumulator stack before selection can be performed on it. To implement this flads are used so that the control flow in the code produced can be the reverse of the order of recognition. Thus, for N TH OF S the following code is produced:

|  | TRA $\theta$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| $\rho:$ | CLA $N$ |
|  | TRM Selection Routine to get $N$ th of chain in top of chain acc. |
|  | TRA $X$ |
| $\theta:$ | STACK $S$ |
|  | TAKE CONTENTS |
|  | TRA $\rho$ |
| $X:$ | . |

The code corresponding to LAST OF $S$ uses a zero in place of $N$ in the above code.

```
    Consider now the example 3 RD FORMULA OF S. Here we have to search
for successive elements of the type FORMULA imbedded in a chain of elements
which may include elements other than formulas. The code produced for
this is quite similar to the code for N TH OF S. It is as follows:
            TRA 0
            p: CLA }
            STI X1
            CLA Type FORMULA ( }\leftarrow\mathrm{ a bit pattern )
            STI X2
            TRM Selection routine for Nth or LAST <type>.
                                    leaves integer for position in accumulator as output.
                    TRM Convert integer for position into subchain selection.
            TRA X
                0: STACK S
                    TAKE CONTENTS
                            TRA \rho
X: . . .
```

The expressions LAST F OF S, 1 ST (|VOWEL|) OF $S$, and $N T H(F+G \times 3)$ OF $S$ produce code identical to the code above, except the class name or expression is stored in $X 2$ and a mark transfer to a different selection routine is made.

Another kind of selection expression is exemplified by the following
1ist:
FIRST 4 OF S
LAST 3 OF $S$
ALL BEFORE 3RD SYMBOL OF S
ALL AFTER LAST FORMULA OF S

The first and third of these expressions produces a call on the selection

```
of the chain stacked on top of the chain accumulator. The second and
    TRA 0
    \rho: CLA 4
        ADD 1
        TRM Select all before <ACC>
        TRA X
        0: STACK S
        TAKE CONTENTS
        TRA \rho
    x: . . .
```

routine to select all elements before but not including the Nth element
fourth of these expressions produce calls on a selection routine to select
all elements after the $N$ th element of the chain stacked on top of the chain
accumulator. Thus, the code for the expression FIRST 4 OF S is as follows:

In the case of $A C L$ BEFORE $3 R D$ SYMBOL OF $S$ the code starting at $\rho$ above is replaced with code to compute the location of the third symbol of $S$ and to leave the position as an integer in the accumulator. This consists of using the same type selection routine as was shown in the code sample on page 70 at the top. [This is the reason that an integer was left in the accumulator in the code sample on the top of page 70 even though it may have seemed inefficient at the time. The type selection routine is thus seen to be shared by a number of types of code pieces with different structures and different functions. It is most convenient to have the output of this routine left as the integer giving the position of the object found.]

In the case of the expression LAST 3 OF $S$ the code starting at $p$ in the code sample on this page, above, would be replaced with a

| TRM | Count length of list on top of chain accumulator. |
| :--- | :--- |
| SUB | 3 |
| TRM | SELECT ALL AFTER $<A C C>$ |
| TRA | $X$ |

```
Likewise in the case of the expression ALL AFTER LAST FORMULA OF S one replaces the code at \(p\) with
Codepiece to compute position of last formula in chain
on top of chain accumulator. Position found left as an
integer in normal accumulator.
STI temp
TRM COUNT LENGTH OF LIST in chain acc.
SUB <temp>
TRM SELECT ALL AFTER <ACGy
```

A more complicated example is the following: BETWEEN FIRST SYMBOL AND 3RD BEFORE LAST X OF $S$.

The stratagem for computing subchains between two expressions is to calculate the integer positions in the chain between which the subchain will extend. Then find the greater of the two, take the subchain consisting of all elements before that integer position, then in this subchain take all elements after the integer position which is the lesser of the two. This clearly gives the subchain between the two. The result is that we conw struct code to compute both integer positions, and we deliver both integers to the BETWEEN SELECTOR routine which does an arithmetic comparison of the two positions and calls the ALL BEFORE and ALL AFTER routines in succession to accomplish its objective.

A final type of selection routine we will consider is the type exemplified by expressions such as ALL SYMBOL OF $S$ and ALL SUBLIST OF S. These expressions can be used in two separate contexts:

| First Possibility: | $L \in[$ ALJ SYMBOL of <<S>]; |
| :--- | :--- |
| Second Possibility: | DELETE ALL SUMBOL OF <<S>; |

In the first possibility the selector routine should leave a concatenated chain consisting of all sYmboLS found in the chain $\ll S \gg$. In the second case the selector routine should leave position markers allowing the dele-
tion routine to perform deletions at each position marker. The situation is resolved by having the ALL SELECTOR ROUTINE leave position markers stacked in the chain accumulator and a check is made in all constructive operations (such as concatenating lists or description 1ists) to see that any position markers left by the ALL SELECTOR ROUTINE have their referents concatenated into a unit before partaking in a constructive operation. The deletion routine can then perform deletions at each position marker. Editing Statements

Consider the editing statement INSERT [ A, B,C ] AFTER LAST SYMBOL, BEFORE FIRST (|VOWEL|) OF S. The code produced for this is as follows:


Let us now trace the effect of executing this code on the contents of the chain accumulator. We begin in the initial state $\mid \boldsymbol{\phi}$. Upon entering the code we build tup AnBnC stacked on top of the chain accumulator getting AnB $\sim \mathcal{C} \mid \phi$. Then we transfer to $\theta$ where we stack $S, S|A \cap B \cap| \phi$ and take its
contents $\langle S\rangle\left|A_{n} B-\infty\right| \phi$. At this point we transfer back to $\rho$ to start computing the insertion locators. We first compute the position of the last symbol in the chain using the type selection routines explained earlier, then we stack a pointer to the element in the chain < s which is the last symbol. This converts the chain accumulator to look like
$Q \mid\langle S| A m B n \mid \phi$. Since we will always need $\langle S$ on top of the stack in order to use it in the process of computing insertion locators we stack
 Then we compute the second insertion locator corresponding to the position of the first (|VOWEL|) minus one, and we stack it on the chain accumulator getting $Q\left|\leq S>A_{\text {Anc }}\right| \rho \mid \phi$. This top insertion locator is now stacked two down producing $<S$ we can continue in this fashion to process as many insertion locators as we wish from an insertion locator list of any length. Finally, we come to the INSERTION ROUTINE. This routine pops $<S$ from the chain accumum lator and inserts copies of A B C at every insertion locator looping until all insertion locators in the chain accumulator are exhausted. The state of the chain accumulator after the statement is $\mid \phi$.

The code produced for the DELETION ROUTINE follows a similar strategy. The code stacks selectors pointing to the subchains that axe to be deleted. Then a transfer is made to the deletion routine which zeroes out the interfors of the subchains referred to. A final pass removes from the chain all zero elements. Two passes are needed, since it is legal to DELETE two subchains, one of which is overlapping part of the other. If we remove the subchains from the chain as we go along we are in danger of having sub. sequent subchain deletion operations destroy the integxity of the chain by linking the first part of the chain to available space and by linking
the available space to the second part of the chain.

Deletion of interior of this subchain indicated by dotted lines - - -


Alteration statements such as ALTER ( 1ST FORMULA, 3RD BEFORE LAST, LAST SYMBOL ) OF S TO [ $A, B, C$ ] again produce code similar in strategy to that produced by the insertion and deletion statements. The selectors are computed and the subchains they point to are stacked. The interiors of these subchains are zeroed out and the insertions are performed by inserting copies of the chain to be inserted after the last zero of the sub. chains zeroed out. Finally, the zero elements are erased. An attempt to set up alteration with less passes leads to destruction of the integrity of the chain in some cases of overlap. Thus, the multiple passes are necessary. The description list editing statements THE A OF B IS NOT C and THE A OF B IS ALSO C are special cases of deletion and insertion. The first computes the subchain consisting of the value list THE A OF B and applies the operation DELETE $C$ to it. The second checks to see if $C$ is among the value list THE A OF B and does an INSERT C AFTER LAST OF to the value list should it be the case that $C$ was not on it beforehand. PUSH DOWN AND POP UP STATEMENTS

A push down statement merely inserts a bar attribute \| between the contents attribute and the first element after the contents attribute. For example, if we have executed $S \leftarrow[A, B, C]$ then the chain in $S$ looks like $/[\operatorname{CONT}: A, B, C][N A M E: S]$. Then executing $\downarrow S$ causes the following code to be compiled:

## STACK S

TRM PUSH DOWN ROUTINE

Where the latter routine changes the chain in $S$ to look like /[CONT:] [ |:A,B,C] [NAME:S]; The pop up operation is the inverse of this deleting the contents and removing the first bar attribute $\mid$ found after the contents. The code for pop up is

STACK S
TRM POP UP ROUTINE

FOR STATEMENTS

```
    Suppose we execute L <- [A,B,C] and then encounter the statement
FOR S <-ELEMENTS OF L DO.... This causes the following code to be compiled:
```

STACK S
STACK L
TAKE CONTENTS
COPY TOP OF CHAINACC
CT: TRM FOR LIST GENERATOR
TRA 9
TRM p
TRA a
01 •••

When the for list generator is called it detaches the first element of the copy of $L$ found on top of the chain accumulator and inserts this first element in $S$. It then exits green causing a mark transfer to the closed subroutine for the body of the for statement and upon return control passes back to the for list generator for another iteration. On successive iterations it detaches the successive elements of the copy of $L$ and places them in the contents of the control variable. Finally, the copy of $L$ becomes

```
exhausted, and the for list generator exits red, causing it to transfer around the code for the for statement body.
In the case of parallel for statements, such as
PARALLEL FOR ( I, J,K ) ; ELEMENTS OF (<S>, < B , <U ) DO.. the generator stacks a list of the control variables \(I, J\), and \(K\), and a list of sublists [ <S \(\rangle,\langle\mathbb{C},\langle\mathbb{C}\rangle\) ], each sublist being a copy of the original. The generation cycle detaches each control vaxiable and its corresponding sublist, stacks them, calls the simple for list generator explained above, and returns them when finished. The generation stops on the first cycle before all sublists are exhausted. The control structure is identical to that explained above. IDENTITY ROUTINES
```

There is a recursive identity routine which accepts its two parameters as chains stacked on the chain accumulator and wich outputs a true or false in the normal accumulator. PASSING ACTUAL PARAMETERS

The thunks for actual parameters which are symbolic expressions stack their arguments on the chain accumulator when called.


## expression scanner - the guts of the translator






| - 17 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | ERROR | 4 | 04 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NR |  |  | < | 1 | * |  |  | NL | 1 |  |  | E2B |
| - 1 |  |  | > | 1 | 3 |  |  | NG | 1 |  |  | E2B |
| - 2 |  |  | <S6> | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | ERROR | 4 | 04 |
| E2D |  |  | t | 1 | * |  |  | LI |  | EXEC | 76 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SUBR | COM | - El |
| - 1 |  |  | <SQ> | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | ERROR | 99 | 099 |
| E2E |  | - |  | 1 | ${ }^{*}$ |  |  | - ${ }^{\circ}$ | 1 | SUBR | COM | - EI |
| - 1 | 3 | - | t | 1 |  |  |  | . 1 | 1 | EXEC | 94 | - El |
| + 2 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | ERROR | 77 | 00 |
| E2F | t | I | <SG> | 1 |  |  | E | <S6> |  | EXEC | 7 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | EXEC | 47 | E2A |
| + 1 | - | IF | <SG> |  | * |  | . IF | <SG> |  |  |  | El |
| + 2 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | ERROR | 77 | 00 |
| E2G | B | I | 8 |  | -* |  |  | CLSO | 1 | EXEC | 64 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SUBR | COM |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | c. ${ }^{\text {, }}{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| + 1 | 8 | । |  |  | ** | 0 | $i$ | । | 1 | Extc | 76 | - EI |
| $+2$ |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | ERROR | 78 | 00 |


| INT |  | OSE | INTE | <PE> | 1 | $\rightarrow$ OSE | TYPE | <PE> | 1 | ExEC | 147 | RT1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +1 |  | OSE | INTE | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | E1 |
| RTI |  |  | TYPE | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | EXEC | 83 | RT2 |
| RT2 |  | OSE | TYPE | <SG> | 1 | - | EP | <SG> | 1 | EXEC | 181 | EP1 |
| +1 |  | All | TYPE | <SG> | 1 | * | SL | <SG> | 1 | EXEC | 200 | SL1 |
| +2 |  |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | ERROR | 116 | 0 |
| PUSH AND Pop |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PD1 |  |  | + | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | *PD1 |
| +1 |  |  | + | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | E1 |
| +2 |  |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | ERROR | 113 |  |
| PU1 |  |  | * | $\stackrel{ }{+}$ | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | *PU1 |
| +1 |  |  | $\uparrow$ | <SG> | , |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | E1 |
| +2 |  |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | ERROR | 114 | 0 |




## MORE UTILITY ROUTINES FOR THE EXPRESSION SCANNER




## IFOR' STATEMENT


-go tor statement
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DECLARATIONS

| DEC |  |  | OWN | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | ExEC 156 | -TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TP |  |  | <TP> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | SUER CHG | *SEC |
| SEC |  |  | ARRA | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| +1 |  | TYPE | RECU | 1 | $\rightarrow$ | RECU | TYPE | 1 |  | EXEC 158 | - SEK |
| SEK |  |  | PROC | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | EXEC 1.59 | *PR1 |
| +1 |  | $1 \rightarrow$ | SWIT | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | *SWI |
| +2 |  | LABE | I | 1 | $\rightarrow$ | TYPE | 1 | 1 |  | EXEC 154 | TID |
| +3 |  |  | I | । |  |  |  | 1 |  | EXEC 174 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TID | SUAR ID | Cup |
| +4 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | ERROR 174 | ODC |
| CUP | OWN | TYPE | ; | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 1 |  | EXEC 139 | -CNT |
| +1 |  | TYPE | ; | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | -CNT |
| AR |  | TYPE | ARRA | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  | ARRA | 1 |  | EXEC 142 | IDA |
| +1 |  |  | ARRA | 1 |  |  |  | I |  | EXEC 143 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IDA | Sugr Slu | ARD |
| ARD |  |  | 1 | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  | XI | 1 |  | EXEC 140 | *E1 |
| +2 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | ERROR 144 | ODC |
| ART |  | ARRA | ; | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | -CNT |
| +1 |  | ARRA | , | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  | ARHa | 1 |  | EXEC 144 | IDA |
| +2 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | ERROR 145 | ODC |
| PRI |  | PROC | 1 | 1 | $\stackrel{+}{ }$ |  | P-Io | 1 |  | EXEC 160 | FND |
| FNo |  | TYPE | P-10 | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  | P-ID | 1 |  | EXEC 161 | PSA |
| +1 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | PSB | EXEC 162 | *FPL |
| FPL |  |  | ¢ | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | EXEC 157 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SUBR SIE | PCC |
| +1 |  | $\mathrm{P}=10$ | ! | 1 | + | PROC | 10 | 1 |  | EXEC 163 | -S1 |
| +2 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | ERROA 163 | OSP |
| PCC |  |  | ) | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | $\triangle$ CCA |
| +1 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | ERROR 194 | QSP |
| CCA |  | ¢ | ; | 1 | * |  |  | 1 |  |  | - Val |
| CCC |  |  | : | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | *CCB |
| +1 |  |  | <SG> | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | - CCC |
| CCB |  |  | 1 | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 1 |  | SUBR SIJ | PCC |
| +1 |  |  | <SG> | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | *CCC |
| VAL |  |  | valu | 1 |  |  |  | I |  | EXEC 472 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SUBR SIU | VLU |
| SP |  |  | <SP> | 1 |  |  |  | + |  | SUER CHG | SPA |
| +1 |  | Prid | <SG> | 1 | * PROC | 1 * | <SG> | 1 |  | EXEC 164 |  |
| +2 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | ERROR 164 | OSP |
| VLU |  | VALU | ; | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | \#SP |
| +1 |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | ERROR 195 | OSP |
| SPA |  |  | TYPE | + |  |  |  | 1 |  | EXEC 167 | aSP2 |
| SP2 |  |  | I | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | ISP | SUBR ID | SPT |
| +1 |  |  | ARRA | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | EXEC 168 | 4 ISP |
| +2 |  |  | PROC | 1 |  |  |  | I |  | EXEC 169 | *ISP |
| +3 |  |  | LABE | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | EXEC 170 | +1SP |
| +4 |  |  | SWIT | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | EXEC 171 | ASP |
| +5 ${ }_{\text {+ }}$ |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | I |  | ERROR 171 | OSP $\triangle$ SP |
| SPT +1 | TYPE | TYPE $\langle S G\rangle$ | ; | f | $\stackrel{+}{+}$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | *SP |
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| H39 |  |  |  |  | <OS> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | RETURN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +1. | THE | $E$ | OF | $E$ | <SG) | 1 | * | $E$ |  | 1 | EXEC 106 | VR1 |
| +2 |  | SL | OF | $E$ | <SG〉 | 1 | * | $E$ | <56> | 1 | EXEC 63 | SL3 |
| + 3 |  | ELEM | OF | $\varepsilon$ | <SG> | 1 | - | $E$ | <S6> | 1 | EXEC 213 | COM |
| +4 |  | ATtR | OF | E | <SG> | 1 | * | $E$ | <SG> | 1 | ExEC 214 | COM |
| +5 |  | + | + | E | <SG> | 1 | - | $E$ | <SG> | 1 | EXEC 197 | COM |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | EXEC 207 | RET |
| +6 |  | * | * | E | <SG> | 1 | * * | $E$ | <SG> | 1 | EXEC 198 | COM |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | EXEC 207 | RET |
| +7+8 |  |  | \$ | $E$ | <SG> | 1 | * | $E$ | <S6> | 1 | EXEC 184 | COM |
|  |  |  |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | RETURN |  |
|  |  | PRODUC | IONS | FOR | EVAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EVi+1 |  |  |  | I |  | 1 | * | $E$ |  | 1 |  | E2 |
|  |  |  | EVAL | 1 | <SG〉 | 1 | - | $E$ | <S6> | 1 | ExEC 7 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | EXEC 70 | E2A |
| EV4 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | EVI | I | , | EXEC 71 | E1 |
| +1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | - E1 |
| +2 |  | - |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | ERROR 200 | 00 |
| EV2 |  | EVAL | 1 | E | ) | 1 | * |  | FV | 1 | EXEC 64 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | EXEC 64 | - E1 |
| +1 | FV | $E$ | ( | $E$ |  | 1 | $\rightarrow$ |  | E | 1 | EXEC 72 | $\triangle E 2 A$ |
| +2 |  |  |  |  | <SG> | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | ERROR 201 | 00 |
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099: IMPOSSIBLE ERROR, $\rightarrow \rightarrow P A N I C+$


TABLE $2:$ CHARACTERS AND HIERARCHIES


```
TABLE 3: META~VARIABLES
<MOM
THE TABLE aS LOADED
```



```
- 〈SP> REAL INTE BODL LOGI ARRA PROC HALF SWIT LABE STRI FORM SYMB
    <UN> ABS SIN COS LN EXP SQRT ARCT ENTI SIGN
    <DC> REAL INTE BOOL LOGI ARRA PROC HALF SWIT LABE STRI FORM SYMB OWN
~
```




```
    <BI> TRUE FALS INFI
    <PN> INST CONT
    <AT> INDE OPER COMM
    <BK>.I EVP II
-<OS> ST ND NORD TH NH ND RD IS HAS TO IN B: AND BEFO:AFTE:
    <PE> OF AND , )
    <BA> BEFO AFTE
    <SL> FIRS LAST ALL BETW ( \
    \langleEA\rangle ELEM ATTR
    <,1\rangle , J
                                TABLE 3 LOADED CORRECTLY
```


## Appendix

-AND* HhCOHU SOURCE
14128151
08 DEC 63
Q OPER. t HJO2

00100130


BOOLEAN, ... INTEGER, SINGLE. DOUBLE, _1
LOGICAL* FUNCTION. SUBLIST. LABEL, FORMULA. TEXT, TRUMP, STRING SYMBOL. 'THOUGHT. CLASS, LAST. .ANY $\qquad$ MODE1 ........ MODE2, MODE3 CELL

MAX*T2\# | MAXIMUM FIXED STORAGE AND__MINIMUM-T.EMP.
INTE86R * STEPPE (STEPPE) >
8R....'......... 14377 «THE, 8R447 « TRU.
$8 \mathrm{R} \quad 11263$ «X20/X21/X22/X23/X24/X25/X26/X27/X28/X29/
X3U/X31/X32/X33/X34/X35/X36/X37/X38/X39V
X40/X41/X42/X43/X44/X45/X46/X47/X48/X49/
X50/X51/X52/X53/X54/X55/X56/X\&7/X58/X59/........
X60/X61/X62/X63/X64/X65/X66/X67/X68/X69/
X70/X71/X72/X73/X74/X75/X76/X77/X78/X79, -....
8R 56441. 》 X100/X101/X102/X103/X104/X105/X106/X107/X108/X109/ X110/X111/X112/X113/X114/X115/X116/X117/X118/X119/X120/X121/X122/X123/X124/X125/X126/X127/X128/X129/ X130/X131/X132/X133/X134/X135/X136/X137/X138/X139/X140/X141/X142/X143yxi44/X145/X146/X147/X148/X149/ X150/X151/X152/X153/X154/X155/X156/X157/X158/X159/X160/X161/X162/X163/X164/X165/X166/X167/X168/X169/
$\quad$ X160/X161/X162/X163/X164/X165/X166/X167/X168/X169/
$=\quad$ X170/X171/X172/X173/X174/X175/Xi76/X177/-X178/X179/- X180/X181/X182/X183/X184/xia5/X186/X187/X188/X189/
$\qquad$ : /x191/X192/X193/X194/X195/X196/X197/X198/X199/
-..... $\mathrm{X} 210 / \mathrm{X} 211 / \mathrm{X} 212 / \mathrm{X} 213 / \mathrm{X} 214 / \mathrm{X} 215 / \mathrm{X} 216 / \mathrm{X} 217 / \mathrm{X} 218 / \mathrm{X} 219 /-$ X220/X221/X222/X223/X224/X225/X226/X227/X228/X229/ X230/X231/X232/X233/X234/X235/X236/X237/X238/X239/ X240/X241/X242/X243/X244/X245/X246/X247/X248/X249/-

........... | X240/X241/X242/X243/X244/X245/X246/X247/X248/X249/ |
| ---: |
| X250/X1/X252/X253/X254/X255/X256/X257/X258/X259/- | X260/X261/X262/X263/X264/X265/X266/X267/X268/X269/ X270/X271/X172/X273/X274/X275/X276/X277/X278/X279/X280/X281/X282/X283/X284/X285/X286/X287/X288/X289/ X 290/X 291 / X 292 /.X2-9.3/X 29.4 /X 295 /X 29 /X 2 9Z>LX29 \&/X2A9.J8R $14300 . \bullet$ X80/PAR/X82/TAR/X84/X85/X86/RAG/X88/X89/ ERROR/LBS/UBH. -I UNDEF LABL EXIT, LB-STORAGE.-UB-HISTOFJO


$\qquad$ -63224 TbMP, $\qquad$ I TEMP BIT T $10 \$ 26$ $\qquad$ . I RELATIVE ADDRESSING PARAMETERS -VAL2.8STAALKA.-T-1,F0RV,




```
{ pendix
```



```
* 97t TESTLLEFT3&_SYMBOLJ }
    SETIRIGHTZ, SYMBOLI;
    CODE(MARKJUMP\<X200>1)
    1 FAULT 97 $
0__+103._
OL1 +
    CODE{MARKJUMP-(<X2O1>1)
    I_LOCAL_DUSRIP.TION_GIST
    2._1044.
    | FAULT IOS $
    CODE{MARKJUMP{<X121\rangle)}
    TESTILEFT4: SYMBOLJ.
    TESTILEFT2A...SYMBOL\ *
    SET[RIGHT2. SYMBOLI&
    CODE(MARKJUMP{<X127>))
    1 FAULT 106 $
    :FAULT 108. $
    +108+
    TEST\LEFT5*_SYMBOLJ.*
    MARKJUMP\DT\&
    CODE{MARKJUMP{<X139>J)........... IS NOT
    : FAULT'109 $
    CODE(MARKJUMP{<X157>!) | DESCRIPTION LISTSSTORE
```



```
    TESTILEFT5, SYMBOLI *
    MARKJUMP{DT\}
    CODE(MARKJUMP(<X134>)) I IS ALSO
    |FAULT 109 $
        664
    TEST\RIGHT2,SYMBOLI..M
        POP{BASE, RELAJ}
```



```
    MARKJUMP\\langleX15O\\) I UNITE SYMBOL BITS
    MARK\UMP(<X136>)) $
        I STACK UNCARRIED
* 67%
1-46+}-RIGHT1*
```




```
3% CODEOX1*LEFT2;
    CODELXI:L
    MARKJUMP\\langleX165\rangle\! OSE GEFORE EP
    VALUE2*X1*0)
    CODE(X1-LEFT2;
    X2*LEFT4;
    MARKJUMP{\langleX166>;: | OSE AFTER EP
```
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THABVAR! MARKJUMP(DECLAHEI: JUMPIEXITI) IVAR!ABLE LIST
'ALST'CODE(MARKJUMP(FLADIJ:STURLOC*X1): I
MARKJUMP(VG01: MARKJUMP(DECLAREI: JUMPIEXIT); IARRAY LIST
'FLST'ENTER(FPTILEFTI,FNO,FALSEI : I FORMAL PARAMETER LIST
FNO - FNO + 1 ; JUMP\{EXITI: I GOUNT THE PARAMETERS

'SLSTIFNOMFPTILEFTI, $\$$,I:~SIGNAL $\rightarrow$ FAULT 6: I SPECIFIER LIST
FPT(O.,S) $\rightarrow$ T+ABVAR; MARKJUMP(DECLARE): ICALLED BY VALUE,DECLAREDII
 CODSTKの(THUNK+FNO)=SHIFT+CXT3TALLY(CODELOC):1


ENTERTSYMB:LEFT1,TYPEヵTHUNK,FNO, CXTIS\$ I CALL $8 Y$ NAME

- 7

PUSH (3ASE,O); I A NEW BASE -
CONSTILEFT2I - TESTILEFT2.BOOLEANI - LEFT2~LEET2VLOGICALS_:
MARKJUMPIF!ND];

'FOREVERI JUMP\{FOREVER|:
JUMP(F7): $\quad 10$ FUNCTIONLESS PROCEDURE
 JUMPiF71; 12 ALL ARRAY CASES ELSEWHERE
 JUMP(DESL): $\quad 44$ LABEL IN COND'L IN CODEPIECE JUMP(FPAR): - $\quad 1.5$ FORMAL PARAMETER JUMPIFUNCI: 16 FUNCTION


## SN

COR 1604
IF7' FAULT 7 S JUMPIEXITI: I-I EXIT AFTER CONSTANT_OR_FAULT

- variablel

RIGHT2* XEY + MODE1+TYPE\&TEMP: I THE CORE OF THE EXPRESSION

+21.
IFUNC: MARKJUMP\{SAFENI:MARKJUMPICALLI? I RACC ALREADY SAFE_IN_-EXEC 21
-fRETIACC - STORAGE
1 FUNCTION VALUE IS IN I,R-1
IGET: TTT-ACE:TTHTYE+MODE1: - 1 THE CORRECTION AND THE EXPRESSIC]-
$T$ * CODELOC ; I WHERE THE CORECTION WILL BE
CODE(ASC-TT;VALUE2-ACCI: - I GET IT INTO THE ACC.
1 IT NEEDS TO BELONG
$\langle T\rangle-\langle T\rangle+T T T: B A S E-C X T: A L T E R$ THE-ACCESS
JUMP(EXIT]: 1-30=
PFPARI.
MARKJUMP(SAFEN): 1 SAFEN THE ACCUMULATOR J
CODSTKGTARSTALLYICODELOCI: 1 TRM VZO3

C-
CODSTK~(THUNK+KEY)*SHIFT+RELOCBTALLYICODELOCI:I V2O3'S PARAMETER
ACC~RO: JUMPIGETJ:

- DESLIFAULT 198
- $92+$

CODE (MARKJUMP (<X100>1)
iconcatenate
POP(SWICH, O):


```
Appendix
```

    106
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$\qquad$

```
    MARKJUMPIFIND];
    ACC*1 %
    RIGHT1 *. KEY + MODEI: TYPE . TEMPI
    BASE RUQO / FAULT 22 $
* 23+
    RIGHT2 <. RIGHTZ-A-"«<8R6332I>__1-SETIRIQHT2,-MODEOX
| 25%+ SEE ARRAYS
* 26*
    PUSH(FLAOI.O);
    SWCONT m LfcFT2J
```

$\qquad$

``` SAVE LEFTF2, SWCONT-IS-NOI-IN-USE-NOW-
    LEFT2 * VAL2J
    MARKJUMP[FIND]:. . . . . . . . . . . . . - - 
    T - KEY MOUE1 • TYPE - TEMP;
    RELA «" CXT
    RELB «- BA;E;
    LEFT2 «- SWCONT*-.........| RESTORE LEFT2
    CODEC T*LEFT2 > 0 * JUMP(FLADI) $ > 1
    CODEC MARKJUMPIFLAD31~J MARKJUMP(ALFA1 )1
    MARKJUMP(INCR'EI I
    COOE(JUM?|BETA) ):
    ASSIGN t FLAD11
*. 27 +
    pusHiFuAUi.u);
    TES7UEFT2,BOOLEAN! - FAULT. 27 S)
    CODE(LEFT2 •* MARKJUMPIFLAD31J JUMPtAL^AH
                        JUMPtFLADIJS):_
    *-28* ASSIGNIFLAQ1J
    CODEC MARKJUMPIFLAD31)
_*.30*
    RIGHT2.*.FQ|V: ALFA*CODELOC
    TESTIL5FT2#BOOLEANJ v TEST{LEFT2.TRUMP। *
    TESTIL5FT2.TKUMP) ""
    MARKJUMP(8R11765]; LEFT2 «' <8R63226>1
    MARKJUMP-t<X57>.].$ ; PUSHIFLAD1,01;
    CODEC -vLEFT2 JUMP (FLAD1]$)। FAULTT 30 $
+.31+
        #EXE31"
    ..HUSH[FLAD2,OM CODE< JUMPIFLAD?11; ASSI`NIFLADIJ
```

$\qquad$

```
+ 32*
            POP.JFLAD4,T11 J_CODEIJUMPI<T1>11;....ASSIGNIFLADA
```

$\qquad$

```
_- ASSIGN[FUADI J.
```

$\qquad$

``` \(\therefore . . .\).
* 34*
    ASSIGNIFLAD2].
            . . ._ .............
                                    \therefore
```

$\qquad$

```
* 35 +
```



```
Appendix
1 1 2
36+
    MARKJUYPIATLASI: I ASSIGN EVERYTHING
    01 * DUMPWIDTH*LXPR2*Q1$;
    STORLO` > MAX -> ACC * STORLOC I ACC + MAX $. 
    L18 - ACC: CODE(STOP)
    _ 37*
    STORLOE > MAX -> MAX * STORLOC % : I FIND LAST LOCATION IN FIXED
    CLUTCH * TKUE : I ONLY NEGESSARY ...IF...PROCEDURE... BODY
    MARKJUMP(ATLAS): I ASSIGN LABELSS, PROCS,ETC.
    LEVMLEV-8R10U000: - I RESTORE LEVEL
    CXT & MARKJUMP(SASS): CODE(NARKJUMP{X861):
                COUE(MARKJUMP(<X33>1)-9:
    ENTER(SYMB;STAB):POP(STAB,O): I ENTER SCATTER LABEL
    POP{STAB,STOKLOC} I................ESET FOR OUTER BLOCK
    ; POP\STAB.LOC(LAB)]
    * 38*
        MARKJUMP(8K117651:
        JUMP(EXE31)
    + 39+
        FORVGRIGHTC;
        AlFA - CODELOC;
    PUSHIFLADS,O!
+40+
    T * ABVAK;
    TYPE - DUUBLE;
    VAL2 - LEFTI; I VAL2 HAS NOW THE POSTFIX INTEGER OF STEP
    MARKJUMP(DECLAKEI;
    PUSHIFLAO1,01; PUSHIFLAD2,01I
    CODE(MARKJUMP(FLAD1I; JUMP(FLAD2I):
    ALFAHCODELOC: ASSIGNIFLAD1I: TALLYICODELOCI
* 41*
    CODE( JUMP(\langleALFA\I)! ASSIGN(FLLAD2)
    + 42*
    CODE{ JUMP\<ALFA\I)& T1. CODELOCS
    CODE( MARKJUMP(ALFAJ )!
    MARKJUMP(INCHE):
    ALFAWT1; ASSIGN(FLAD2)
. 43b
    XEO 112 = 0112 * LEV * LEV:
    XEQ 112 0112;
    CODE(MARKJUMP(<X122>)) % ;
    PUSH(FLADA.01;CODE( JUMP(FLAD4I):
    ASSIGNIFLAOSI; PUSH{FLADA,COUELOCII TALLY{CODELOC!
    44*..SEE DESIGNATIONAL: EXPRESSIONS
* 45*
    MARKJUYP{BR117631)
    ASSIGN!FGAD2!
1.50._SEE DESIGNATIONAL EXPRESSIONS
1 51+ SEE DESIGNATIONAL EXPRESSIONS
| 52\downarrow.... SEE DESIGNATIONAL EXPRESSIONS
+60t
    RIGHT2 * VALZ
+ C2.
    BETA + CODELOCS
    PUSH {BASE,0!;

```

Appendix
1 1 4
T+SYMB(LEFT3.5.,);
SIGNAL.
ARRAY =: (TATMASK) *
DOUBLE=_(T, ^-TMASK) \&ACC-0:ACC+1\$:_C~ACC:
TT+SYMZ\0,:S,1:
CODE(ACCWLEFT3);
ACC * LXPRO * TT;
MARKJUMP(8R64341);
ACC * SLOO126 * C:
MARKJUMP{8H64341);
ACC * 8LOO1261 * (( T an TMASK)*8R1070000001);
MARKJUMP{8R643411:
CODE( MARKJUMP{<X59>1);
MARKJUMPI PUSEV J;
CODE(STORLOC * XZ); TALLY(STORLOC) :
FAULT.94 \$.FAULT 941 \&
+ 95*
RIGHT1 * EVAL_+1 * MODE1..._FORMULA ;
POP{EVAL*0!: EVALI * EVAL
__-98d_
- TESTILEFT2.FORMULAI \& FAULT 98:
CODE( X3~LEFT2; X2\&LEFTA); MINUS(CODELOCI;
CODE( MARKJUMP{\langleK36\rangle));
MARKJUMP{8K11775!; 1-VALUE1-ACC,FORM
SN COR 0 %OR 0 % O. % 8
623 SN
LEV * LEV \$
_-..-994
RELA. BASE;
MARKJUMP(8R11710)
$100$
IEX100'
MARKJUMPIUNMAKE2!;
MARKJUMPIUPSETI:
MARKJUMP(8R11660)
_-105. MARKJUMP\UNMAKE21;
MARKUUYP(SETTUP);
MARKJUMP(8R1171.7!
_-_+107t
MARKJUMP\UNMAKEI\;
RELB.- BASE;
TESTILEFT2.DUUBLEI~TEST\LEFT2,SINGLEIVTEST(LEFFT2,INTEGERI
C+O: CODE(XI-LEFT2); M!NUS!CODELOC):
TEST[LEFT2,THUMP1 *
C+1: MARKJUMP(8R117231 :
TESTILEFT2.FORMULA! *
C-1: MARKJUMP{8R11.733!:
FAULT 107 \$ \$ \$
+112+
RIGHT2 * LEFT2 : I RIGHT2 HAS THE WRONG VALUE
GSTORE!CONSTILEFT41: FAULT 712:- | CANIT STORE INTO A CONSTANT
CONSTILEFT41 * FAULT 712 :
LEFT4 < 2000 -> RUDY\&FALSE
RELA * BASE : LEFT2 * LEFT4; I STORE MIGHT USE UPSET

```
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```

        FAULT 116.$ $
    17+...,*
        C=0 *
        COOE{-VALUE2. -LEFT4.< LEFT2):
        Co25: JUMP(F!NAL]S
    -1118+
C口O
CODE:VALUE2 - LEFT4 > LEFT2)I
C+14! JUMP!F!NALI \$
-61194
C口\
CODERVALUE2*-m(LEFT4 (.LEFT2).):
C+17! JUMP{FINAL]\$
-+1206
C=0 *
CODE(-VALUEZ - -(LEFT4 ) LEFT2))t
C-16: J\MP(F!NAL)\$
-\$121+
c=0 +
CODE(_VALJEZ..LEFT4-\#.. LEFT2II
C*19: JUMP(FINAL) \$
-4224
C=0 *
CODE\&VALUE2.--LEFTA_= .. LEFTZ)I
C. 5.8R3 ->
CODE{MARXJUMP(<X186>1)
VALUE2-ACCI:
_-.-SETIRIGHTZ, BOOLEANJ:
C+1BS JUMP{FINAL! \$
423*
C=0 - CODE{VALUE2 - LEFT4+LEFT2II.-NUMPISALIDA!t
C+12!. JUMP{F!NAL} S
4124*.
C=0 - COOE(VALUEZ MEEFT4*LEFT2)I JUMP(SALIDAJ:
C+13:-JUMP[FINAL]_S_
+1256

```

```

    C-10) JUMP(FINALI $
    \$1264.. ......-................
C=0 \# SODE(VALUER - LEFTA/LEFTE)3 \UMPISALIDA):
C-C+12:-JUMP{FINALIS.S_
\$127*
C=O + NODE(VALUEZ-LEFT2):
C+32: JUMP{F!NAL! \$

```

```

CCO9:_UNMP[F!NALI_\$_-
4131*
C=0 * COUE\MARKJUMP\<XGO\I): JUMP\ACC2`:
C-06: JUMPIFINAL! \$
*42**
C00 - NOOE(MARKJUMP[<<\S1>]): JUMP(ACCE! !
-_C*05;-JUMP\F!NAL!-5....
4133*

```
```

        C-0 - C00EU1ARKJUMPI<X62>))> JUMPlACC21 t
        n>->
        C*04; JUMP(FINALJ $:
    .34*
        .C<0 . \bullet»-C00E<MARKJUMPt<X63>) >l JUMPUCC2! I
        003; JUMPU'INALJ S-
    ,135*-
    C=0* C00E<MARKJUMPt<X64>) > J JUMPUCC21 I
    C<-02J-JUMP(FiNAL)-S
    136*
    CO * ~OOE<MARKJUMP(<X65>1>J JUMPUCC21.I.
    C-Oli JUMPIFINAU <<
    137*- C=0 - MAHKJ"Mpl8RH735U JUMPIACC2I >
    OOOJ-.JUMP (FINALI--S
        &EE ARKAys
    _ I_.i.41-._.SEE-ARRAYS.

```
\(\qquad\)
``` －－
    i -42
        g三e AREAYS
```

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

```
    *146*
        ..T-YPE- [0Jミミミ-
    *147*
    -T-YPE-. -1NTEQEA
    *148*
    -TYPE.
```

$\qquad$

``` BOOLEAN－
    6?'
    6?'-
    0?'7
    C9"'"
    n') ?.'.'
    09>0
    0931
    0932
    0 9 3 3
    0934
        0935
        0936
        0937
        093C!
        0939
        0940
        09*1
        0942
        09A3
        0944
        0945
        0946
        0947
        # (.)
        0
        0949
        0?>0
        TYPE. >...- LOGICAL
        09:::
        0932
        0953
        09?-'
    -IYPE- .SYMBOL-
    c:r.
    -TYPE__>- .SINGLE-
        FNO..>_2UL = - हTART COUNTENG - בARAMEZERS-
        XEQ 190 FLST
                        gORMAZ EARAMETER LIST
        *09
                        <
        09i""
    PUSH[STA3,STORLOCj;STORLOC.-IJ | RESET STORAGE BEFORE SEEING FUMCTI
```



```
                CLUTCH * TRUE S ! JUMP AROUND PROCEDURES
    RIGHT2-CXT'R1GHT3-ACC; | R3 FOR FUNC.J R2 FOR P&CC
        99}
    -....CXT. <...CODELOC ;. . I NOW WE HAVE - THE - NEW CONTEXT........ 090J
    COR 0737000000 STz O.CODELOCJ 00:
```



```
    PUSH{LSS,CSSU;CSS*CODELOC; | SET UP AN ORIGINAL 首AD OF CHAIM O
    _-<CODELOC>.<-LEY;JALL-YtCODELOC) J- I KEEP LEVEL IN THE...HEAD___:____(>^
    LEV *> LEV BR100000; I KEEP LEVEL IN THE HEAD
```



```
    RIGHT1 LEFT1 ; SAVE "HE IDENTIFIER — - 0976
    SETtLEFTl, FUNCTION];
    PUSHtLADLE.LbFTlJ;
    _PUSHJLAOLE. CXT]....;
```

$\qquad$

```
                            T THE TAGGED IDENTIFIER
    I INTO THE POT FOR ATZAS
    0976
        PUSH[LADLE* U ]
    I IN THIS CASE A PROCEDURE-NAME -....
    I FENC. DESIG. GLOBAL TO FUNC,
```




```
Appendix
    120
    COMT 3 - <COMT 2>:
    ___CODE(JUMPICOMT 3)).:
    CODERJUMPICHAINICOMT 2|l) $ : FAULT 44 $ :
    ENTERILAB; LEFT2. LABL, O, LEV, 11/.
    JUMP(PRINC!) $
-c.50.
    ENTERILAB; LEFT2,SWIT,STORLOC,LEV,OJB
    ___BETA+STORLOC;
    SWCONT&1; TALLYISTORLOCJ;
    IEX50,
    PUSHIFLAD4,0!; T* CODELOC+3;
    CODE(STORLOC: LOC(TI) JUMP(FLAD4))]
    TALLY(STORLOCI
- 51.*
    SWCONT * SWCUNT+1%
    -.-ASSIGN(FLADA1: JUMPIEX5OI
    - 52*
    ASSIGNIFLADAI: CODESBETA *.LOCISWCONTI)
    * 15$
    TYPE - LAB!LEFT4,S.,.,\:
    SIGNAL *
    TYPE = SWIT. }
    THLAB(0.,SS.1;
    CODE(YI~LEFT:2; Y2*-T): MINUSICODELOCJ;
    COUE{ JUMP(<X35>1): FAULT 15 $ : FAULT 7 $
    I ROUTINES FOR PATTERNS
    + 76+
    MARKJUMP(8R11751)
    d 82d
+83+
    TYPE-FUNCTION
        MMARKJUMP[8R3.1715)
```

$\qquad$

```
    84
            CODE( VALUE1~LEFT2 * <M58>):,
N M
N
    COR 0............61560000070
    COR O 5350063245
```



```
    COR 0 415006334?
    COR 0 .-...... 5350003*.1
    COR 0. 1730063042
    SET(RIGHT1,FURMULAJ
    + 85'
    TESTILEETG, SYMBOLI_*
    - TESTILEFT2. SYMBOLJ -
    MARKJUMP(DATATERM):
    CODE(MARKJUMP{<x136>)) 5;
    JUMP(INSTI &%;
    C-0;
    'EXEB5!
    MARKJUYP(8R12745)
    -----
```

    - -
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