

# Project Tricarbon

aka Cycloproatriene

## Simple Compiler Components

### Design Document

## *Rationale*

Project Tricarbon - C sub 3 , or Cimple Compiler Components - is my attempt at making a cleaner compiler ecosystem. The key word involved is *components*; I have no intention of writing frontends for every language, architectural translators for every ISA, or object wrappers for every platform's pet executable format. While some degree of arrogance is of course required in order to think myself capable of designing an interface that will *allow* for such, I am not nearly stupid enough to believe that I could then fully *implement* it.

*"Okay, but what does that mean? What really even is this?"*

Basically, instead of writing a *library* that people can use for optimization and machine code generation (like, say, QBE, MIR, or libLLVM), I'm writing a simple *protocol* that various programs can use. That is, you could for instance wrap libLLVM in a small shim to use it for optimizations - but you could also construct a simple native compiler for your new language by just writing a parser that speaks Tricarbon's ASL (more on that shortly), and building a static executable with a complete parser, semantic analysis, optimizations, and code generation! The only work you need to do is to add a parser.

*"Wait, don't language frontends need semantic analysis, too?"*

In existing "language-independent" compiler systems, yes. Tricarbon is designed differently, in a way that shifts complexity from the frontends to tricarbon itself (the *protocol*, not even the implementation). However, I believe that the simplification that this allows for each individual component more than makes up for it, and that overall complexity decreases. Additionally, this actually simplifies other parts of tricarbon as well, so I believe it is a net gain in simplicity.

*"Isn't this too ambitious? Why shouldn't I use a more practical project, like QBE or LLVM?"*

If I was promising to implement support for every ISA, every operating system, every programming language, and so on, than this would not be merely ambitious, but lethally stupid and absurdly arrogant - *especially* if I claimed I would provide that in a timely manner! The goal with tricarbon is *not* to support everything - or even all that much! The goal is to create a protocol that reduces compiler complexity, and to write a few components that use it. Anyone else can then make their new project speak the same protocol, enriching the ecosystem for everyone entangled in its... el... eternally erudite grasp? Sorry, I can't start alliterating and then *stop*!

*Okay, so I'm going to try to be a bit formal from here on out, and let the design do the talking.*

### *Abstract*

Compilation is typically viewed as an NxM problem - every language needs a frontend, plus a backend for each target. Projects like LLVM aim to reduce this by sharing backends and optimizations. This traditional view is inaccurate: the frontend for a language written to use libLLVM needs both parsing and semantic analysis, which can be broken into separate steps (and frontends do this split internally). Furthermore, the backends can be split into "machine code generation" and "object file wrapping," a distinction understood by Zig's self-hosting compiler. Combined with the typical lock-in employed by libraries like LLVM or QBE, writing a compiler is needlessly painful today. I devise a simple protocol compilation components can use to solve both issues.

### *Notation*

For the purpose of clarity, I use Zig's syntax for disambiguation of arrays, slices, pointers-to-one, and pointers-to-many. Code samples are typically provided in both C99 and Zig, mostly to showcase how two different languages with two different libraries can cooperate using a standardized protocol. For types, each code block is assumed to have an implicit include of the *stddef.h* and *stdint.h* headers. Note that `const` is not used in the C samples, and zig code conforms to the grammar as laid out in the 0.7.1 language reference after modification with accepted proposals.

```
*T // pointer to a single T
[*]T // pointer to many T, length is unknown
[N]T // array size N of T
[*N]T // pointer to N objects of T
[]T // slice of T. length is runtime known. Where val is a slice, val.ptr is a [*]T, and val.len is the length.
```

Additionally, any of the pointer types other than pointer-to-one can be annotated with an arbitrary *sentinel*, a value which marks the end of the data.

`[*:0]char` is a pointer-to-many characters, with unknown length, where the last value is a 0. This is identical to a C string, as the meaning is typically used. Note that C's `*char` is ambiguous between `[*]char` and `*char` in this notation! The notation is used specifically to disambiguate such cases.

### *Goals and ideals*

In order to be able to work on a design and test if it meets the goals, said goals need to be explicit and well-defined.

- Freedom
- Correctness
- Simplicity
  - Architectural simplicity
  - Code simplicity
  - Data simplicity
- Ease of use / friendliness
- Language-independence
- Position-independence
- Compiler performance

### *Freedom*

Any user of tricarbon-based components should be able to fully ignore me. This is the core design ideal, which must never be violated in any manner. For instance, simplicity is my third listed goal - if someone wants their component to be complex and to do things I personally oppose (a C++ or Rust frontend, for instance), they **MUST** be able to do so. The only exception is the second Ideal, correctness. A user is *not* free to do the wrong thing.

However, this applies only to *objective* cases, *not* dogma. Code which infinitely loops is not acceptable. Code which performs major undocumented behavior is not acceptable. These constraints are necessary to further preserve the *user's* freedom - tricarbon users have the right to

know what your code does before they run it! One important extension of this is somewhat controversial: nasal demons are forbidden. If your optimizer sees undefined behavior as defined by the C standard, for instance, it **MUST NOT** format your hard drive (deliberately), open Doom, and so on. It must at least try to do the "right thing," even if I disagree what that behavior is.

Moreover, the ecosystem should be fully *decentralized*. This means that there are *no* "official" tools, only a complete list of known tools, which will be unsorted (and randomly resorted every time the list is updated!) There are only two conditions for a tool to be accepted into the tricarbon project and added to the list: first, it obeys the protocol - that is, a program may be rejected if it doesn't produce a conforming ASL, but if the ASL produced is conforming (even if not, subjectively, *well-formed*), it *must* be accepted. Secondly, it must have some form of value. Value is subjective, but it must (to put it loosely) "do something." If it copies the input directly to the output, for instance, it will not be accepted.

Of course, in the same vein, if someone forks the "bad" (but conforming) code, they can easily get their fork accepted into the list. For forks, the project will be a bit more strict: some characteristic of the program needs to have changed in a real way (output is different, performance is improved, etc). This requirement is dropped if someone trusted vouches for the project (which includes the maintainer of the original project).

This principle can be seen largely in the separation of components. If someone likes my x64 backend but thinks my type analyzer is trash, they can take what they like and discard what they don't. This decision can be made simply by not compiling the unwanted components! Compare this to LLVM, where everything is one big library, or Zig's stage1, which requires *every possible LLVM target* to be included in the build to meet the ideal of first-class cross-compilation and explicitly does not support building with them disabled.

This ideal is somewhat paradoxical in nature, as I'm *imposing* my axiomatic ideal of agency on all authors of tricarbon components. However, a conforming component *can* perform multiple functions, so it's still fully possible to ignore me on this and build a component that engenders lock-in (a component which targets many backends, for instance). It's always possible to

give up freedoms, it's much harder to gain them back later. Succintly, the ideal is to give people the option to make the choice of freedom for themselves.

### *Simplicity*

The third Ideal is simplicity. If anything can be done in a simpler manner without restricting freedom, it SHOULD be done as such. Note well that I said *should*, not *must*. Sometimes, making the architecture a tiny bit more complex can allow making the implementations much simpler, or faster, or so on. Such tradeoffs are typically made on a case-by-case basis. However, any case where any such tradeoff is made MUST contain the rationale in the design. Generally, architectural simplicity is more important than code and data simplicity, which are roughly equal.

### *Architectural simplicity*

The project's architecture needs to be as simple as possible. There are many reasons for this, so a short list of the most important ones follows. It makes it easy for people with little experience in compilation to learn how it works and use it, making the project beginner-friendly. It makes it easier to extend later, adding features which are needed for new pieces. It allows for composing behavior of arbitrary complexity out of simple primitives.

### *Code simplicity*

Implementations need to be simple. This is more relaxed; implementations can *choose* complexity if they so choose. However, tricarbon MUST *encourage* simplicity of implementation; it must be easy to write simple code to interact with tricarbon. This, again, contributes to beginner-friendliness.

### *Data simplicity*

Data structures need to be simple. This contributes to a positive feedback loop with code simplicity and, yet again, makes the project more beginner friendly. You shouldn't need to pore over the design to figure out how types are designed; it should be intuitive.

## *TODO*

Notes on the rest of the ideals; focusing on the design for now.

## *Overview*

There are a few classes of components, separated not by their functionality but by their communication patterns:

- Drivers
- Parsers
- Modifiers
- Code generators
- Object wrappers

To qualify as a component, a program **MUST** implement at least one of these, and **MAY** implement all of them. Every component **MUST** be executable as a binary, and **MAY** additionally be loadable as a dynamic object.

## *Drivers*

A driver is a program that is invoked by the user, either directly or as a library. Drivers, in turn, invoke 1 parser per input file, any number of modifiers, zero or one code generator, and zero or one object wrapper. For instance, my CLI driver is invoked as follows:

```
c3 hello.zig -o hello --target=native # zig parser -> modifiers -> codegen -> ELF wrapper, on Linux
c3 hello.c -std=c99 -o hello.asl # c parser -> modifiers -> disk
c3 hello.coy -o hello.s # coyote parser -> modifiers -> codegen -> disk
```

Note that the driver is language-independent and yet understands language-specific options. This demonstrates a property of drivers: drivers **MUST** pass their full argument list to every component they invoke. However, the driver **MAY** make decisions about which components to invoke from the options, as well - for instance, a driver may decide to use a high-performance C99-only parser when given the option, but to use a more general C parser, which supports other standard revisions, if none is specified. This means that the driver can be written to support options for many languages or none at all, yet the user can still control the other invoked components. To facilitate this, unrecognized options **MUST** be ignored by other components.

Drivers need not be CLI programs; the requirement is that the driver **MUST** give the user a way to pass options to invoked components, assuming the user knows what options the component accepts. As a special case, every non-driver component **MUST** give all known options when receiving the `--help` flag, and the driver **MUST** have a way of communicating them to the user. The driver can use any flag for this, such as `--help-parser` to get the parser's flag list.

### *Parsers*

A parser is any program which reads in *arbitrary* inputs and produces an ASL. Input may be a programming language, IR, machine code, or any arbitrary format. The instructions in the ASL produced by a parser **MAY** be typed; the driver **MUST** assume that they are not.

### *Modifier*

A modifier is any program which reads in an ASL and produces a modified ASL. For instance, typification and semantic analysis are fed the raw ASL produced by the parser, and give an ASL with analyzed instructions as their output. For most input languages, the driver needs to ensure that the ASL is typified and analyzed immediately after parsing; this is **NOT** a hard requirement (e.g. when reading in LLVM IR, the driver may not need to do so).

### *Code generator*

## DOOM

### *Abstract Syntax List*

The core innovation of Tricarbon is the Abstract Syntax List. Unlike traditional compilers, which use a parse tree, parsers written to speak the Tricarbon protocol create a position-independent list of nodes. The reason this is so significant is that the ASL is *designed* to efficiently represent various languages, instead of attempting (as GCC did) to adapt an AST to fit various languages.

The ASL provides all three forms of simplicity through a few unique properties:

- Position-independence
- Generalized nodes
- Rootlessness
- Data-as-metadata

To give an idea of code and data simplicity, here is a quick sample to showcase usage.

### *C99*

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include "tricarbon.h"

int
main(int argc, char **argv)
{
    struct c3_asl asl;
    // Convenience function:
    // reads the ASL into two separate spots on the heap (for more intuitive memory management),
    // and provides the pointers and sizes. Note that on a system where the processes can share
    // memory, this MAY bootstrap a bidirectional pipe and use shared memory.
    if(c3_asl_read_parent(&asl) != 0)
        return 1;
    // ...
    // do optimizations here...
    return c3_asl_write(stdout);
}
```

### *Zig*

```
const c3 = @import("tricarbon");

pub const main = fn() void {
    // choose an allocator
    const allocator = ...;
    const ASL = c3.readParent(allocator);
    for(ASL.nodes) |node| {
        ...
    }
};

// ASL looks like this:
struct {
    nodes: [:0]c3.ASL.Node,
    str: [:0]u8,
}
```

### *Layout*

The ASL layout in memory is undefined. Libraries and applications are free to choose. When sending over a pipe, it MUST be laid out as follows: spec version, as specified later, followed by the node count (32-bit), the full node list, the length of the character buffer (32-bit), and the raw character buffer (which MUST NOT be null terminated).

### *Position-independence*

A few heresies needed to be committed to achieve position-independence for the ASL. These are, however, simple, correct, and performant.

The fundamental string type of tricarbon is not, in fact, the string. Character pointers are, shockingly enough, *not* position-independent! Slices have the same problem; they still rely on a pointer. As such, the ASL's list of nodes is followed immediately by a character buffer, and strings are a slice-like type consisting of *index* and length.

```
struct c3_string{
    size_t index;
    size_t length;
};

struct c3_asl{
```

```
    struct c3_node *nodes;
    char *str;
    size_t node_count;
    size_t char_count;
};

bool
read_asl(struct c3_asl *asl)
{
    fread(asl->node_count,
```

### *Nodes*

A node is a tagged union. A node may be a file, an expression, a statement, an IR bundle, and so on. Since this is intended