Just-in-time in No Time? "Use the Source!" How to distill a JIT compiler from an interpreter

Frej Drejhammar <frej@sics.se>

120529



Who am I?

- Senior researcher at the Swedish Institute of Computer Science (SICS) working on programming tools and distributed systems.
- Used to be hard-core C programmer until introduced to Scheme during undergraduate education.
- Started using Erlang "for real" while working in the same lab as Joe at SICS.



What this talk is About

An in-depth tour of the current JIT-compiling beam emulator prototype (BEAMJIT) and the techniques used to build it.



Outline

Background

Just-In-Time Compilation

JIT Strategies

Tracing JIT

HiPE vs JIT

The BEAM Emulator

BEAM: Specification & Implementation

The BEAM JIT Prototype

Overview

Tools

Running Example

Source Code Representation

Profiling

Tracing

Code Generation

Executing Native Code

Current Status

Future Work

Q&A



Just-In-Time (JIT) Compilation

- Compile what you are about to execute to native code, at run-time.
- Fairly common implementation technique
 - Python (Psyco, PyPy)
 - Smalltalk (Cog)
 - Java (HotSpot)
 - JavaScript (SquirrelFish Extreme, SpiderMonkey)



JIT Strategies: When to Compile

Sub-optimal to spend time to compile and optimize code which is only executed once.

- Heuristics, perhaps with help from compiler
- Run-time profiling



JIT Strategies: What to Compile

Trade-off: Byte-code often more compact than native code. Decide what to compile:

- Module at a time
- Method / function at a time
- A trace a single execution path



Tracing

Use light-weight profiling to detect when we are at a place which is frequently executed. Trace the flow of execution until we get back to the same place.

The initial strategy selected for BEAMJIT.



Tracing: Details

- Assumes that the most likely execution path is the one we are following.
- The trace is aborted if it becomes too long.
- When we are back to the starting point: Compile.



HiPE vs JIT

Why would Erlang need a JIT-compiler, we already have HiPE?

- Cross module optimization.
- Native-code much larger than BEAM-code.
- Tracing does not require switching to full emulation.
- Modules are target independent, simplifies deployment:
 - No need for cross compilation.
 - Binaries not strongly coupled to a particular build of the emulator.



Outline

Background

Just-In-Time Compilation

JIT Strategies

Tracing JII

The BEAM Emulator

BEAM: Specification & Implementation

The BEAM JIT Prototype

Overview

Tools

Running Example

Source Code Representation

Profiling

Tracing

Code Generation

Executing Native Code

Current Status

Future Work

A&C



BEAM: Specification

- BEAM is the name of the current VM.
- A register machine.
- Approximately 150 instructions which are specialized to approximately 450 macro-instructions using a peephole optimizer during code loading.
- No authoritative description of the semantics of the VM except the implementation source code!



BEAM: Implementation

Fairly standard directly threaded code interpreter.

```
while (1) {
   Instr* PC;
   ...

opcode_0: {
    /* Do something */
    PC += 3; /* Skip past immediates */
    goto **PC;
   }

opcode_1: ...
}
```

Opcodes are addresses to code implementing that opcode.



Outline

Background

Just-In-Time Compilation

JIT Strategies

Tracing JIT

HiPE vs JIT

The BEAM Emulator

BEAM: Specification & Implementation

The BEAM JIT Prototype

Overview

Tools

Running Example

Source Code Representation

Profiling

Tracing

Code Generation

Executing Native Code

Current Status

Future Work





Goals

- Do as little manual work as possible.
- Preserve the semantics of plain BEAM.
- Automatically stay in sync with the plain BEAM, i.e. if bugs are fixed in the interpreter the JIT should not have to be modified manually.
- Have a native code generator which is state-of-the-art.



Plan

Our plan:

- Parse and extract semantics from the C implementation.
- Transform the parsed C source to C fragments which are then reassembled into a replacement interpreter which includes a JIT-compiler.

Compare this to other languages:

- Python's PyPy
- Smalltalk's Cog



Tools

- LLVM A Compiler Infrastructure, contains a collection of modular and reusable compiler and toolchain technologies.
 Uses a low-level assembler-like representation called IR.
- Clang A mostly gcc-compatible front-end for C-like languages, produces LLVM-IR.
- libclang A C library built on top of Clang, allows the AST of a parsed C-module to be accessed and traversed.



What do we need?

- A way to profile.
- A way to represent the emulator source code.
- A way to trace execution.
- A way to convert a trace into native code.
- A way to share emulator state between interpreter and native code.

All without slowing down the interpreter too much.



Profiling

- Let the compiler insert profiling instructions at the head of loops.
- Maintain a counter and when a threshold is reached, turn on tracing.

```
\begin{array}{c} \mathsf{loop}\left(0\right) \; -\!\!\!> \\ \mathsf{ok}\,; \\ \mathsf{loop}\left(N\right) \; -\!\!\!> \\ \mathsf{loop}\left(N\!-\!1\right). \end{array}
```

```
{function, loop, 1, 2}.
    {label, 1}.
    {func.info, {atom, ex}, {atom, loop}, 1}.
    {label, 2}.
    {jit_profile, 0}.
    {test, is, eq_exact, {f, 3}, [x, 0}, {integer, 0}]}.
    {move, {atom, ok}, {x, 0}}.
    return.
    {label, 3}.
    {gc.bif, '-', {f, 0}, 1, [x, 0}, {integer, 1}], {x, 0}}.
    {call.only, 1, {f, 2}}.
```



Example

```
\begin{array}{c} loop(0) \rightarrow \\ ok; \\ loop(N) \rightarrow \\ loop(N-1). \end{array}
```



Implementation

```
_op_i_is_eq_exact_immed_frc: {
  Instr* next = (Instr *) *(I + 2 + 1);
  if (x0 != I[(1)+1]) {
   goto _op_jump_f;
  I += 2 + 1:
 goto *(beam_ops[(Instr)next]);
_{op_iump_f}: {
  I = ((Instr *) I [(0)+1]);
 goto *(beam_ops[(BeamInstr)*I]);
```



Source Code Representation

Preliminary step: Parse and simplify emulator source

- Flatten variable scopes
- No fall-troughs
- Remove loops, replace by if+goto
- Turn structured C into a spaghetti of Basic Blocks (BB),
 CFG Control Flow Graph.
- Do liveness-analysis of variables.

```
-op_i_is_eq_exact_immed_frc: {
    Instr* next = (Instr *) *(I + 2 + 1);
    if (x0 != I[(1)+1]) {
        goto _op_jump_f;
    }
    I += 2 + 1;
    goto *(beam_ops[(Instr)next]);
}

-op_jump_f: {
    I = ((Instr *) I[(0)+1]);
    goto *(beam_ops[(BeamInstr)*I]);
}
BeamInstr

...
op_iis_eq
    jnext.
if (x0
    go
    go
    }
    else
    go
    }

-Ibl_2487:
    I = (I
    goto *
```

```
BeamInstr *next_125;
...
_op_i_is_eq_exact_immed_frc:
    jnext_125 = *(1 + 3);
    if (x0 != |[2]) {
        goto _!bl_2487;
    } else {
        goto _!bl_429;
    }

_!bl_2487:
    | = (||)[1];
    goto *beam_ops[*1];

-jit_anon_!bl_429:
    | += 3;
    goto *beam_ops[next_125];
```



Tracing: Recording Execution Flow

Exploit that the code is split into BBs, on entry record:

- Current I (Program counter)
- An identifier for the BB

```
BeamInstr *next_125;
                                   BeamInstr *next_125;
_op_i_is_eq_exact_immed_frc:
                                   _trace_op_i_is_eq_exact_immed_frc:
   jnext_125 = *(I + 3);
                                          (jit_trace_append_bb(c_p—>trace, I, 214)) {
    if (x0 != 1[2]) {
                                            beam_ops = jit_plain_ops;
        goto _lbl_2487;
    } else {
                                            goto _op_i_is_eq_exact_immed_frc;
        goto _lbl_429;
                                        _{next_{1}25} = *(1+3);
_lbl_2487:
                                        if (x0 != 1[2]) {
    I = (I)[1];
                                            goto _trace_lbl_2487;
    goto *beam_ops[*]:
                                            goto _trace_lbl_429;
_jit_anon_lbl_429:
    1 += 3:
    goto *beam_ops[next_125];
                                   _trace_[bl_2487:
                                           (jit_trace_append_bb(c_p->trace, I, 745))
                                        I = (I)[1];
                                       goto *beam_ops[*I];
                                   _trace_lbl_429:
                                          (jit_trace_append_bb(c_p->trace, I, 1388))
                                        goto *beam_ops[next_125];
```

Tracing: Enabling/Disabling Tracing

- Generate two implementations of each opcode, a plain and a tracing version.
- Make the interpreter indirectly threaded.

```
while (1) {
                                             while (1) {
  Instr* PC:
                                               Instr* PC:
opcode_0: {
                                              opcode_0: {
   /* Do something */
                                                 /* Do something */
                                                PC += 3; /* Skip past
   PC += 3: /* Skip past
               immediates */
                                                            immediates */
     oto **PC:
                                                  oto *ops[*PC]:
opcode_1: ...
                                              opcode_1: ...
```

- Switching implementation is just a matter of changing ops.
- Surprisingly small effect on performance.



Tracing: Trace representation

Currently naive:

- One ongoing trace per process.
- Fixed maximum length.
- Only one ongoing trace starting from the same profiling instruction.
- Large potential for improvement.



Code Generation: Introduction

- Use LLVM's optimizer and native code generator.
- LLVM understands LLVM-IR, we have C.
- Do not want to implement a C-compiler Generate stubs which are then compiled to IR using Clang.
- JIT code generator reads IR during initialization and extracts relevant parts from the stubs.
- Trace is traversed and stub fragments are glued together, to a function implementing the trace.
- The function is then optimized and compiled to native code using LLVM.



Code Generation: Stubs

• Stubs return the value of the conditional (for conditional branches), or the new I (for opcode dispatch).

```
BeamInstr *next_125;
                                    int op_i_is_eq_exact_immed_frc(void)
_op_i_is_eq_exact_immed_frc:
                                      BeamInstr *1:
    inext_125 = *(1 + 3);
                                      BeamInstr *next_125;
    if (x0 != 1[2]) {
                                      Eterm x0;
        goto _lbl_2487;
                                      next_125 = *(I + 3);
    } else {
                                      return (x0 != 1[2]) != 0;
        goto _lbl_429;
Ibl 2487:
                                    void *Ibl_2487 (void)
    I = I[1]:
    goto *beam_ops[*I];
                                      BeamInstr *1:
                                      I = I[1];
                                      return (void *) * 1;
_jit_anon_lbl_429:
    1 += 3:
    goto *beam_ops[next_125];
                                    void *Ibl_429 (void)
                                      BeamInstr *1:
                                      BeamInstr *next_125;
                                      1 += 3:
                                      return (void *) next_125;
```



Code Generation: Resulting Function

When two BBs are linked to each other through a conditional branch:

- Insert conditional that checks that we still are on the fast-path.
- If we are on the slow path, return which BB execution should continue from.

```
int trace_fun(void)
  BeamInstr *1;
  BeamInstr *next_125;
  Eterm x0:
 start:
  next_125 = *(1 + 3):
 if ((x0 != 1[2]) != 0)
   return 2487; /* BB */
  I += 3:
  if (| [next_125] != trace[index+1].|)
    return next-125: /* Opcode. The index of an opcode and the first BB in its
              implementation overlap */
 /* N - 1 etc */
  goto start;
```

Shown as C, actually done on IR.



Code Generation: Optimizations

- Insert a I=trace[index].I; at the start of each opcode stub. (future work)
- Teach LLVM-optimizer that anything accessed via I is a compile-time constant. (future work)

```
int trace_fun(void)
int trace_fun(void)
  BeamInstr *1;
                                                                Eterm x0;
  BeamInstr *next_125:
  Eterm x0:
                                                               start:
                                                                if (x0 != 0)
                                                                   return 2487: /* BB */
 start:
  next_125 = *(I + 3);
  if ((x0 != 1[2]) != 0)
                                                                /* N - 1 etc */
    return 2487; /* BB */
  I += 3:
                                                                goto start;
  if (\lceil next_125 \rceil != trace[index+1]. \rceil)
    return next_125:
  /* N - 1 etc */
  goto start;
```



Executing Native Code

- Interpreter keeps much of its state in local variables.
- Need a way to pass that state to the native code.
- Collecting state into a shared C-struct would be simple, but not efficient.
- Solution is to copy the state into a buffer which is used to initialize the locals in the native code.
- Do the opposite when we fall off the fast path.
- Use liveness information to avoid copying data we do not need.
- Generated from source.



Current Status

- First working version a week ago today.
- Only unicore.
- Naive tracing.
- Traces are never GC:d.
- Lacking optimizations.
- Conservative liveness analysis.
- Too early to get any performance figures.



Future Work

- Implement JIT-specific optimizations.
- Manage traces and compiled native code.
- Improve liveness analysis.
- Integrate with code update.
- Performance evaluation.
- SMP-support.
- Extend JIT:ing to BIFs.



Outline

Background

Just-In-Time Compilation

JIT Strategies

Tracing JIT

HiPE vs JIT

The BEAM Emulator

BEAM: Specification & Implementation

The BEAM JIT Prototype

Overview

Tools

Running Example

Source Code Representation

Profiling

Tracing

Code Generation

Executing Native Code

Current Status

Future Work

Q&A



Acknowledgments

- Ericsson For funding the project and letting me do a cool hack as (part of) my job.
- Jonas Sjöbergh For the title of the talk.



Just-in-time in No Time? "Use the Source!"

Questions?

