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Abstract

Lisp is a particularly important programming language that has found itself in many applications in artificial intelligence. Many architectures have been proposed to support the execution of Lisp. BIDDLE is an attempt to design a data driven architecture that directly executes Lisp in parallel. In this paper, the main ideas behind BIDDLE are introduced. The discussion will be centred around the issues of direct execution, handling of side effects, exploitation of Lisp's inherent parallelism and control of redundant parallelism.

1. Introduction

Since the early days of artificial intelligence, it was realized that the conventional imperative programming languages were not convenient nor powerful enough to handle the structures required for symbolic processing. The advent of declarative programming have given rise, in recent years, to whole new classes of computer architectures, namely the dataflow and the reduction architectures. Given the clean semantics of declarative programming languages, certain natural parallelisms are inherent. However, most of such architectures have settled for side-effect free or single assignment languages. Such requirements hamper the applicability of these architectures to realistic programming applications. This is because a large amount of software written in the traditional languages must be rewritten, often with considerable effort to comply with the new restrictions.

In BIDDLE, we attempt to approach the architectural design from a language-first point of view. The language of choice is Lisp. Firstly, Lisp is popular. It is believed to be the second oldest programming language still in common use and there already exist a large amount of software written in Lisp. Secondly, Lisp has an elegant semantic structure with considerable inherent parallelism.

Experience has shown that Lisp is costly to execute. As such, many architectures have been proposed and built to give hardware support for the language. There is also interest in executing Lisp in parallel. However, most attempts on parallelizing Lisp have been to invent new language constructs, such as futures, thus giving rise to new dialects. There are also dataflow and reduction machines that execute Lisp. However, the focus has been on pure (side effect free) subsets of Lisp. We believe that although Lisp essentially has a sequential semantic, it is possible, through fine grain parallelism, to exploit it to the extreme. Furthermore, to utilize the existing body of software, we believe that side effects has to be allowed. We also believe that the underlying parallel architecture should be transparent to the programmer to allow for extensibility.

The aim of BIDDLE is as follows:

1. Direct execution of Lisp: there is no need for a separate compilation and execution phase.
2. Parallel execution of Lisp: execution paths with no data dependencies are taken concurrently by software.
3. Data driven execution of Lisp: instructions are executed when data become available, not because of artificial sequentiality imposed by location.

In this paper, we shall describe some of the main ideas behind BIDDLE. As we are still at an early stage of the project, the design proposed here can only be taken to be a preliminary one.

2. Direct Execution of Lisp

We shall now describe the main idea behind the direct, data driven execution of Lisp. The description is only for the most basic execution model. We have incorporated various features that enhance the execution model. The changes will be dealt with in the later sections. To aid the explanation, we shall use the simple Fibonacci program given in Figure 1 which is written in Common Lisp.

The architecture of BIDDLE is shown in Figure 2. In BIDDLE, the program will be keyed in from a terminal attached to a preprocessor. The pre-processor's job is to check for syntactic correctness. The program is then sent to the object store manager which will allocate space for it in the object store. To be efficient, a piecemeal approach is taken, i.e. functions are placed one at a time as soon as they are determined to be syntactically correct. We shall not at this moment concern ourselves with the internal form. Assume for the moment that the machine works directly with the source files.

Execution is triggered by a evaluation request from the user. This causes the pre-processor to send an EVAL packet to the instruction store manager. Included in the EVAL packet would be the parameters for the function call. Also the destination of the result of this EVAL packet is the user's I/O.
(DEFUN FIBONACCI (N)
  (COND ((= N 0) 1)
        ((= N 1) 1)
        (T (+ (FIBONACCI (- N 1))
               (FIBONACCI (- N 2)))))

Figure 1. Fibonacci in Lisp

process. The packet can be sent to a free processing element (PE) which produces object instructions and child EVAL packets on subcomponents of the source code. If there are no free PEs, it will sit in the execution queue awaiting for one.

On receipt of the child EVAL packet, the PE will carry out further compilation. The result of compilation would be a series of packets which can be conceptualized as the execution tree shown in Figure 3. The execution tree created by the compilation is rooted at the node of its parent that caused the evaluation. In other words, the initial EVAL request will cause the creation of a single execution tree, while other EVAL nodes in this tree will cause the tree to expand further. These packets are sent to the instruction store. Those instructions whose arguments are all in are deemed executable and are enqueued into the execution queue. Those that do not have all its arguments must wait at the instruction store for all its arguments. From the execution queue, packets get allocated PEs. If the packet received by a PE is of normal form, i.e. a basic operation such as add, subtract etc, it is executed and the result is send via a RESULT packet back to the instruction store manager. Contained in the RESULT packet will be the destination of the result. The token store manager will match this with instructions in the code store and form other executable tokens. This process is repeated until the final result is returned to the user. The compilation process is therefore a reduction process, specifically this technique is called string rewriting. [18] It is necessary to point out that, whereas in other reduction machines, an evaluation demand causes the execution of pre-compiled code, in BIDDLE object instuctions are generated and sent to the object store as they are needed, and those that have data ready are immediately dispatched. There are no distinct compile and execute phases.

3. Priority and Bidirectional Demand

Before going further, lets examine the concepts of eager and lazy evaluation. In eager evaluation, [2] processing begins as soon as all the data required is made available. This is the crux of data driven processing. The problem with this approach is that it may generate too much work. In the dataflow machines that were built, it was found that there is a need to contain parallelism. Furthermore, critics pointed out that there may be a good proportion of computations are not required and thus wasted. A good example would be the IF-
If the evaluation is eager, it is possible that $2n+1$ computations (at most $n$ execution to evaluate the boolean guards and $1$ computation to evaluate the function chosen.) In BIDDLE we will prioritize the computations as follows. We assign priorities to the boolean guards, $B_1, B_2, ..., B_n$ such that $B_i$ has a higher priority than $B_{i+1}$, while each $F_i$ has a lower priority than its guard. Thus lower numbered guards are likely to be evaluated before higher numbered ones and all the guards will be evaluated before the functions. Depending on the workload of the system, one or more guards will be in concurrent execution. When a guard, say, $B_i$, evaluates to true, its functional part, $F_i$, will be given an increment in priority while the functions, $B_{i+1}, F_{i+1}, B_{i+2},$ etc, will be purged. (The detailed implementation will be discussed later.) If, on the other hand, the system is so free that it can accommodate all $2n+1$ computations, then all will be executed, though eventually only one $F$ will be used. Suppose $F_i$ is evaluated because of this but it was found that its guard evaluated to false. BIDDLE provide us with the mechanism to eliminate the entire tree rooted at $F_i$, thus terminating $F_i$ as soon as it is found to be useless.

The flowing of purge and priority adjustment signals results in bidirectional data flow. There is a demand for computation in one direction, producing a result data flow in the opposite direction, as well as a demand for purge/priority adjustment, resulting in the elimination of execution subtrees. To achieve this, object instructions contains parent and child pointers until they are executed. When data are received from child instructions, child pointers are replaced by data or data pointers, while child instructions are purged.

4. Handling Globals and Side Effects

BIDDLE incorporates an object store which stores and manages global and temporary objects, specifically lists. The two differ only in their scope of usage and to the hardware of the object store they are to be handled in the same way. The object store manager will therefore be responsible for allocating, deallocating and accessing lists. Each dispatched instruction comes to the object store manager to have its object identifiers translated into physical memory addresses, while any space allocation/deallocation required to complete the instruction execution will also be performed. Of course, this runs the risk that there might be too much work for the object store manager thus causing it to be a bottleneck. A distributed storage system may be a possible solution, though this will complicate control.

The use of globals and side effects is a common practice in programming. Although this has been criticized to be highly undesirable, we believe that with discipline these can be used effectively to improve efficiency and code readability. We feel that the controlled use of globals is still valuable to software development. In fact, this was realized early in the several dataflow projects and subsequently, structure stores of one sort or another has been incorporated into these designs. However, their usage is restricted by the single assignment rule [1] which says that a data item may be read many times but written only once in its lifetime. The single assignment rule gives most high level dataflow languages a imperative language flavour, which is not quite to the taste of the purists.
Since the target language of BIDDE is Lisp and pure functional Lisp is rarely used nowadays, it has to have the ability to manage globals, most commonly resulting from the SETQ Lisp construct. The biggest problem with side effects is that the semantics of Lisp determines the result. Since Lisp's semantics is sequential in nature, it is necessary to schedule instruction firing so as not to violate the semantics. A method to overcome it has been proposed.

Before describing the methods, we must return to the notion of the execution tree, which was introduced informally in section 2. An execution tree is a (binary) tree whose nodes correspond to independent computations and edges corresponding to data flow. We now augment the execution tree with the addition requirement that it be ordered in the sense that if there is data dependency between the computations then computation of the left subtree of a node must precede that of the right subtree which in turn precede that of the node. The aim of this requirement is to provide a way to express the sequential semantics of Lisp. It is necessary to keep the tree binary so as to fix the format of the packets. The overhead involved in this "binarization" is the introduction of additional nodes and greater height of the tree.

BIDDE considers the whole set of named variables used in a Lisp task as a collection of Environment Objects, which are "sent" from instruction to instruction in the precedence sequence specified in the source program. Each BIDDE instruction in the instruction store contains an Environment Access Control Field (EACF) with four possible values: 00(no environment access permitted), 10(access offered to left child), 01(access offered to right child), and 11(access). When a new EVAL on a Lisp program is sent to the instruction store and assigned a instruction location, the EACF of that location is set to 10, since the root instruction must first offer the access rights to its left child, which is still to be created. After the EVAL goes to the dispatcher and gets executed, the object instruction returns to the instruction store, accompanied possibly by child EVAL instructions. If there is a left child EVAL, then the location assigned to it would have 10 as its EACF and the process continues recursively. The EACF of the right child, and all its descendants, will be set to 00, since the right to access the environment is still held in the left branch.

If it turns out that there is no left child but there is a right child EVAL, then the EACF of the parent changes from 10 to 01 and that of the child is set to 10. Again the process is recursively continued.

However, for either child, the execution of EVAL on it may reveal that it is the root of a module requiring no external environment access. There is no need to offer external environment access to individual instructions in the module. To prevent such unnecessary processing, we would do the following: When an EVAL execution returns an object instruction starting such a module to the instruction store, the instruction store manager will set the No Global Access Flag (NGAF) of the instruction. It initiates a separate environment access analysis for the local environment which starts of the module. When the instruction store manager performs its search for EACF = 00 instructions, any encounter with an instruction with a set NGAF would cause it to stop further depth search(i.e., no need to enter this module) and move the search to another branch. That is, the above described search process would be changed to:

**SEARCH:**

- a. If the child itself has a left child, then set EACF=10 and move to the new child instruction and start a new search;
- b. If there is no left child but there is a right child, change EACF of current instruction to 01 and start new search from right child;
- c. If there is neither left nor right child, change EACF of current instruction to 11.

During the EACF updating process one may encounter an instruction which is the root of a module requiring no external environment access. There is no need to offer external environment access to individual instructions in the module. To prevent such unnecessary processing, we would do the following: When an EVAL execution returns an object instruction starting such a module to the instruction store, the instruction store manager will set the No Global Access Flag (NGAF) of the instruction. It initiates a separate environment access analysis for the local environment which starts of the module. When the instruction store manager performs its search for EACF = 00 instructions, any encounter with an instruction with a set NGAF would cause it to stop further depth search(i.e., no need to enter this module) and move the search to another branch. That is, the above described search process would be changed to:

**SEARCH:**

- a. If the child itself has a left child, and its NGAF = 0, then set EACF = 10 and move to the new child instruction and start a new search;
- b. If there is no left child or if the left child has NGAF ≠ 0, then change EACF of current instruction to 01 and start search from right child;
- c. If there is also no right child, or its NGAF ≠ 0, then change EACF of current instruction to 11.

After the instruction store manager updates the EACF of an instruction to 11, the instruction is free to access environment variables using any variable addresses stored in the instruction. However, if the instruction store manager checks the instruction itself, it may turn out that neither of the instruction's two data/child address fields contains a variable address referring to either the global or the local environment. Thus, it does not need to use the right of access, which can be passed up to its parent. If the current instruction is the left child, the parent EACF should be 10, which is updated to 01, starting the offer to the right described above. If the current instruction is the right child, the parent EACF should be 01, which is updated to 11, to start a check on its data/child address fields and possibly a new move upwards.

A child instruction that does require global access would return the access right to its parent only after execution.

---

\[\text{Dataflow programs, on the other hand, use the dataflow graph.}\]

Because such programs are side-effect free, there is no ordering requirement, in which case a graph is favoured for its brevity. Demand-driven programs, on the other hand is initially represented by a tree. With the use of supercombinators to achieve laziness, the tree is quickly transformed into a graph as well.
Hence, the arrival of a data token from the left child at an instruction with EACF=10 would change its EACF to 01, and start the process of offering access to the right child. The arrival of a right token at an instruction with EACF = 01 would change the EACF to 11, and start the process of returning access to the parent. Thus, the above listed steps can be triggered off by either a token arrival, or by the return of an object instruction which is the root of a non-global accessing module, depending on what value is in the EACF of its instruction location.

Note that a non-global accessing module may nevertheless change internal variables (function arguments) of its own. Thus, while there is no need to perform external environment access analysis on this module, the offer of global access right from the parent will still start an internal environment access control process, by setting the EACF of its root instruction to 10 and transmitting this downward to child instructions. This will go on in parallel with environment access control analysis outside the module. Hence, having modules with no side effect in the source code will help to speed up analysis and therefore also execution.

Further, it is possible that a module has neither global variable accesses nor changes to internal variables. For such a module, all its instructions may have EACF=11 as soon as the parent offers it environment access right, i.e., when an attempt is made to turn the EACF of the root instruction to 10. This may be termed the rapid inheritance of environment access.

The BIDDLE user interface may require all source programs to carry annotation indicating whether a module has global variable accesses and whether it defines or uses global variables. Alternatively, a preprocessor in the source code may analyse the source code as it is entered into the object store and produce such annotations on the code. This information is carried into the object store. The execution of an EVAL instruction on such a module would cause the information to be checked and used to set the NGAF and NCVF (No Change to Variables Flag) of the root instruction.

A module with NGAF=1 would have an independent environment access analysis, so that the access right offered by the parent is immediately returned. A module with NCVF set would set EACF of all child instructions as soon as the access rights come from above.

In actual implementation, the two EACF bits and the NGAF/NCVF flags need not be separately provided for but can use the same bits of an instruction word, since the latter are needed only once or twice during an analysis.

When the object instruction produced by an EVAL instruction, with NGAF and NCVF bits, arrives at the instruction store, the EACF of its location may be 00 (no access right offered from parent) or 10 (offer already waiting). In the former, if NGAF=0, then the EACF are used to store the NGAF/NCVF bits and the module waits for the rights to be offered before starting its environment access analysis. However, if NGAF=1, then local environment analysis starts immediately. The current instruction's child EVAL instructions are given their EACF values (left 00, right 10). Further, if the current object instruction has NGAF = 1, the parent EACF is updated from 10 to 01 or from 01 to 11 depending on whether the object instruction is the left or right child. If NGAF ≠ 1, the parent EACF is updated only after its child instructions have executed. However, if the object instruction has both NGAF and NCVF = 1, then both its child instructions would receive EACF = 11 and this is propagated downwards to all descendants. The decision taken at the instruction store can be summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGAF</th>
<th>NCVF</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Perform global analysis if EACF of the instruction is 10. Any local access is also taken care of in the process. If EACF = 00, wait for parent to set EACF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No analysis needed, but must hold permission till all the children have executed due to possible read accesses by children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local analysis starts immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No analysis needed at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Handling COND

The problem of the COND statement has been discussed in section 3. Briefly, it gives rise to too much unnecessary work too quickly. Another problem with the COND statement is that both the boolean guards as well as the functional parts may affect the global environment. The first problem is handled by the priority scheme discussed in section 3, while the latter is handled by the EACF scheme described above. The details (left out in the discussion in section 3) will now be described. For the description, we refer the reader back to the example in section 2.

From Figure 2, notice that there are two special packet types, BOR and CG, which stands for Biased OR and Conditional Guard, respectively. The CG instruction will hold the right token if it arrives before the left token. If its guard (its left child), evaluates to true, the CG instruction will send a priority increment token to its right branch thus hastening its execution. At the same time it will send a purge token to its parent (a BOR), telling it to purge its right child. Later, when its right child of the CG instruction returns a result, it will return it straight to its parent. However, if the guard evaluates to false, it will send a purge token to its right child (thus terminating its existence) if the latter has not yet execute and sent it result or discard the result if it is already in. At the same time it will send a priority decrement token to its parent, informing the parent that it has failed and to hasten the execution of its sibling.

The BOR instruction, too, will hold its right token until the result from its left arrives. If it receives a purge token from its left child, it will send the purge token to its right and then waits for result from its left which it will relay to its parent. If it receives a priority increment token from its left child, it will send it to its right child if it has not yet execute and waits for result from its right. If the result from the right is already present, it is passed to the parent.

In the Fibonacci example (see Figure 3), the entire graph is global free, so we can safely expand the EVAL nodes 8 and 10, which spawn their own subtrees (in parallel), but
will eventually yield a single result to send to its parent. Now, nodes 3, 5, 9 and 11 can execute in parallel without any mutual interference. However, the priority scheme will give node 3 preference for execution followed by node 5, 9 and 11 in that order. Suppose node 3 evaluates to true, it will generate a purge token to its parent (node 2) and a increase priority token to its right sibling (in this case, there is no right sibling node). Node 2 will pass the purge token to node 1 who relays it to node 6, effectively purging the entire right subtree of node 1. The result, 1, will then be passed up to node 1 who relays it to the parent of the original EVAL node. Note that because the tree is right biased, even if node 6 also evaluates to true, it can only purge the right subtree of node 6, while node 3 purges the right subtree of node 1, which includes node 6. The result therefore, resolve purges in favour of the left, which semantically precede the rest.

6. Space Requirements in BIDDLE

BIDDLE is a compile-and-execute machine. Its instructions are generally not reusable. This is because as soon as an instruction has completed its execution, it is purged. Furthermore, the various pointers that are needed can only be allocated at run time. The main advantage of this is that there is no need to keep any form of context information. Such context information are required by the dynamic dataflow architecture. In its parent (node 2) and a increase priority token to its right sibling, there is a static piece of reusable code (represented by a dataflow graph) through which data tokens will flow. In order to allow more than one data token on a particular edge in the dataflow graph, tokens from different activations must be distinguished. This gives rise to the tagged token dataflow model in which data token are tagged. [4] In BIDDLE, we forego the tags (which are quite sizable) in favour of dynamically creating all the instructions a particular execution will thread. By reducing the size of data packets, we have also reduced the communication cost associated with it.

What about the space efficiency of the instruction store? The instruction store will have to be larger than it was in the tagged token architecture's case. We argue that while it is certainly true that we will need a larger instruction store, it is not true that this space is not used efficiently. Firstly, as instructions are erased immediately after they are send for execution, space can be reused for new ones. Secondly, if an object program is meant to be reused, it will have to be compiled out for all possible execution. However, only one execution path exist. There is therefore inefficiency in the "compile everything once and for all" approach. This is especially true for the case of the generalized COND statement discussed earlier. Furthermore, we note that the actual compilation process is relatively simple. This means that recompilation is a relatively cheap process.

Now consider iterations which certainly require repeated execution with data sent many times round the same piece of code. In BIDDLE, we do not support iterations in the form of the DO statement in Common Lisp. Instead, we support the MAPCAR construct which we thought was more in line with the original spirit of Lisp. The processing of MAPCAR is shown in Figure 4.

In compiling MAPCAR, we need a new multioperand instruction, the ASSEM. Its purpose is to collect the results of the various calls on F unwound from the original MAPCAR call. In the figure, the pseudo-machine code is given to represent the execution tree. The number before the colon identifies the instruction. The items after the colon but before the instruction and its operand(s) while the number after the "->" identifies the destination. The ASSEM instruction introduces a new problem. The problem is that it is not possible to store all the child addresses individually in the ASSEM instruction. Instead, the instructions are all stored in a fixed order in a contiguous block of memory. The ASSEM instruction merely stores the number of children that it has. When it is purged or its priority is increased, the adjacent child instructions' priority will also be similarly altered.

As is already well known, loops can be generalized into recursions. However, in traditional imperative languages, recursion is more expensive than loops in term of the space requirement. This is due to the need to save up the entire environment up till the point of the next recursion call. Functional programming, which is side effect free, encourages recursion since there would be no space cost as there is no local environment to save. Lisp, however, is more in line with the former than the latter. In fact, most Lisp machines are stack machines of one form or another [16]. This was because a hardware implemented stack would aid in the implementation of recursion. BIDDLE, however, is not a stack machine. What is done in BIDDLE is that each recursion has a separate copy of code associated with it. This is also called the code copying approach [18]. Now the memory requirement of recursion is shifted to the instruction store. Each copy of the code requires memory which is allocated with the instruction store manager.

In the code copying approach, we cannot reduce the memory required by the codes by insisting on maintaining a single copy of the code. This is because data (in the form of arguments and pointers) are integrated into the code. Therefore, each "copy" of the code is in fact different from each other with respect to the data embedded in it. What we may be able to reduce, however, is the amount of compilation necessary to produce the same code. However, we argue that this is not worth the efforts. Firstly, compilation is a fairly straightforward process and it appears from currently available analysis that compilation will not be too time demanding. Secondly, even assuming that some form of template is produced and stored up, we still need to perform work to fill in the data required to activate the computations involved. Compared to compilation, we think that this work is as substantial and has to be performed by something no less than
7. Handling List Operations

List operations are crucial in Lisp. As such, there have been a lot of work on supporting list operations efficiently. In BIDDLF, lists, regardless of whether they are global or temporary, are stored in the object store managed by the object store manager. Each processing elements, on the other hand, will have a certain amount of local memory to work with. To make thing transparent, the local memory is made to work like a cache extension of the object store. When a dispatched instruction arrives at the object store manager and requests for memory for a list, the object store manager will clear the local memory controller will liaise with the object store manager as to write-back its content to the object store and unlock that piece of memory for others to use. An improvement of memory access can be exploited by sending instructions accessing the same object to the same PE. Chances are that this PE will still have the object in its local memory. Thus all that is required to start work would be the acquisition of a lock on the same object in the global store. The memory transfers involved can then be minimized.

8. Discussion

In recent years, many major dataflow [19] and reduction architecture [20] projects have been launched. However, these either use side-effect free [11] or single assignment languages. BINNER's original influence came from the Manchester project [10]. Lisp machines have been around for quite some time following the pioneering work done at MIT [7][6]. There are also data driven Lisp machine, most notably the Japanese projects[21][3]. However, these mainly concentrate on the pure subset of Lisp, most notably the Japanese projects[21][3]. However, these mainly concentrate on the pure subset of Lisp. An early paper on did claim to have made headway in handling SETQ and other constructs, but no details were available [14]. The idea of direct execution of Lisp has also been around for quite some time but these works were done in the 70's and there were no particular attention paid to parallelism [17]. Perhaps the least explored idea is that of process cancellation. Only a handful of ideas exist in this area [13]. The idea of the use of priority in the scheduling of task was also mentioned in conjunction with the control of AND and OR parallelism [8].

As far as we know, the ideas of combining a list store with Lisp source programs, direct execution by dynamically generating dataflow instructions that subsequently return to the PEs for execution, and managing eager/lazy execution through prioritized and purgeable instructions have not been attempted before, though the roots of these can be traced to others.

In summary, we have proposed BIDDLF, a direct execution architecture for Lisp based on both data and demand driven principles. We have used a priority queuing mechanism to control the parallelism and the workload of the PEs. We have also introduced a novel mechanism where by the sequential semantics of Lisp can be enforced in such a way so as not to reduce the parallelism too drastically. BIDDLF is, therefore, aimed at balancing between eager and lazy evaluation, sequential semantics and parallelism.

At present BIDDLF exists only on paper and it is a long way from hardware implementation. However, we think that there is sufficient new yet practical ideas in BIDDLF to be excited about, and we certainly foresee that shortly, we will be able to produce a emulated prototype of BIDDLF to demonstrate that the design principles are indeed sound and workable.
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