



The joke was entirely Simon Cozens' fault^Wresponsibility



VM == fake hardware. This isn't anything new, we've been doing it for decades.



Like async I/O, threads, event handling, large files...



The closer your implementation platform is to what you're implementing, the easier it is and the less 'friction' there is between layers. Sometimes adding a thunking layer is enough to make things a lot easier.

This is not unlike electronics, where you really want to match the impedence of circuitry.



It's a lot easier to present a single known interface and have each platform twiddle the bits they need to to implement that interface. Threads and async I/O are two big examples of that.

Building events and objects into the underlying platform (at least as far as the languages that use it are concerned) make language implementation easier and facilitates interoperability between routines in different languages.





ISS is the international space station, for those who don't know. (It ought to be 10K kilometers, really. Give or take a bit)



AppleWorks doesn't have arrows, but the structure's still reasonably clear. The connection to frozen bytecode's two ways--the optimizer and interpreter can either freeze it or load it





This is a combination of tokenizing and parsing, but parrot's regex engine (courtesy of the steroids recently introduced into Perl's regexes) can act as a parser as well as just a regex engine.



Makes swapping in new languages on the fly a lot easier. Also makes temporarily enhancing or overrriding parts of an existing language easier.

This is how lexically-overridden operators will be done--if + should be - for *all* operations in a block, this is where you'd do it. (If you're overriding only for a single class, that'd be done elsewhere, in the class vtable)



The PTx entries are temp PMC locations that the register coloring algorithm will later allocate to real PMC registers. (And we do have a register coloring algorithm now)



This is the place that the tree that the parser built up is transformed into bytecode. Definitely very well traveled ground.

It'll probably look different than this does, this is just an example to give a feel for what you might do.

Parrot in detail

15



Optimizing is... interesting. Alas, many of the languages that Parrot is well suited for are horrid to optimize, as we'll see.



Perl, generally, is almost impossible to optimize. (But you already knew that) I generally make it a point to note that, while as a language *implementor* it's a pain, as a language *user* I really like the features that make it tough to optimize.

Optimization (really de-pessimization, but who's quibbling?) is really cheating, and we can only cheat when we know nobody can look. That's not too often, alas.



And the answer's potentially never, of course. If x is tied, overloaded, or otherwise active we can't do this.



I make this point because the interpreter part of the picture may not interpret anything. The next slide points out what might happen



Needless to say, "Damian!" is the first thing that someone pipes up when I hit the final point. :)



And now on to the details of the pieces



It seems so innocuous... If this were a CPU diagram there'd be active components here, like ALUs and FPUs. We don't really have that.



An interesting side note--because we have such a huge range of opcode numbers, and because we have the capability to load in opcode functions as we choose, and because the bytecode loader may do a transform and is pluggable, we can run JVM and .NET code directly.



Error checking's not here, of course. It should be, but it's removed for simplicity and slide space.



The core's not 100% flexible--the core ops are fixed. Most everything else can be overridden, though.



Parrot *will* be able to run z machine games by the time we release, dammit!. I have the data files for Lurking Horror, and I'm not afraid to use them!



Note that the int, string, and float registers are mostly for internal use.



Yes, we have stacks, gobs and gobs of stacks.

Strings	
String Data Length Flags Encoding Character Set Locale	
Parrot in detail	29

There's actually a bit more to strings, since we do COW for strings and substrings, but this is it.

Locale's sort of "language string came from" when we know it. We need this for proper string sorting--different languages sort differently. "ll" or an accented vowel sort differently depending on the language/locale the string came from.

I usually make it a point to point out that software should bow to people, not the other way around. I find it rather repulsive that people will change the rules of their language to match the limitations of a computer program.



While Perl 6 may be unicode all the way, Parrot is *not*. It doesn't give a rip, really, and won't. There's no real reason why it should, ultimately. We've a slight bias towards unicode as a fallback, but unicode conversion's lossy.

PMCs	
Vtable Pointer Flags	
Data pointer Cache data Svoc	
GC data	
Parrot in detail	31

Kinda small, isn't it?



And yet still faster than perl 5. Go figure. :)

Because of this architecture you pay for fancy features when accessing the data that uses it, not the operators that might be overridden. Perl 5 checks every variable for magic or tying on every access, and checks every variable to see if it overloads an operator every time it performs an operation. Yech. Much wasted time, there.



PMCs are both wonderfully complex and nicely simplifying. They let us punt on most variable actions and let the variable decide what to do, which is what really should be done. We can have more special-case straight-line code that way.



The third point's important. Branches are *expensive* on most processors these days, and each test's a branch. Removing the tests speeds things up a lot.

Vtables

• Some example functions name type clone get_(integer | float | string | value) set_(integer | float | string | value) add, subtract, multiply, divide call method GC special methods

Parrot in detail

35



The engine cares remarkably little about whether a PMC is an aggregate or not.



The structure may change, I'm not sure. Doing it this way means we can have true multidimensional arrays/hashes/whatever.



The potentially interesting tied behaviour is being able to tell whether you're calling @pid[\$\$]{time} or @pid[\$\$]{time}{user}, in case you care.



Means that aggregate PMCs can do something interesting when treated as a single thing. Matrix math, say.



But they don't resume, which is probably for the best. Allowing resumable exceptions is a major pain.



Yes, exceptions will carry the language that was in effect when they were thrown.



We generally use longjmp for exception throwing. We do a setjmp outside the runloop (returning 0 exits the runloop, hence that is an exception too) and just let it sit until we need it.



Memory allocation's a major waste of time. In more than one sense.







Circular references are OK now--we find those. And no, there's no guarantee of destruct order for objects with an active destructor. The destruction phase can be overridden if you want to impose some sort of order, but that's tricky.



A bit restrictive, but it makes things easier. And easier tends to be faster. Besides, it's less work to lift what turns out to be an onerous restriction than to put a restriction in place after the fact.



Since we've mutable strings, the third point is often very true for perl.



Layering synchrony on an asynchronous system's easy. Layering asynchrony on a synchronous system's a major pain in the neck.

The last point usually gets applause from folks who've had it inflicted on them for any length of time.



Yes, very Tcl-ish.



Or any number of things. Heck, you could treat an IO stream as just a black box data morpher if you so chose.



Generally people have no idea what continuations are, or if they do it hurts to remember.



You don't realize how nice standard calling conventions are until you don't have them. There's nothing worse than having, say, three different Fortran compilers for the same system that generate completely incompatible object files because their calling conventions are all different.

The ovals are variables and the squares are interpreters.

In the second and third diagrams, the interpreters are in separate threads and run independently. The data shared in the middle is automatically locked on access.

In the first example, the interpreters share everything, and only one runs at once to avoid stepping on toes. Generally good for coroutines and such.

And more coming, of course. The BASIC interpreter runs eliza and hunt the wumpus.

The Mono folks have closed the gap a bit, and we've not benchmarked Microsoft's .NET because we don't have any hardware to do it on properly. (Simulations indicate Mono runs at about half the speed of MS' implementation, but I don't quote simulation numbers)