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Abstract

This report describes the design of a Prolog machine organization implementing D. Warren's architecture [7]. The objective was to determine the maximum performance attainable by a sequential Prolog machine for "reasonable" cost. The report compares the organization to both general-purpose, microcoded machines and reduced-instruction-set machines. Hand timings indicate that a peak performance rate of 450 K LIPS (logical inferences per second) is well within current technology limitations and 1 M LIPS is potentially feasible.
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1. Introduction

Japan’s Fifth Generation Computer Systems project [2] aims to build highly parallel logical inference machines with prodigious performance, by exploiting advanced circuit technology, and by pursuing research into non-von Neumann architectures. The target is a performance of 100-1000 M LIPS (logical inferences per second).

To attain such a performance, it will be necessary to exploit large-scale parallelism in logic programs, of which the main kinds are AND parallelism (where several goals in a clause are executed concurrently) and OR parallelism (where several clauses matching a goal are processed concurrently). However, it remains to be seen whether practical logic programs have enough large-scale parallelism to enable such ambitious performance targets to be achieved. Certainly, there are important examples of logic programs that do not have any inherent large-scale parallelism, e.g., simple list concatenation.

From a machine design standpoint, the problem is analogous to the classical argument between advocates of vector machines and advocates of fast scalar machines in the numerical computation environment. To attain very high performance, a vector capability is necessary; however, performance is bottlenecked by scalar performance. Similarly, to attain very high performance in logical inference machines, inherent parallelism must be exploited; however, performance will be bottlenecked by the speed of sequential inference.

In view of these concerns it is important to investigate the maximum performance that can be achieved by a sequential Prolog machine, where only small-scale parallelism (invisible to the programmer) is exploited. It is also generally agreed that systems relying on radical departures in both hardware and software technology usually achieve less than what is expected. For this reason, conventional pipelining methods are used to achieve high performance.

Although the processor model discussed here is sequential, the architecture is structured to permit exploitation of unification parallelism, by allowing implementations with multiple execution units. AND and OR parallelism can also be successfully implemented around this machine model in a tightly coupled multiprocessor system, of say 8 to 16 processors, attaining very high performance.
This report describes the design of a Prolog machine organization implementing D. Warren's architecture [7]. The objective was to determine the maximum performance attainable by a sequential Prolog machine for "reasonable" cost. A compiler is used to produce object programs in a high-level, stack-oriented instruction set. As with most high-level language processors, e.g. ICOT's PSI [3] and the Symbolics 3600 Lisp Machine [5], the organization is centered around a micro-controller because of the complex nature of the instruction set. In this design, the following criteria are stressed:

- A lean cycle, i.e. the hardware is partitioned to minimize the number of logic levels between latches in the datapath.

- Issue one microinstruction per cycle if interlocks allow.

The cost of expanding the high-level machine instructions into microsequences is offset by overlapping the microinstructions in a pipelined execution unit. Memory accesses are also overlapped by use of an interleaved memory. This allows the optimal use of slow memory, which is more cost-effective for the large physical memories required by symbolic processing applications. Such a consideration is especially important because memory references tend to be more random than in numerical processing, so that caching data is less effective.

The report falls broadly into three parts. The first part describes the machine organization. The second part presents preliminary results in the form of hand timings. In the last part conclusions are drawn and future work is summarized. Refer throughout this report to Warren [7] for details of the Prolog machine architecture.
2. Organization

The model described is a single-user, single-pipeline Prolog processor. The memory system, instruction and execution units (I-Unit and E-Unit(s)) and $\mu$controller are discussed in this report. Systems issues, e.g. interrupt handling, are not discussed. The model description will set the stage for an answer to the following question (see Conclusions):

*Instead of designing a special-purpose processor, why not emulate the instruction set on a general-purpose $\mu$coded machine, e.g. Symbolics S600, or compile it onto a reduced instruction set machine, e.g. IBM 801 [4]?*

A summary of the design evolution is given at the end of this chapter. It is helpful in keeping subtle and interrelated design decisions in perspective, but cannot be discussed until terms are defined.

2.1 Memory

The memory model is an interleaved memory with a four cycle access. Because memory accesses are overlapped, access time is not a critical parameter in the processor model. For a single E-Unit, first-come-first-served (FCFS) module queues prevent the possibility of read-write, write-read and write-write races; (extension to multiple E-Units will require a more complex solution).

The model can be extended to include a cache in front of memory or in the I-Unit only. If the locality of heap references is minimal, the cache is better used for instructions only, especially in a multiple E-Unit system.

2.2 E-Unit

The basic datapaths of the E-Unit (*figure 1*) form a three stage pipeline:

- C stage - Array access of the stack buffer, register file, trail buffer and control counters, latching results into the temporary registers ($T,T_1$) and push-down list (PDL).

- E stage - arithmetic-logic unit (ALU) execution, latching results into the result register ($R$), memory address register (MAR) and memory data register (MDR).
• P stage - Put-away into C stage arrays.

2.2.1 Micromachine

Many of the high-level Prolog machine instructions make an arbitrary number of passes through the execution pipe. Controlling such complex sequences while minimizing pipeline breaks is well suited for data-stationary μcode [1]. The μcontroller (figure 2) function is to supply the execution pipe with μinstructions of the form:

| C.E.P control | locks to set | branch control | branch address |

Thus each μinstruction contains control information for a single pass through the pipe. A μinstruction is joined with the machine instruction operand to form a control word. Control words are latched in a series of control registers, one per stage (figure 3). At each stage, the control word is checked against resource locks. A control word can proceed to the next stage if no required resources are locked and subsequent control words can proceed. If the control word cannot proceed, constituting a pipeline break, the result of stage execution is not latched. Resource locks, as indicated in the μinstruction, are initially set when the control word first enters the pipe.

The I-Unit delivers the initial μinstruction address of the μsequence corresponding to each machine instruction. These are queued in the E-Unit. The model assumes distinct μsequences for instructions executed in read and write modes. Because the μinstructions are overlapped, the mode may be selected after subsequent μsequence addresses have been queued. Therefore either the I-Unit must deliver two alternative μaddresses (corresponding to the two modes) from which the E-Unit selects one, or else alternative μsequences are allocated on sufficient boundaries in the μstore to allow concatenating the mode to a single μaddress to form the correct μaddress.

The μstore is a two port read-only memory (ROM) permitting access to the next sequential μinstruction and the target μinstruction indicated by the branch address field of the current μinstruction. The type of μcontrol transfer is indicated by the branch control field. The controller supports μroutine call, return, unconditional branch, conditional branch, dispatch next machine instruction and n-way branch (via a μaddress ROM). The controller can dispatch a new machine instruction every cycle (if the I-Unit can supply them) by virtue of a bypass around the μaddress queue. A conditional
branch can be resolved by a logic signal produced early in the cycle, selecting the correct \( \mu \)instruction late in the cycle. For branch conditions generated too late in the cycle, e.g., by arithmetic comparison, an extra cycle is taken, keeping the cycle lean.

2.2.2 Tag Definition

As with other tagged architecture machines, careful consideration must be given to defining an extensive, but not excessive, set of tags. The tag encoding must permit quick decoding for determining object type, a criterion directly related to the critical path of the \( \mu \)controller because conditional branches can be resolved by condition codes set by tag decoding. A benefit of the tagged architecture is the ability to introduce hardware type checking in the Prolog engine.

Associated with each object in the machine is a 5-8 bit tag. This simplifies testing data objects in unification and testing procedure objects in clause indexing. Most objects are one word in length (32 bits) not including the tag. Longer objects, e.g., lists, structures, and real numbers, are composed of more than one word. Lists are a special type of structure with an implied arity of two. Structures and lists look like:

```
STRUCTURE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pointer to</th>
<th>functor</th>
<th>--------- &gt;</th>
<th>functor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
LIST:

The tags are organized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tag</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>object contains:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000000</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>its own address (<em>variable reference</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011000</td>
<td>reference</td>
<td>address of another object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000</td>
<td>atom</td>
<td>identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010001</td>
<td>integer</td>
<td>integer value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010010</td>
<td>real</td>
<td>exponent value (immediately following is: manissa value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010011</td>
<td>structure ptr</td>
<td>address of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010100</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td>functor identifier (immediately following are: arity (N) first argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>second argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nth argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010101</td>
<td>list ptr</td>
<td>address of list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>instruction</td>
<td>code (remaining tag bits are opcode?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first tag bit represents data or program. The second tag bit indicates if the object is bound or unbound. The third bit indicates if the object is a reference to another object. The last bits distinguish between nonreference objects. This is confusing because a structure pointer is considered a "nonreference" object, even though it refers to a structure. Reference objects are the stuff with which the unification algorithm glues
together nonreference objects. Thus it makes no sense to have a list-reference object, but a list pointer object is needed.

Consider the following example. State 1 contains two unbound variables. State 2 depicts the binding of the first variable to a list. State 3 depicts the binding of the second variable to the first (bound) variable. The second variable becomes a reference, not a list pointer, otherwise it would represent the wrong structure.

1. variable variable
2. list variable
   |
   |
   integer
   list
   |
   |
   variable
   atom

3. list<-----reference
   |
   |
   integer
   list
   |
   |
   variable
   atom

The first three tag bits are kept in decoded form to permit fast testing in hardware. If there are less than 128 opcodes, then the remaining tag bits for instruction objects can be used for the opcodes. This organization also permits the extension of type checking of unbound variables and reference pointers. For instance, list-variables can be created by the compiler with tag=00101. During runtime, binding of such a list-variable to anything other than a list pointer causes an error interrupt. A list-reference with tag=01101 is then needed to bind a list-variable to a list pointer object (as in above example). Other unbound variables to be bound to the same reference chain compare their list-variable tags with the list-reference tag during runtime type checking.

In the dereferencing algorithm (see Appendix I), it is essential that the reference and
variable tags are mutually exclusive because only the reference tag is checked. If all variables were also considered references, then dereferencing would loop forever when it hit a leaf variable.

An object, once loaded into a temporary register, exists in two places: that register and the stack where it permanently resides. This means that a variable reference in a temporary register is like a nonvariable reference to a variable (reference). For this reason, whenever an object of tag "variable" is loaded into a temporary register, its tag is changed to "reference." The object in the temporary register will be referred to as "a reference to a variable."

\[
\text{nonreference} \\
\begin{array}{c}
T: \begin{array}{c}
123 \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
\quad \text{simple case} \\
\quad \text{atom, integer, etc.}
\]

\[
\text{nonvariable reference} \\
\begin{array}{c}
T: \begin{array}{c}
Y \\
\hline
\end{array} \text{----------} \begin{array}{c}
123 \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
\quad \text{still simple} \\
\quad Y \text{ is a bound variable}
\]

\[
\text{"nonvariable reference"} \quad \text{variable reference} \\
\begin{array}{c}
T: \begin{array}{c}
X \\
\hline
\end{array} \text{----------} \begin{array}{c}
X \\
\hline
\end{array} \text{-->} \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
\quad \text{confusing} \\
\quad X \text{ is an unbound variable} \\
\quad X's \text{ tag in } T \text{ is changed from variable to reference.}
\]

### 2.2.3 Datapaths

The E-Unit datapath includes a stack buffer, general register file, trail buffer and PDL. The trail buffer is used to cache the trail stack segment, and is not strictly necessary. The PDL is used during unification. Both arrays are first-in-last-out stacks which are burst to memory when they fill up. A multiple E-Unit organization refers to multiple pipes, each with its own μcontroller and ALU, sharing a single I-Unit, stack buffer and register file.

The register file is modeled as a one input, one output array storing the temporary variables and procedure arguments. Control pointers are implemented in ad hoc
registers and counters. The \texttt{B}, \texttt{E} and \texttt{A} (top-of-stack) pointers are needed for managing the stack. The \texttt{S} and \texttt{H} pointers are kept in counters, reducing interlocks. The \texttt{P} and \texttt{CP} pointers require access from both the I-Unit and E-Unit(s).

The stack buffer caches the top of stack in a fast array. The stack holds two types of objects: environments and choice points. Each is arbitrary in length. An environment holds permanent variables, which are directly referenced. A choice point holds state pointers and goal arguments, which require nothing more than sequential referencing, but are accessed directly for design uniformity.

It is stipulated at present that, to avoid thrashing in the stack buffer, current environments not contained in the buffer must be copied onto the top of the stack from memory. This policy increases stack size in an effort to enforce locality of stack references. It also simplifies buffer management because all references are forced to map into the buffer.

Because the stack is a segment in the virtual address space, it is conceivable to reference the stack directly from memory. If a memory cache is needed anyway, e.g., for the heap and program, the stack reference penalty will be reduced. Such an organization does not differ greatly from a standard (scientific/numerical) processor [4]. However, in such a model, general-purpose register allocation puts a burden on the compiler whereas there is no register allocation, per se, for a specialized stack-buffer model. This problem worsens with multiple E-Units, which must lock portions of the stack. Setting and testing locks on word units is less expensive in a sequential stack buffer than in a set-associative cache.

Without a general-purpose cache, a specialized buffer is needed to decrease the stack reference penalty. The stack-buffer design we favor holds a sequential set of locations from the virtual stack segment. The buffer is managed explicitly by the \texttt{\mu}controller. A copy-back policy is instituted, i.e., updates are not immediately reflected in memory. All direct memory references interrogate the buffer and make updates if the virtual address falls between the bounds registers.

Stack references consist of an offset plus a base register. The offset is specified by machine instructions with a value. \texttt{\mu}instructions can specify a value or hardware counter (for use when reading and writing choice points). The base register is either the
E or B register. Because of the time critical nature of stack address generation, the number of buffer entries must be kept low. The generated address is guaranteed to fall within the valid buffer range by virtue of the following policy. When the *allocate* and *try* instructions update a base register to become the new top of the stack and that point is within a certain number of buffer entries from the lowest page, a copy-back is initiated. In the current model, a copy-back cannot proceed in parallel with E-Unit operation, i.e., the pipe is broken.

2.3 I-Unit

The primary function of the instruction unit is to supply instructions to the E-Unit(s). The I-Unit also processes certain control instructions directly from the instruction buffers in an effort to reduce the procedure call penalty.

The Prolog machine instruction set has no conditional branches, only procedure calls, which can match one of possibly several clauses. The main design criterion of the I-Unit is to compute clause addresses quickly. To this end, only *indexing on tag* (switch on term) is optimized. Control instructions detected and executed in the I-Unit are *prefetch* and *prefetch_continuation*. These instructions attempt to prefetch the next clause to be executed into the I-Unit. If the indexing method is not by tag, however, no prefetching is done.

*prefetch P* is generated by the compiler anywhere before the corresponding *jump* or *invoke* instruction. P is the address of a *switch on term* instruction having four operands defining a dispatch table. Each operand, a clause address, corresponds to a different type tag. If the clause has alternatives, they are explicitly defined by *try*, *retry* and *trust* instructions linking the alternatives. The *jump* instruction is generated by the compiler at the clause end, indicating that the instruction streams should be switched, i.e. it is an unconditional branch to a clause determined in the preceding *prefetch*.

The I-Unit services *prefetch P* by using the low-order bits of P to address a small *map cache* (*figure 4*). This cache holds a set of previously seen *switch on term* instructions. If the entry key matches P, the tag of register A1 (holding first argument of a procedure call) is used to select which clause is to be executed.
To allow synchronization between the I-Unit and E-Unit, there is a bit in the \( \mu \) instruction associated with the P stage. The bit indicates that the put-away should also be directed to the I-Unit (this complicates the datapaths given in figure 1). The architecture specifies that only an A1 register (holding the functor of the first argument) put-away stage should be used in conjunction with this bit; however the mechanism described is more general and powerful, allowing any A register (any argument) to be used for hashing.

The functor is latched into a dedicated register in the I-Unit and the register then becomes valid. This allows the placement of the \texttt{prefetch} anywhere in the stream. The I-Unit simply retries the mapping each cycle if the register is not yet valid. Note that this mechanism allows the compiler to use the A1 register to accumulate partial results and then transmit the complete result for hashing.

This scheme complicates the machine architecture, however. Each of several operations used to modify an A register must have two opcodes corresponding to the special \( \mu \) instruction bit. A compiler must recognize the final put-away of A1 and use the alternate opcode.

It may be sufficient, in the cases where A1 is used to accumulate partial results, for the compiler to simply *turn off* this optimization, i.e., not use prefetching. Thus an alternative scheme is to assume the compiler will never reload A1, and automatically direct the (single) A1 put-away to the I-Unit. This method requires no extra opcodes.

When the mapping is finally completed and the map entry does not match, the instruction cache is accessed for P. A suitable map cache entry is chosen for replacement by the returning \texttt{switch_on_term} instruction. Note the map operates under the principle that clause addresses exhibit locality, i.e., computation in a given time window repeatedly executes the same set of clauses. This is reasonable because of recursive looping. The map buffer can be considered a dynamic collection of *road maps* for various procedure invocations.

There are two interchangeable instruction buffers (FCFS queues) in the I-Unit. With each is associated a program counter. At any given time, one is marked *current* and the other *future.* The eventual clause address produced by the \texttt{prefetch} mapping is latched into the future program counter. This counter contends with the current
counter (and E-Unit(s)) for cache cycles, in an effort to fill up the future instruction buffer.

The jump instruction, also executed in the I-Unit, switches the buffers. In clauses requiring even moderate unification of procedure arguments, the I-Unit will be able to at least partially fill the future instruction buffer beneath normal E-Unit operation, if the cache holds the instructions. This gives a one cycle delay, needed to recognize the jump and switch I-buffers.

prefetch_continuation is similar to prefetch, but is used in unit clauses and has no operand. The CP register holds the address of a switch_on_term instruction. The invoke instruction is similar to jump, but stores the continuation address in the CP register. Both are executed in the I-Unit.

2.4 Summary

The machine design is the result of several iterations of both architecture and organization redefinition. The original architecture (goal-stacking) defined a "zero address" instruction set, i.e., an instruction got its operand (implicitly) from the stack. An organization model was developed, involving a stack buffer, and timings were done.

This architecture evolved into the environment stacking architecture, using a "single address" instruction set described in Warren [7]. The operand is specified explicitly in the instruction by a base register and offset, although address generation is more limited than in a conventional machine. The idea was to directly address the current environment on the stack. This permits multiple E-Units to operate concurrently with less interlocking than if all operands were implicit.

The organization model developed for the environment-stacking architecture gave timings similar to those of the goal-stacking architecture. This was due to model assumptions that the stack buffer could be accessed either explicitly or implicitly in one cycle.

The machine organization also evolved. Portions of the design are optional, such as the trail buffer and PDL. Removal of this hardware would involve relatively minor μcode modification. A major change involves increasing the number of temporary registers to three, by adding a TO register (placed between the {E, B, HE, TR} registers
and the ALU). This register speeds up certain instructions (e.g., \texttt{get\_list}) at the expense of increased complexity and cost of the datapaths.

The next evolutionary step for the organization is to go to multiple E-Unit pipelines. Each such pipeline contains a private ALU, PDL, and \{T, T1, MDR, MAR, R, S\} registers. All the pipelines share a common stack buffer, register file, and control registers (it may be necessary to increase the number of ports in each array). Each pipeline has its own \textmu controller. The I-Unit issues \textit{groups} of machine instructions to each pipe. A group contains the code unifying a single term or argument of the clause head or a goal in its body. Development of a multiple E-Unit model is a topic for future research (see \textit{Conclusions}).
3. Timing Results

Using the hardware model described, approximate µcode translations were written for the machine instruction set. Two simple Prolog programs were expanded from machine instructions to µcode traces. This chapter presents hand timings of those traces.

3.1 Determinate Concatenate

The first program trace is the determinate execution of `concatenate`:

```
concatenate([],L,L).
concatenate([X|L1],L2,[X|L3]) :- concatenate(L1,L2,L3).
```

Recall from [7] that `concatenate` translates into the following machine instructions:

```
concatenate/3: switch_on_term(C1a,C1,C2,fail)
C1a:       try_me_else C2a
  C1:     get_nil A1
           get_value A2,A3
          proceed

C2a:       trust_me_else fail
  C2:     get_list A1
           unify_variable X4
           unify_variable A1
           get_list A3
           unify_variable X4
           unify_variable A3
          execute concatenate/3
```

For instance, "?- concatenate([a,b],[c,d,e],X)." instantiates X to [a,b,c,d,e]. The timing considered here is based on the execution of "?- concatenate([a,b,c,...],[z],X)." To execute this goal, the following machine instructions are executed repeatedly.

```
prefetch            concatenate/3
get_list A1
unify_variable X4
unify_variable A1
get_list A3
unify_variable X4
unify_variable A3
```
jump

The second clause is always immediately chosen, i.e., no unification is attempted with the first clause, by virtue of indexing. The 8 machine instructions are dynamically expanded into 12 \( \mu \) instructions. The \( \mu \) code trace is given in Appendix II.

The timing diagram below has time, in machine cycles, running vertically and pipe stages running horizontally. The decode (D) stages, representing the \( \mu \) store access, are annotated with the \( \mu \) instruction number. The start of a \( \mu \) sequence is labeled with the corresponding machine instruction. Memory references are denoted by blank stages extending beyond the execution stage. Memory reads are followed four cycles later by a put-away stage.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>get_list A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>unify_variable X4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S REG DEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unify_variable A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>get_list A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MEMORY ACCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

It is assumed that the I-Unit can supply an aligned instruction to the E-Unit each cycle within the context of a single clause, i.e., instruction boundary problems are ignored. It
is assumed that the heap is not cached. jump and prefetch are not shown because they are removed from the instruction stream by the I-Unit. The timing indicates 8 instructions execute in 22 cycles, giving 2.8 cycles per instruction. If one procedure call is considered a single logical inference, the performance is 22 cycles per logical inference (CPLI).

The following table summarizes the frequency and total penalty of each type of break in determinate concatenate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>control reg. dependency</th>
<th># occurrences</th>
<th>penalty (cycles)</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memory read</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microcontrol</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macrocontrol</td>
<td>1 D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Microcontrol refers to delayed branch resolution due to arithmetic compares. Macrocontrol refers to jump delay. The control register dependency was due to an interlock on the S pointer.

3.2 Nondeterminate Concatenate

The second program trace is a list substring search requiring the nondeterminate execution of concatenate:

\[
\text{substring(Sub,Bef,Aft,Str) :- concatenate(Bef,Int,Str),} \\
\text{concatenate(Sub,Aft,Int).}
\]

For instance, "?- substring([a,b],X,Y,[d,a,a,b,c])." instantiates X to [d,a] and Y to [c], indicating the strings delimiting the substring [a,b]. The timing considered here is based on the execution of "?- substring([z],X,Y,[a,b,c,...])." which repeatedly fails. The machine instructions executed in each iteration are listed below:

<succeeding unit clause>
prefetch continuation prefetch next clause
try_me else C1 create choice point
get nil A1 1 level of indirection on dereferencing A1
bind A1 (variable) to nil
trail binding
get_value A2,A3

unify A3 (list pointer) to A2 (variable)
1 level of indirection on dereferencing A2
0 levels of indirection on dereferencing A3
trail binding

jump

<falling recursive clause>
prefetch concatenate/3
get_list A1
unify_variable X4
unify_variable A1
get_list A3
unify_value X4

unify bound to bound - fails, backtrack
detrail 2 bindings

<succeeding recursive clause>
prefetch concatenate/3
get_list A1
1 level of indirection on dereferencing A1
bind A1 (variable) to newly created list pointer
trail binding

unify_variable X4
unify_variable X1
get_list A3
unify_value X4

unify X4 (variable) to bound argument
1 level of indirection on dereferencing X4
no trailing

unify_variable A3
jump

The timing was done with assumptions similar to determinate concatenate. The failure of unify_value X4 causes the top of stack to be reset to the last choice point. The 19 instructions expand into approximately 89 µinstructions. The µcode is given in Appendix III. The timing follows.

time
1 | D |
2 | C | D |
3 | E | .
4 | P | .
5 | . |
6 | D |
7 | C | D |
8 | E | C |
9 | E | D |
10 | P | C | D |

1 try_me_else
2
3
4
TEST FOR COPY-BACK
LATE JUMP CONDITION
5
6
11 | E | C |
12 | E | D |
13 | P | C | D |
14 | E | C |
15 | E | D |
16 | P | C | D |
17 | E | C | D |
18 | P | E | C | D |
19 | D |
20 | C | D |
21 | E | C | D |
22 | P | E | C | D |
23 | P | C | D |
24 | E |
25 |
26 |
27 |
28 |
29 | P |
30 | C | D |
31 | C | D |
32 | E | C | D |
33 | E | C |
34 | E | D |
35 | C | D |
36 | E | C | D |
37 | P | C | D |
38 | C |
39 | D |
40 | C | D |
41 | E |
42 |
43 |
44 |
45 |
46 | P |
47 | C | D |
48 | C |
49 | D |
50 | C | D |
51 | E | C | D |
52 | E | C |
53 | E | D |
54 | C | D |
55 | C | D |
56 | E | C |

LATE JUMP CONDITION

7
8

LATE JUMP CONDITION

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

MEMORY ACCESS

18
19
20

LATE JUMP CONDITION

21
22
23
24

DISPATCH VIA ROM

25
26

MEMORY ACCESS

27
28
29

DISPATCH ON ROM

30
31
32
33

JUMP DELAY

1 | D |
  | P | E |

1 get_list A1
1 get_list A1
2
3 MEMORY ACCESS
4
5
6 LATE JUMP CONDITION
7 8 copy_var X4
8 9 copy_var X1
9 10 get_list A3
10 11
11 12 unify_val X4
12 S REG DEP
13 MEMORY ACCESS
14
15 MEMORY ACCESS
16 DISPATCH VIA ROM
17
18
19 LATE JUMP CONDITION
The trace executes in 165 cycles, giving 8.7 cycles per instruction and 55 CPLI (assuming each iteration corresponds to 3 logical inferences). The pipe breaks are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># occurrences</th>
<th>penalty (cycles)</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>memory read</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dispatch via ROM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late branch condition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure call</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stack tests</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>register dependency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROM dispatches are used by unification μcode for quick n-way branches dependent on the tags of the two terms unified. The procedure call delay assumes the prefetching mechanism hid most of the penalty. Stack tests refer to stack bounds checks when reading and writing a choice point. In this example, the choice point was always found in the stack buffer by virtue of tail recursion optimization.

3.3 Analysis

Assuming a 100ns cycle time for the model, which seems feasible using circuit technology equivalent to the Symbolics 3600, determinate concatenate runs at 450 K LIPS and nondeterminate concatenate runs at 180 K LIPS. To put these results in perspective,
• A firmware implementation of the Prolog instruction set on the Symbolics 3600 is estimated to run determinate concatenate at 110 K LIPS.

• Determinate concatenate compiled by DEC-10 Prolog compiler [6], runs on DEC-2060 at 40 K LIPS.

• PSI performance is predicted to be 30 K LIPS [3].

• On the basis of a prototype implementation it is estimated that a macrocode emulation of the Prolog instruction set on the VAX/780 would run determinate concatenate at 15 K LIPS.

For determinate concatenate with the heap referenced through a one cycle cache with bypass (and 100% hit ratio), 4 cycles are saved. Compiler optimization can prevent the interlock on S, saving 2 cycles. These modifications combined give the performance of 2.0 cycles/instruction and 16 CPLI, a 27% speed improvement.

For nondeterminate concatenate, a cached heap would, at best, save 24 cycles. Removing S interlocks saves 6 cycles. These modifications combined give the performance of 7.1 cycles/instruction and 45 CPLI, an 18% speed improvement.
4. Conclusions and Future Work

The work completed to date indicates that a sequential Prolog machine with significant performance can be built using conventional design principles for pipelined processors. Assuming reasonable technology, the timing results show the model runs significantly faster than all current or near-future implementations of Prolog. Far more importantly, it is felt the sequential pipelined machine will provide the best cost/performance ratio in the just now emerging high-end environment of logical inference processors and this cost/performance advantage will extend to implementations with multiple E-Units.

There appear to be several reasons why the pipelined Prolog processor can significantly out-perform a Symbolics 3600 μcode implementation. The lean cycle of the Prolog processor permits greater overlapping than the partially overlapped 3600 "fat" cycle. Given an equivalent technology, the model has a cycle time of less than half the 3600. Compared to the 3600, memory accesses are more highly overlapped, allowing a slow memory with less performance degradation. In addition, the specialized hardware support for procedure call, indexing and unification dispatching enhances Prolog performance. It should be borne in mind, however, that the present processor design is probably substantially more complex (and costly) than the 3600.

Justifying any advantage over reduced instruction set machines is more difficult. The microarchitecture of the Prolog processor is primitive and permits more parallelism, on the datapath level, than a conventional machine. The object code is more compact, making memory caching more effective. There are no conditional branches in the machine instruction set, only on the μinstruction level, permitting branch target prefetch and "late select." The Prolog macroinstruction prefetch unit is expected to be more efficient than a conventional prefetch unit, which must change context more frequently. Were the instruction set compiled into primitive instructions, many conditional branches and subroutine calls would be generated (if only to keep the object program to a reasonable length). Although the dynamic translation of machine instructions into μsequences has a large latency, it is usually hidden when calling procedures by executing certain procedural instructions in the I-Unit concurrently with E-Unit operation. Disadvantages of the Prolog machine include the effectiveness of a directly accessible stack buffer, which is unproved. In addition, the impact of a large μinstruction on hardware cost (and speed) has not been assessed.
Related design problems concern designing a better stack buffer and defining multiple E-Unit operation.

The fundamental problem with nondeterminate computation is the burden of saving the complete program history at each choice point. Currently, the stack holds both active environments and backtrack information, consisting of choice points and inactive environments. The creation of a choice point "freezes" all objects below it on the stack because resumption of that choice point must reinstate the machine exactly. This lessens the locality of the stack, i.e., current environments may lie deep within the stack, resulting in degraded stack performance. A primary concern is to increase the stack locality of the computation. This is currently achieved by copying the current environment to the top of stack. Two other ideas are being entertained:

- Split the stack into a choice-point stack and environment stack.

- Split the stack into two windows, holding the current choice point and the current environment. Note that one of these objects must be at the top of the stack.

Additional E-Unit pipes introduce new problems as well as aggravating old ones. Most critical is the instruction bandwidth produced by the I-Unit. This will limit the number of pipes, beyond which performance is no longer cost effective. In addition, memory requests from different pipes can cause races. These must be prevented either by careful compiler scheduling of the pipes or dynamic synchronization in hardware. An efficient set of interlocks and hardware locking mechanisms is needed. The combination of these considerations appear to limit the number of pipes from 2-4.
I. Appendix: Instruction Set Microcode

The following \( \mu \)code descriptions are approximate in nature. Sequences for common instructions and abstract operations are given. Instructions not given can often be inferred from similar instructions. Control instructions are not given. Some complex portions of sequences are also missing, replaced with a "?", e.g., stack-buffer management operations.

The descriptions are given in an informal register transfer language, to indicate the pipe stages necessary for each. An example of a \( \mu \)instruction description follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{LOOP:} & \quad \text{C} \quad T = A3 \\
& \quad \quad \text{jump} = \text{islist}(A3) \\
& \quad \text{E} \quad R = T + T1 \\
& \quad \quad \text{MAR} = T.X5 \\
& \quad \text{P} \quad Y4 = R \\
& \quad :\text{jump}(\text{LOOP})
\end{align*}
\]

This imaginary instruction loads register \( A3 \) into the \( T \) register. A flag bit is set from \( A3 \)'s tag (other tags are tested with \text{isref}, \text{istrect} and \text{isvar}). It assumes that a previous \( \mu \)instruction has loaded the \( T1 \) register. During the execution stage, the \( T \) and \( T1 \) registers are added and the sum is latched into the \( R \) register. A memory read is initiated by loading the virtual address in \( T \) and the put-away target, register \( X4 \), into the \( \text{MAR} \) (a memory write is indicated by loading the \( \text{MDR} \)). During the put-away stage, the \( R \) register is stored into register \( Y4 \). When the memory read completes, another put-away is performed.

The label and jump indicate control flow. There are two pre-defined labels: \text{DISPATCH}, which indicates the first \( \mu \)instruction of the next macroinstruction and \text{RETURN}, which indicates the \( \mu \)instruction pointed to by the top of the micromachine push down list. There are several methods of transferring control within the \( \mu \)code: unconditional branch, conditional branch, dispatch next macroinstruction, dispatch on unification table, call and return.

Certain stages can be "doing nothing." This is noted by a "nil" argument. All stages "doing nothing" after the last stage to "do something" are absent in the notation. For example, the following two \( \mu \)instructions are equivalent:
C    nil
E    R = T + T1
P    nil                       : (DISPATCH)
C    nil
E    R = T + T1               : (DISPATCH)

There are often alternative choices of \(\mu\)code for implementing the same operation. Time is traded for space, or time (for frequent operations) for time (for infrequent operations). Alternative datapaths introduce different \(\mu\)code - here the trade-off is time for cost. Optimizing for speed is tricky because minimizing \(\mu\)code paths (reducing number of cycles) often adversely affects cycle time by complicating the hardware (increasing the length of critical paths). Relevant alternatives are given so that final design decisions can be made for a given technology.

**Basic Operations**

**Fail**

This operation is performed when a failure occurs during unification. It causes backtracking to the most recent choice point. The pointers saved in the choice point are restored in following order:

B-------->BP  current program pointer
H    current heap pointer
TR  current trail pointer
B    current backtrack pointer (to last choice point)
BCP  continuation pointer
BCE  current environment pointer
n    number of arguments
\{A1, A2, ..., An\} all of the valid A registers

The choice point is essentially discarded by restoring B to the previous value saved in the choice point. The trail is "unwound" as far as the choice point trail pointer, by popping references off the trail and resetting the variables they address to unbound.

**FAIL:** C   ?                        <check if choice point is in buffer or not>

**MISS:** C  ?                         <purge buffer and reload>

**HIT:** C   T = B                    <pop stack to B>
E   R = T
P   A = R
C T1 = B0 <get old program pointer>
E R T1
P P = R

C T1 = B1 <get old heap pointer>
E R T1
P H = R

C T = B2 <get old trail pointer>

LOOP:

C T1 = TR <detrail bindings>
E done = T1<T

C nil
E jump = done :jump(NEXT)

C T1 = top of trail
E TR = TR + i
C MAR = T1
E MDR = T1||unbound tag : (LOOP)

NEXT:

C T1 = B3 <get old backtrack pointer>
E R T1
P B = R

C T1 = B4 <get old continuation pointer>
E R T1
P CP = R

C T1 = B5 <get old environment pointer>
E R T1
P E = R

C T = B6 <get # of goal arguments>
i = 7

LOOP:

C T1 = Bi <restore A registers>
i = i + 1
E done = T<(n+7)
R T1
P Ai = R

C nil
E jump = done :jump(LOOP)

C nil : (DISPATCH)
Trailing
This operation is performed when a variable reference (in T) is bound. If the variable is in the heap and is before the heap backtrack point HB, or the variable is in the stack and is before the stack backtrack point B, the reference in T is pushed onto the trail. Otherwise, no action is taken.

The code, assuming a trail stack, follows:

1  C     T1 = H
    E   local = T > T1

2  C     T1 = HB
  E  trailHB = T > T1
     jump = local : jump(LOCAL)

3  C     nil
  E   jump = trailHB : jump(NEXT)

4  C     nil
  E   R = T
  P   top of trail = R
     TR = TR - 1 : (NEXT)

5  LOCAL: C     T1 = B
    E   trailB = T > T1

6  C     nil
  E   jump = trailB : jump(NEXT)

7  C     nil
  E   R = T
  P   top of trail = R
     TR = TR - 1

NEXT:

Without a trail stack, the trailing action is done as follows:

C     T1 = TR
  E   MAR = T1
     MDR = T
     R = T1 - 1
  P   TR = R

Detrailing
This operation is performed during backtracking. The trail is "unwound" as far as the choice point trail pointer (in T), by popping references off the trail and resetting the variables they address to unbound. The following code assumes a trail stack.

```
1  LOOP: C T1 = TR
     E done = T1 < T

2     C nil
     E jump = done : jump(NEXT)

3     C T1 = top of trail
     E TR = TR + 1
     MAR = T1
     MDR = T1 || unbound tag : (LOOP)
```

**NEXT:**

**Unification**

This operation is performed while popping the arguments of a procedure from the stack. The \( \mu \) instructions for unify constitute a \( \mu \) routine. The code assumes a unification dispatch table for calculating the unification case in one cycle. This is a 256 entry \( \mu \) address ROM, entered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>microaddr</th>
<th>ROM address</th>
<th>refT</th>
<th>refT1</th>
<th>listT</th>
<th>listT1</th>
<th>strctT</th>
<th>strctT1</th>
<th>varT</th>
<th>varT1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2REF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1REF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVAR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1VAR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBOUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2LISTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2STRUC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following code assumes the two terms to be unified are in T and T1.

```
1  UNIFY: C nil : rom
```
2REF:  
C  nil  
E  MAR = T, T  

C  jump = isref(T)  : jump(2REF)  

T1REF:  
C  nil  
E  MAR = T1, T1  

C  jump = isref(T1)  : jump(T1REF)  

C  nil  : rom  

TREF:  
C  nil  
E  MAR = T, T  

C  jump = isref(T)  : jump(TREF)  

C  nil  : rom  

EQUAL:  
C  nil  
E  jump = T=T1  : jump(RETURN)  

C  nil  : (FAIL)  

2STRUC:  
C  nil  
E  jump = not(both structures of same functor)  : jump(FAIL)  

C  top of PDL = M  
Q = Q + 1  
E  R = T - ?  
P  M = R  

C  top of PDL = S  
Q = Q + 1  
E  R = T - ?  
P  S = R  

C  top of PDL = S1  
Q = Q + 1  
E  R = T1 - ?  
P  S1 = R  

LOOP1:  
C  T = M  
E  R = T - 1  
P  M = R
C
T = S
S = S + 1
E
MAR = T, T

C
T1 = S1
E
MAR = T1, T1
R = T1 + 1
P
S1 = R

: call(UNIFY)

C
T = M
E
jump = T<>0

: (LOOP1)

C
nil
E
R = top of PDL
Q = Q - 1
P
S1 = R

C
nil
E
R = top of PDL
Q = Q - 1
P
S = R

C
nil
E
R = top of PDL
Q = Q - 1
P
M = R

: (RETURN)

2LISTS: C
top of PDL = M
Q = Q + 1
E
R = 2
P
M = R

C
top of PDL = S
Q = Q + 1
E
R = T - 2
P
S = R

C
top of PDL = S1
Q = Q + 1
E
R = T1 - 2
P
S1 = R

LOOP2: C
T = M
E
R = T - 1
P
M = R

C
T = S
S = S + 1
E  MAR = T, T

C  T1 = S1
E  MAR = T1,T1
R = T1 + 1
P  S1 = R  : call(UNIFY)

C  T = M
E  jump = T<>0  : jump(LOOP2)

C  nil
E  R = top of PDL
  Q = Q - 1
P  S1 = R

C  nil
E  R = top of PDL
  Q = Q - 1
P  S = R

C  nil
E  R = top of PDL
  Q = Q - 1
P  M = R  : (RETURN)

OBOUND: C  nil
E  local = T1>T

C  nil
E  jump = local  : jump(TVAR)

T1VAR: C  nil
E  MAR = T1
  MDR = T

C  T = H
E  local = T1>T

C  T = HB
E  tailHB = T1>T
  jump = local  : jump(LOCAL2)

C  nil
E  jump = trailHB  : jump(RETURN)

C  nil
E  R = T1
P  top of trail = R  
TR = TR - 1  : (RETURN)

LOCAL2: C  T = B
E  trailB = T > T

C  nil
E  jump = trailB  : jump (RETURN)

C  nil
E  R = T
P  top of trail = R  
TR = TR - 1  : (RETURN)

TVAR: C  nil
E  MAR = T
MDR = T
C  T1 = H
E  local = T > T

C  T1 = HB
E  trailHB = T > T
jump = local  : jump (LOCAL1)

C  nil
E  jump = trailHB  : jump (RETURN)

C  nil
E  R = T
P  top of trail = R  
TR = TR - 1  : (RETURN)

LOCAL1: C  T1 = B
E  trailB = T > T

C  nil
E  jump = trailB  : jump (RETURN)

C  nil
E  R = T
P  top of trail = R  
TR = TR - 1  : (RETURN)
Indexing Instructions

\texttt{try\_me\_else n}

This operation is performed when entering a Prolog procedure for which there is more than one potentially matching clause. The following values are put into a choice point object:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \{A1,A2,\ldots,A_n\} all of the valid A registers
  \item n number of arguments
  \item BCE current environment pointer
  \item BCP continuation pointer
  \item B current backtrack pointer (to last choice point)
  \item TR current trail pointer
  \item H current heap pointer
  \item BP current program pointer
\end{itemize}

First, the top of stack register, A, is incremented by n+7 (computed by compiler). B is saved, and reset to the top of stack. The current program pointer is the last item to be pushed onto the choice point, because it must be popped as early as possible during the failure sequence to allow prefetching of the code. HB is set to the current heap pointer, and B is set to point to the current top of stack. The implementation of pushing a variable number of A registers onto the stack is rather tricky. A counter, initially specifying the number of valid A registers, is decremented each C cycle and used to access the register bank. The jump condition is set by the counter.

\begin{verbatim}
1 C T = B T1 = A i = 7
E R = T1 + (n+7)
P B = R A = R

C ? Compare A to Z in hardware
   if too close, copy-back buffer page.

LOOP: C T1 = Xi
E R = T1
P Bi = R
C i = i + 1
E jump = i<(n+7) : jump(LOOP)
C T1 = H
\end{verbatim}
E \quad R = T1
P \quad B1 = R
    \quad NB = R

C \quad nil \quad <\text{old B}>
E \quad R = T
P \quad B2 = R

C \quad T1 = TR
E \quad R = T1
P \quad B3 = R

C \quad T = E
E \quad R = T
P \quad B4 = R

C \quad T = CP
E \quad R = T
P \quad B5 = R

C \quad T = P
E \quad R = T
P \quad B6 = R

\textbf{Put Instructions}

\texttt{put\_var\_Y \ n.m}

This instruction represents a goal argument that is an unbound variable. The instruction puts a reference to permanent variable \texttt{Yn} into register \texttt{Am} and initializes \texttt{Yn} with the same reference.

1 \quad C \quad T = E||n||unbound \ tag
E \quad R = T
P \quad En = R
    \quad Am = R \quad : \text{(DISPATCH)}

\texttt{put\_val\_Y \ n.m}

This instruction represents a goal argument that is a bound variable. The instruction puts the value of register \texttt{Yn} into register \texttt{Am}.

1 \quad C \quad T1 = Yn
E \quad R = T1
P \quad Am = R \quad : \text{(DISPATCH)}
put const C,m
This instruction represents a goal argument that is a constant. The instruction puts the constant C into register Am.

1
  C   T = C
  E   R = T
  P   Am = R         : (DISPATCH)

put struct N,m
This instruction marks the beginning of a structure without substructures occurring as a goal argument. The instruction pushes the functor N for the structure onto the heap, and puts a corresponding structure pointer into register Am.

1
  C   T = N
       T1 = H
       H = H + 1
  E   MAR = T1
       MDR = T
       R = T1
  P   Am = R              : (DISPATCH)

Get Instructions

get var V n,m
This instruction represents a head argument that is an unbound variable. The instruction gets the value of register Am and stores it in register Vn.

1
  C   T1 = Am
  E   R = T1
  P   Vn = R              : (DISPATCH)

get val X n,m
This instruction represents a head argument that is a bound variable. The instruction gets the value in register Am and unifies it with the contents of register Xn. The final result is left in register Xn.

1
  C   T = Am
2    C    T1 = Xn    :call(UNIFY)
3    C    nil
    E    R = T1
    P    Xn = R    :(DISPATCH)

get_val_Y n,m
This instruction represents a head argument that is a bound variable. The instruction gets the value in register Am and unifies it with the contents of register Yn.

1    C    T = Am
    T1 = Yn    :call(UNIFY)
2    C    nil    :(DISPATCH)

get_const C,m
This instruction represents a head argument that is a constant. The instruction gets the value of register Am and dereferences it. If the result is a reference to a variable, that variable is bound to the constant C, and the binding is trailed if necessary. Otherwise, the result is compared with the constant C, and if the two values are not identical, backtracking occurs.

The following code assumes a T0 register.

1    C    T = Am
    listT = islist(Am)
    jump = not isref(Am)    :jump(NOTREF)
2    LOOP:    C    T0 = B
    E    MAR = T,T1
          trailB = T>T0
3    C    jump = isvar(T1)
    T0 = HB
    E    trailHB = T>T0    :jump(VAR)
4    C    jump = isref(T1)
    listT = islist(T1)
    E    R = T1
    P    T = R    :jump(LOOP)
The following code assumes no TO register.

1 NOTREF: C
   T = Am
   listT = islist(Am)
   jump = not isref(Am) : jump(NOTREF)

2 LOOP: C
   nil
   MAR = T, T1

3 C
   jump = isvar(T1) : jump(VAR)

4 C
   jump = isref(T1)
   listT = islist(T1)
   R = T1
   T = R : jump(LOOP)

5 NOTREF: C
   T1 = C
   jump = T=T1 : jump(DISPATCH)

6 C
   nil : (FAIL)

7 VAR: C
   T = B
   trailB = T>T1

8 C
   T = HB
   trailHB = T>T1

9 C
   jump = not trailHB and not trailB
   MAR = T1
   MDR = T : jump(DISPATCH)

10 C
   nil <assume trail stack>
\[ E \quad R = T_1 \]
\[ P \quad \text{top of trail} = R \]
\[ TR = TR - 1 \quad : (\text{DISPATCH}) \]

**get_list m**

This instruction marks the beginning of a list without substructures occurring as a head argument. The instruction gets the value of register Am and dereferences it. If the result is a reference to a variable, then that variable is bound to a new list pointer pointing at the top of the heap and execution proceeds in "write" mode. Otherwise, if the result is a list, then the pointer S is set to point to the arguments of the list and execution proceeds in "read" mode. Otherwise, backtracking occurs.

The following code assumes a T0 register.

1. \[ C \quad T = Am \]
   \[ T_1 = Am \]
   mode = read
   list = islist(Am)
   jump = not isref(Am) \quad : \text{jump(NOTREF)}

2. \[ \text{LOOP:} \quad C \quad \text{mode = write} \]
   \[ T0 = B \]
   \[ E \quad \text{MAR} = T, T_1 \]
   \[ \text{trailB} = T > T_0 \]

3. \[ C \quad T0 = HB \]
   \[ E \quad \text{trailHB} = T > T_0 \]
   \[ \text{jump} = \text{isvar}(T_1) \quad : \text{jump(VAR)} \]

4. \[ C \quad \text{jump} = \text{isref}(T_1) \]
   \[ \text{list} = \text{islist}(T_1) \]
   \[ E \quad R = T_1 \]
   \[ P \quad T = R \quad : \text{jump(LOOP)} \]

5. \[ \text{NOTREF:} \quad C \quad \text{mode = read} \]
   \[ \text{jump} = \text{list} \]
   \[ E \quad R = T_1 \]
   \[ P \quad S = R \quad : \text{jump(DISPATCH)} \]

6. \[ C \quad \text{nil} \quad : \text{(FAIL)} \]

7. \[ \text{VAR:} \quad C \quad T = N \]
   \[ E \quad \text{jump} = \text{not trailHB and not trailB} \]
   \[ \text{MAR} = T_1 \]
   \[ \text{MDR} = T \quad : \text{jump(DISPATCH)} \]
The following code assumes no TO register.

1  C    T = Am
    T1 = Am
    mode = read
    list = islist(Am)
    jump = not isref(Am)  :jump(NOTREF)

2 LOOP:  C    nil
        E   MAR = T,T1

3  C    jump = isvar(T1)  :jump(VAR)

4  C    jump = isref(T1)
    list = islist(T1)
    E   R = T1
    P   T = R  :jump(LOOP)

5 NOTREF:  C    jump = list
        E   R = T1
        P   S = R  :jump(DISPATCH)

6  C    nil  :FAIL

7 VAR:   C    T = B
        E   mode = write
        nottrailB = T>T1

8  C    T = HB
        E   nottrailHB = T>T1

9  C    T = H
        E   jump = nottrailHB and nottrailB
        MAR = T1
        MDR = T  :jump(DISPATCH)

10 C    nil  <assume trail stack>
        E   R = T1
        P   top of trail = R
        TR = TR - 1  : (DISPATCH)
Unify Instructions

unify_var_V n

This instruction represents a head structure argument that is an unbound variable. It gets the next argument from S and stores it in register Vn.

1
C
T1 = S
S = S + 1
E
MAR = T1, Vn
: (DISPATCH)

copy_var_V n

This instruction represents a head structure argument that is an unbound variable. It pushes a new unbound variable onto the heap, and stores a reference to it in register Vn.

1
C
T = H
H = H + 1
E
MAR = T
MDR = T || unbound tag
R = T || reference tag
P
Vn = R
: (DISPATCH)

unify_val_X n

This instruction represents a head structure argument that is a variable bound to some global value. It gets the next argument from S, and unifies it with the value in register Xn, leaving the result in register Xn.

1
C
T = Xn
T1 = S
S = S + 1
E
MAR = T1, T1
: call(UNIFY)

C
nil
E
R = T
P
Xn = R
: (DISPATCH)

unify_val_Y n

This instruction represents a head structure argument that is a variable bound to some global value. It gets the next argument from S, and unifies it with the value in register Yn.
C
T = Yn
T1 = S
S = S + 1
E MAR = T1,T1 :call(UNIFY)
C nil : (DISPATCH)

unify_local_val_V n

See code for unify_val_V n.

copy_local_val_V n
This instruction represents a head structure argument that is a variable bound to a value that is not necessarily global. It dereferences the value of register Vn. If the result is not a reference to a variable on the stack, then it pushes the result onto the heap. If the result is a reference to a variable on the stack, a new unbound variable is pushed onto the heap, the variable on the stack is bound to a reference to the new variable, the binding is trailed if necessary, and register Vn is set to point to the new variable.

C
T1 = Vn
T = H
H = H + 1
ref = isref(Vn)
var = isvar(Vn)
jump = var or ref : jump(LOOP)

E MAR = T
MDR = T1 : (DISPATCH)

C
jump = var : jump(VAR)

C nil <simplest case>

C
E MAR = T1,T1

C
E var = isvar(T1)
jump = isref(T1) : jump(LOOP)

C
E local = T1>T

C
E jump = local & var : jump(LOCAL)
8  C  nil
    E  MAR = T
    MDR = T
    : (DISPATCH)

9  LOCAL:  C  nil
    E  MAR = T
    MDR = T1|unbound tag
    P  Vn = T

  <create unbound heap object>

10  C  nil
    E  MAR = T1
    MDR = T

  <bind local variable to object>

11  C  T = B
    E  local = T1<T

12  C  nil
    E  jump = local

  :jump (DISPATCH)

13  C  nil
    E  R = T1
    P  top of trail = R
    TR = TR - 1

  : (DISPATCH)

  copy_val_V n

  Push value of variable Vn onto the heap.

1  C  T = Vn
    T1 = H
    H = H + 1
    E  MAR = T1
    MDR = T

  : (DISPATCH)
II. Appendix: Determine Concatenate Trace

The determinate concatenate µcode trace follows. The second get_list switches to write mode. The dereferencing of the argument requires one indirection because, in the steady state, the argument is a reference to a list whose first element is a variable. The prefetch and jump instructions are executed in I-Unit. No T0 register was assumed.

1  C     T = A1   <get_list A1>
    T1 = A1
    mode = read
    list = islist(A1)
    jump = not isref(A1)  :jump(NOTREF)

2  NOTREF: C
    jump = list
    E     R = T1
    P     S = R  :jump(DISPATCH)

3  C     T1 = S   <unify_var X4>
    S = S + 1
    E     MAR = T1,X4  :(DISPATCH)

4  C     T1 = S   <unify_var A1>
    S = S + 1
    E     MAR = T1,A1  :(DISPATCH)

5  C     T = A3   <get_list A3>
    T1 = A3
    mode = read
    list = islist(A3)
    jump = not isref(A3)  :jump(NOTREF)

6  LOOP: C     nil
    E     MAR = T,T1

7  C     jump = isvar(T1)  :jump(VAR)

8  VAR: C     T = B
    mode = write
    E     notrailB = T>T1

9  C     T = HB
    E     notrailHB = T>T1

10 C     T = H
E  \quad \text{jump} = \text{notrailHB and notrailB} \\
\quad \text{MAR} = T_1 \\
\quad \text{MDR} = T : \text{jump(DISPATCH)}

11 \quad C \quad T = Vn \\
\quad T_1 = H \\
\quad H = H + 1 \\
E \quad \text{MAR} = T_1 \\
\quad \text{MDR} = T : \text{(DISPATCH)}

12 \quad C \quad T = H \\
\quad H = H + 1 \\
E \quad \text{MAR} = T \\
\quad \text{MDR} = T | | \text{unbound tag} \\
\quad R = T | | \text{reference tag} \\
P \quad A_3 = R : \text{(DISPATCH)}
III. Appendix: Nondeterminate Concatenate Trace

The nondeterminate concatenate μcode trace follows. No T0 register was assumed.

```
1 C T = B
   T1 = A
   i = 7
   E R = T1 + (n+7)
P B = R
   A = R

2 C ?
   compare A to Z,
   if too close, copy-back.

3 LOOP: C j = i
        i = i + 1
        E test = j<(n+7)

4 C T1 = Aj
   E R = T1
   P Bj = R
       :jump(LOOP)

5 LOOP: C j = i
        i = i + 1
        E test = j<(n+7)

6 C T1 = Aj
   E R = T1
   P Bj = R
       :jump(LOOP)

7 LOOP: C j = i
        i = i + 1
        E test = j<(n+7)

8 C T1 = Aj
   E R = T1
   P Bj = R
       :jump(LOOP)

9 C T1 = H
   E R = T1
   P Bi = R
   HB = R
```
10 C nil
   E R = T
   P B2 = R

11 C T1 = TR
   E R = T1
   P B3 = R

12 C T = E
   E R = T
   P B4 = R

13 C T = CP
   E R = T
   P B5 = R

14 C T = P
   E R = T
   P B6 = R
      : (DISPATCH)

15 C T = A1
   E listT = islist(A1)
      jump = not isref(A1)
      : jump(NOTREF)

16 LOOP: C nil
      E MAR = T, T1

17 C jump = isvar(T1)
      : jump(VAR)

18 VAR: C T = B
      E notrailB = T>T1

19 C T = HB
      E notrailHB = T>T1

20 C T = nil
   E jump = notrailHB and notrailB
           MAR = T1
           MDR = T
      : jump(DISPATCH)

21 C nil
   E R = T1
   P top of trail = R
      TR = TR - i
      : (DISPATCH)

22 C T1 = A2
   E <get_val A2,A3>
23 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} T = A3 \hspace{1em} \text{:call(UNIFY)}

24 \hspace{1em} \text{UNIFY:} \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} \text{nil} \hspace{1em} \text{:rom}

25 \hspace{1em} \text{TREF:} \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} \text{nil} \hspace{1em} \text{E} \hspace{1em} \text{MAR = T,T}

26 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} \text{jump = isref(T)} \hspace{1em} \text{:jump(TREF)}

27 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} \text{nil} \hspace{1em} \text{:rom}

28 \hspace{1em} \text{TVAR:} \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} \text{nil} \hspace{1em} \text{E} \hspace{1em} \text{MAR = T}
\hspace{2em} \text{MDR = T1}

29 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} T1 = H \hspace{1em} \text{E} \hspace{1em} \text{local = T>T1}

30 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} T1 = HB \hspace{1em} \text{E} \hspace{1em} \text{trailHB = T>T1}
\hspace{2em} \text{jump = local} \hspace{1em} \text{:jump(LOCAL1)}

31 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} \text{jump = trailHB} \hspace{1em} \text{:jump(RETURN)}

32 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} \text{nil} \hspace{1em} \text{E} \hspace{1em} \text{R = T}
\hspace{2em} \text{P} \hspace{1em} \text{top of trail = R}
\hspace{2em} \text{TR = TR - 1} \hspace{1em} \text{: (RETURN)}

33 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} \text{nil} \hspace{1em} \text{E} \hspace{1em} \text{R = T1}
\hspace{2em} \text{P} \hspace{1em} \text{A2 = R} \hspace{1em} \text{: (DISPATCH)}

---

1 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} T = A1 \hspace{1em} \text{<get_list A1>}
\hspace{1em} T1 = A1
\hspace{1em} \text{mode = read}
\hspace{1em} \text{list = islist(A1)}
\hspace{1em} \text{jump = not isref(A1)} \hspace{1em} \text{:jump(NOTREF)}

2 \hspace{1em} \text{NOTREF:} \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} \text{jump = list}
\hspace{2em} \text{E} \hspace{1em} \text{R = T1}
\hspace{2em} \text{P} \hspace{1em} \text{S = R} \hspace{1em} \text{:jump(DISPATCH)}

3 \hspace{1em} C \hspace{1em} T1 = S \hspace{1em} \text{<unify_var X4>}
\hspace{1em} S = S + 1
\hspace{1em} \text{E} \hspace{1em} \text{MAR = T1,X4} \hspace{1em} \text{: (DISPATCH)}
4 C T1 = S  
S = S + 1  
E MAR = T1,A1  
     <unify_var A1>  
     : (DISPATCH) 

5 C T = A3  
T1 = A3  
mode = read  
list = islist(A3)  
jump = not isref(A3)  
     <get_list A3>  
     : jump(NOTREP) 

6 NOTREF: C jump = list  
E R = T1  
P S = R  
     : jump(DISPATCH) 

7 C T = X4  
T1 = S  
S = S + 1  
E MAR = T1,T1  
     <unify_val X4>  
     : call(UNIFY) 

8 UNIFY: C nil  
     : rom 

9 EQUAL: C jump = T=T1  
     : jump(RETURN) 

10 C nil  
     : (FAIL) 

FAIL: C ?  
     check if choice point is in buffer 

1 HIT: C T = B  
E R = T  
P A = R  
     <pop stack to B> 

2 C T1 = B0  
E R = T1  
P P = R  
     <get old program pointer> 

3 C T1 = B1  
E R = T1  
P R  
     <get old heap pointer> 

4 C T = B2  
     <get old trail pointer>
5  LOOP:  C  T1 = TR
E  done = T1 < T
      <detrail bindings>

6       C  nil
E       jump = done
          :jump(NEXT)

7       C  T1 = top of trail
E       TR = TR + 1
E       MAR = T1
E       MDR = T1||unbound tag  :(LOOP)

8  LOOP:  C  T1 = TR
E  done = T1 < T
      <detrail bindings>

9       C  nil
E       jump = done
          :jump(NEXT)

10      C  T1 = top of trail
E       TR = TR + 1
E       MAR = T1
E       MDR = T1||unbound tag  :(LOOP)

11 LOOP:  C  T1 = TR
E  done = T1 < T
      <detrail bindings>

12      C  nil
E       jump = done
          :jump(NEXT)

13  NEXT:  C  T1 = B3
E       R = T1
P       B = R
      <get old backtrack pointer>

14      C  T1 = B4
E       R = T1
P       CP = R
      <get old continuation pointer>

15      C  T1 = B5
E       R = T1
P       E = R
      <get old environment pointer>

16      C  T = B6
      i = 7
      <get # of goal arguments>

17  LOOP:  C  j = i
E  i = i + 1
      test = j<(n+7)

18      C  T1 = Bj
E       R = T1
      <restore A registers>
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19 | LOOP: C  j = i
    | E    i = i + 1
    | P    test = j <= n + 7
    |       : jump(LOOP)

20 | C  T1 = Bj
    | E    R = T1
    | P    j = i
    |       : (restore A registers)
    |      <restore A registers>
    |      : jump(LOOP)

21 | LOOP: C  j = i
    | E    i = i + 1
    | P    test = j <= n + 7
    |       : jump(LOOP)

22 | C  T1 = Bj
    | E    R = T1
    | P    jump = test
    |       : (DISPATCH)

---

1 | C  T = A1
    | E    T1 = A1
    |      mode = read
    |      list = islist(A1)
    |      jump = not isref(A1)
    |       : jump(NOTREF)

2 | LOOP: C  nil
    | E    MAR = T, T1

3 | C  jump = isvar(T1)
    |       : jump(VAR)

4 | VAR: C  T = B
    | E    mode = write
    |      nottrailB = T > T1

5 | C  T = HB
    | E    nottrailHB = T > T1

6 | C  T = H
    | E    jump = nottrailHB and nottrailB
    |      MAX = T1
    |      MDR = T
    |       : jump(DISPATCH)

7 | C  nil
    | E    R = T1
    |       <assume trail stack>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T = H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H = H + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>MAR = T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR = T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R = T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X1 = R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>: (DISPATCH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T = H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H = H + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>MAR = T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR = T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R = T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X4 = R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>: (DISPATCH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T = A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T1 = A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mode = read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>list = islist(A3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jump = not isref(A3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>: jump(NOTREF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NOTREF: C</td>
<td>jump = list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R = T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S = R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>: jump(DISPATCH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T = X4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T1 = S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S = S + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>MAR = T1,T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>: call(UNIFY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>UNIFY: C</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>: rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TREF: C</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR = T,T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>jump = isref(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>: jump(TREF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>: rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TVAR: C</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR = T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR = T1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18      C   T1 = H
       E   local = T>T1
19      C   T1 = HB
       E   trailHB = T>T1
       jump = local : jump(LOCAL1)
20     LOCAL1: C   T1 = B
       E   trailB = T>T1
21      C   nil
       E   jump = trailB : jump(RETURN)
22      C   nil
       E   R = T
       P   X4 = R : (DISPATCH)
23      C   T1 = S
       S = S + 1
       E   MAR = T1,A3 : (DISPATCH)
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