38th EuroForth Conference

September 16-18, 2022

Preface

EuroForth is an annual conference on the Forth programming language, stack machines, and related topics, and has been held since 1985. The 38th EuroForth finds us again mostly at home, and the conference is being held on the Internet. The two previous EuroForths were also held online. Information on earlier conferences can be found at the EuroForth home page (http://www.euroforth.org/).

Since 1994, EuroForth has a refereed and a non-refereed track. This year there has been one submissions to the refereed track, which was accepted (100% acceptance rate). For more meaningful statistics, I include the numbers since 2006: 30 submissions, 22 accepts, 73% acceptance rate. This year the only submission was authored by the program chair; Ulrich Hoffmann served as secondary chair and organized the reviewing and the final decision for that paper. The reviews of all papers are anonymous to the author: The paper was reviewed and the final decision taken without involving the author. I thank the program committee for their paper reviews.

In addition to the papers and presentation handouts available before the conference, these online proceedings also contain presentation handouts that were provided at or after the conference. I thank the authors for their papers and slide handouts.

You can find these proceedings, as well as the individual papers and slides, and (when they become available) links to the presentation videos on http://www.euroforth.org/ef22/papers/.

Workshops and social events complement the program. This year's Euro-Forth has been organized by Gerald Wodni.

Anton Ertl

Program committee

M. Anton Ertl, TU Wien (chair) Ulrich Hoffmann, FH Wedel University of Applied Sciences Matthias Koch, Institute of Quantum Optics, Leibniz University Hannover Jaanus Pöial, Tallinn University of Technology Bradford Rodriguez, T-Recursive Technology Bill Stoddart Reuben Thomas

Contents

Refereed I	Papers
------------	--------

M. Anton Ertl: Memory Safety Without Tagging nor Static Type	
Checking	5
Presentation Slides	
Nick J. Nelson: Better Values: Improvements to the implementation	
of the extended Forth Value concept	16
Nick J. Nelson: Forth Query Language (FQL): Refining the result set	
analysis using dynamically generated local functions	20
Ulrich Hoffmann: Fuzzing Forth	24
Krishna Myneni: Progress Towards Porting EISPACK to Forth	33
Glyn Faulkner: Tales from the Left-Hand Path: Dark Confessions of	
a Forth Hobbyist	37
Klaus Schleisiek: German Academia and Forth	42
Bernd Paysan: Gforth 1.0	43
Klaus Schleisiek: uCore progress	44
Ulrich Hoffmann: Standard Report	45
Nate Morse: Joy to the Web: A Zero Install version of Joy (not a	
production) Language called Pounce	46
M. Anton Ertl: Are locals inevitably slow?	48
Ulrich Hoffmann: Enums in Forth	50
Nick Nelson: Resource embedding in Forth	53
Howerd Oakford: Encoding ASCII into cf2022 color Forth tokens $\ .$.	55

Memory Safety Without Tagging nor Static Type Checking

M. Anton Ertl^{*} TU Wien

Abstract

A significant proportion of vulnerabilities are due to memory accesses (typically in C code) that memory-safe languages like Java prevent. This paper discusses a new approach to modifying Forth for memory-safety: Eliminate addresses from the data stack; instead, put object references on a separate object stack and use value-flavoured words. This approach avoids the complexity of static type checking (used in, e.g., Java and Factor), and also avoids the performance overhead of dynamic type checking for non-memory operations. This paper discusses the consequences of this approach on the language, and on performance.

1 Introduction

Accessing arrays with an index outside the array bounds is usually a bug. Other memory access errors include reading an uninitialized location, accessing a field of the wrong structure, and accessing memory that has been freed. Memory access errors are common as sources of program crashes, but they are also a common source of vulnerabilities: Gaynor reports [Gay20] that at least 65% of vulnerabilities in various software environments are due to memory safety issues.

From pretty early on there were programming languages where such bugs could not happen or would be caught and reported, e.g., Lisp and Algol 60. Such programming languages are called *memory-safe languages*.

Forth, on the other hand, allows the programmers to shoot themselves in the foot, and relies on careful programmers to avoid such bugs; while this has some advantages, there are occasions when some programmers prefer memory safety. The Forth world has some answers in this area, e.g., Factor and Oforth, but they rely on static type checking and/or tagging all data for dynamic type checking.

In the present work, we introduce the approach of avoiding some of that type checking by eliminating addresses from the data stack, and instead keeping object¹ references on an object stack. The benefits of this approach are that it avoids both the complexity of static type checking as well as the slowdown of tagging and tag-checking.

In Section 2 we look at the problem and how others have solved it. Section 3 describes our own approach; in particular, the main contribution of this work is to keep object references separate from other data through separate stacks (Section 3.1) and value-flavoured words (Section 3.6). The rest of Section 3 describes various other changes necessary for memory safety, but most of that is relatively straightforward. Section 4 gives an idea about the difference between Forth and Safe Forth by dividing the Core wordset of standard Forth into words that are unchanged in Safe Forth, and words that need various changes. Section 5 discusses topics beyond 1:1-correspondence between Forth and Safe Forth. We present implementation approaches for some common operations in Safe Forth and their theoretical effect on performance in Section 6. Safe Forth is currently a paper design (Section 7). Finally, Section 8 discusses some related work.

1.1 Safe Forth or a memory-safe Forth?

The intention of this paper is to explore the idea of memory-safety without tagging and without static type checking in general. One can build a number of different languages on that foundation, which makes the exposition challenging: Describing only one of these languages loses generality, but makes the description easier to understand. Therefore we take this approach, and we call that language *Safe Forth*, but we occasionally describe alternative variants.

Safe Forth is object-oriented; this plays a minor role in much of this paper, but occasionally shines through. A more detailed description of the object model is given in Section 3.8, where the topic is first discussed in more depth.

^{*}anton@mips.complang.tuwien.ac.at

¹Here *object* refers to a piece of memory, similar to a contiguous region in standard Forth, or an object in the C

standard. The division of memory into pieces instead of providing a flat address space is universal in memory-safe languages. However, elsewhere in this paper *object* typically is used in the object-oriented sense.

2 Existing approaches

Most languages in wide use today are memory-safe, with the exceptions being C, C++, assembly language and Forth; languages like Rust and Ada have unsafe escape hatches, and many others have interfaces to C that can also serve as escape hatches (but into C, not an unsafe dialect of the base language).

As an example, Java has primitive types (such as int or double) and reference types (objects including arrays). Java has static type rules and the Java compiler applies them and knows which type an expression has. On the level of objects, the type checker often does not know the exact class/type of an object, just that it is a subclass of a certain class; the exact class information is present at runtime in a field at the start of each object and is used for method dispatch and for subtype checking.

This scheme is roughly followed by all objectoriented languages, but in many language implementations the primitive types and object references are not distinguished by static type checking, but by tagging: A bit or a few bits of a machine word (a cell in Forth terminology) are reserved for indicating the type of the machine word: each primitive type represented as a machine word gets a different tag, and object references also get their tag (usually one tag for all object references, with more information available at the start of the object).² There are also cases like the Ocaml interpreter that uses tagging in a statically type-checked language to simplify the garbage collector.

In the world of Forth-like languages, Factor uses static type checking, while Oforth uses tagging.

These implementations ensure memory-safety as follows:

- **Out-of-bounds access:** Array accesses are bounds-checked. Sophisticated compilers can eliminate a significant proportion of these bounds checks [BGS00].
- **Uninitialized location:** All locations are initialized. Java and Oforth zero all locations: this initializes integers to 0, FP variables to 0.0, and reference types to null.
- Access to the wrong field: Java only allows accesses to fields that belong to the (statically known) class of the object. Java allows casting to a class C in order to establish that static knowledge, but then Java tests during the cast (at run-time) whether the object is an instance of C. Likewise, other languages either have to establish static knowledge or check on every field access that the object has that field. Like

for bounds checks, there are ways to reduce the number of necessary checks by increasing compiler sophistication.

Use after free: The common approach to avoiding use-after-free bugs is to let the language perform automatic storage reclamation, either through garbage collection or through reference counting (Python). Rust employs a sophisticated static type system that ensures that no reference to an object remains when the object is freed.

3 Safe Forth

This section discusses how Safe Forth differs from Forth, and how its approach achieves memorysafety.

3.1 Basic approach

The basic idea in the present approach is to separate object references from other data types by putting object references on a separate objects stack, and no addresses on the data stack. Words that work with object references take them from the objects stack, and words that work with non-reference data take them from the data and FP stacks.

This makes it unnecessary to use tags or sophisticated type checkers, and yet (with the right setup) it is impossible to perform address arithmetic and similar things that are incompatible with memory safety.

In particular, consider the twenty dynamically most frequently executed primitives in the statistics at http://www.complang.tuwien.ac.at/forth/ peep/sorted:

1	13.5%	;s
2	13.2%	col:
3	9.0%	0
4	5.1%	?branch
5	4.6%	lit
6	3.4%	var:
7	3.4%	dup
8	3.2%	user:
9	3.0%	swap
10	2.8%	+
11	2.5%	con:
12	2.0%	>r
13	1.9%	r>
14	1.8%	0=
15	1.3%	and
16	1.3%	c@
17	1.2%	1
18	1.2%	over
19	1.1%	cells
20	1.1%	rot

 $^{^2 \, {\}rm There}$ is also a technique called NaN-boxing which for the purposes of this paper is a variant of tagging and is not discussed further here.



Figure 1: Stacks in Forth and Safe Forth

The black numbers are for words that do not need to handle tags in a tagged implementation, either because they don't handle data, they handle arbitrary data, or they push pre-tagged data (e.g., lit). The *slanted blue* lines are for words that would need to deal with tags in a tagged system, but do not need that with our approach (or with static type checking). The **bold red** lines are for words that deal with addresses; in a tagged system like Oforth they are replaced with words that have to check both the tags and the class descriptors of the object references, while with our approach (and with static type checking) you avoid the tag checking (but still have to check the class descriptor).

For the four problems mentioned above our approach is:

- **Out-of-bounds access:** Array accesses are bounds-checked (and first the object is checked to be an array of the appropriate type).
- **Uninitialized location** Values, arrays, and structures are zeroed on creation.
- Access to the wrong field A field access checks whether the object actually has that field. It is possible to optimize this check away in some cases with relatively little complexity; e.g., in a method of class C we know that this is an instance of C.
- Use after free Use garbage collection. Other approaches may be possible, but are unlikely to be simpler.

What this approach does not give us is type checking of the data on the data stack. If you want to add 1 to the letter A, you still can³. You also don't have to pay the compiler complexity or runtime cost of such type checking.

3.2 Stack underflows and overflows

Stack overflows and underflows undermine memory safety if they are not caught. Fortunately they can be caught at no run-time cost on systems with a paged MMU, by putting unaccessible guard pages around each stack. This approach has been used by Gforth since almost its inception, and is a good approach for Safe Forth.

Gforth-fast keeps stack items in registers; to avoid spurious underflow exceptions from traffic between these stack items and the stack in memory, several memory slots below the stack bottom are left accessible. In a Safe Forth using this technique, the registers and the extra memory slots of the object stack have to be initialized to safe values (e.g., null); then, while accessing stack items below the bottom is possible, this cannot subvert memory safety.

If MMU-based stack bounds checking is unavailable, the stack pointer can be bounds-checked (more expensively) with code every time it is changed.

3.3 Return stack

In addition to keeping object references on a separate stack, we also have to ensure that we don't open a memory-safety hole through the return stack. Forth systems typically keep return addresses on the return stack, as well as counted-loop parameters and cells moved by the program from the data stack with words like >r. In ordinary Forth, a program can execute arbitrary code with >r exit, which is not compatible with memory safety.

Our solution to this problem is to just exclude the return stack words like r from Safe Forth.

Another solution is to split the return stack into three stacks: A system return stack for systemexecution types (return addresses and loop control paramaters), a data return stack for stashing away data stack items, and an object return stack for stashing away object stack items. However, if you

 $^{^3 \}rm While$ Safe Forth is probably not something Chuck Moore is interested in, at least in this respect it follows his preferences [RCM96]

implement locals, the additional benefit of the latter two stacks does not seem to be worth the cost.

In either case, exit inside a counted loop poses a problem (unless we split return addresses and counted loop parameters into using different stacks). Standard Forth has unloop to remove counted-loop parameters, but memory-safety can be violated in typical implementations by using unloop in a non-standard way. However, because the stack for system-execution types now only contains these types, it is relatively straightforward to implement exit without needing unloop: Just count the number of counted loop nests, and let exit compile code for dropping the corresponding number of loop parameters before compiling the return.

Figure 1 shows the relation between the stacks in Forth and Safe Forth. Optional stacks are shown in light gray.

3.4 Control-flow stack

The control-flow stack contains information about incomplete control structures during compilation. On most systems it is implemented on the data stack (although the standard does not guarantee that).

We considered putting the control-flow stack items on the object stack in Safe Forth. However, in Safe Forth we have to ensure that do-like words are matched with loop-like words not only during compilation, but also at run-time (to avoid memory corruption by mixups of loop-control parameters and return addresses).

Eventually the simplest way to achieve this is to have a separate control-flow stack.

3.5 Null

Null is a value on the object stack without object; trying to access through a null reference throws an error. Null is implemented as address 0 (to make type-ignorant initialization possible). Programs can test whether a reference is null.

3.6 No variables

Variables push an address, so Safe Forth eliminates them. They are replaced with values. In addition to the classical values that communicate with the data stack, there are ovalues for holding object references; an ovalue ov pushes its content on the object stack, and to ov consumes an element from the object stack.

In all other areas variable-flavoured words for storing data are eliminated and replaced with valueflavoured words, with both data-stack and objectstack variants. In particular, field-access words are value-flavoured (Forth-2012 only provides variable-flavoured field words).

Locals are value-flavoured in Forth-2012, which is kept in Safe Forth. The object-stack variant is defined by using o: in front of the local. E.g.

defines two data-stack locals ${\tt a}$ and ${\tt c}$ and an object-stack local ${\tt b}.$

All these value-flavoured words for storing data initialize the data to 0, 0e or null if there is no initialization value given (e.g., for locals after |).

3.7 Fields in structures

This section discusses the access of fields in structures in a non-object-oriented memory-safe Forth. We use the Forth-2012 structure syntax in this section, with modifications.

A (value-flavoured) field is defined with one of the defining words ovalue: value: cvalue: fvalue: etc.⁴ Fields are defined in the context of a structure.

For a field f, performing f takes a reference from the object stack and checks if the reference points to a structure/object that has a field f. If so, it pushes the content of that field in the structure on the appropriate stack (data, object, or FP stack). If not, it throws an exception.

Performing to f^5 is very similar, except that it takes a value from the appropriate stack and stores it in the field.

Forth's field-defining words keep the offset on the data stack during the definition, but that would mean that the program could change offsets and thus undermine memory-safety, so in Safe Forth the offset is kept in a hidden variable.⁶ This means that we have to use begin-structure ... end-structure rather than the alternative 0 ... constant.

The structure name pushes an object representing the structure type on the object stack, and **new** allocates an object of that type and initializes it with the type, and all fields zeroed.

Figure 2 shows an example of a structure. We discuss the representation of the type in Section 6.

3.8 Objects and fields

Safe Forth uses an object model with single inheritance of fields and method implementations, where every method selector can be used with any class (duck typing). When invoking a method, the top of

 $^{^4\}mathrm{Many}$ of these defining words are also defined for Forth in Gforth's <code>struct-val.fs</code>.

 $^{^5\}mathrm{The}$ alternative syntax $\mathsf{->f}$ is already implemented in G forth.

 $^{^{6}\}mathrm{Alternative:}\,$ an opaque object referenced through the object stack.

```
begin-structure intlist
                                               50 farray oconstant a
  ovalue: intlist-next
                                               3e 1 a ->[]
                                               a 1 3 slice oconstant b
  value:
            intlist-val
end-structure
                                                5e 1 b ->[]
intlist new ovalue x
                                                                   b
                                                       а
5 x to intlist-val
                                                 type|farray
                                                                 fslice | type
                                               length
                                                       50
                                                                       base
                                               values
                                                                       start
                                                       0e
                                                                   1
     type intlist
                                                       3e
                                                                   3
                                                                       length
intlist-next null
                                                       5e
 intlist-val
           5
                                                       0e
```

Figure 2: Source code for creating a structure and the resulting memory for the structure

the object stack O is removed, put into this, and used for method dispatch (calling the right method implementation for the combination of the class of O and the method selector).

Fields in objects are similar to fields in structures, with one difference: they refer to the object in this rather than the object stack, and do not consume that object. Because this is set on method entry, we know that the class D of the object is a subclass of the class C for which the method implementation was defined; if f is defined in a superclass B of C, no checking is necessary, and the check can be eliminated when compiling f inside that method.

Note that, e.g., **postpone f** can put **f** in a context where the class of **this** is not guaranteed to be a subclass of B, so it's better to make this optimization dependent on the compilation context. The alternative is to ensure through language restrictions that **f** can only be used in the right context, but one might overlook some corner case, and the restrictions may be too limiting.

3.9 Arrays

Arrays are accessed through a reference on the object stack. They are either object arrays that contain only object references and null, or they are data arrays that contain only data, no object references. Safe Forth has typed data arrays, i.e., they contain only cells, only characters, or only floats.

Safe Forth uses polymorphic access words:

```
[] ( u array -- v )
->[] ( v u array -- )
```

The type of v depends on the type of the array, e.g., for an FP array v is a FP value on the FP stack, for an object array v is an object reference on the object stack.⁷ If the index u is outside the

Figure 3: Source code for creating an array and an array slice, and the resulting memory

array bounds, an exception is thrown.

An alternative is to have object arrays and, for non-objects, untyped arrays of bytes with typed access words that use byte offsets rather than element indices. This approach would be closer to Forth and still memory-safe, but users of an object-oriented memory-safe Forth probably prefer the approach outlined for Safe Forth.

Figure 3 shows an example of an array. We discuss the representation of the type in Section 6.

The word **farray** creates a new FP array with the length (number of elements) given on the data stack; the elements are initialized to 0e.

3.10 Array slices

Forth supports representing parts of arrays by giving the start address and number of elements (or number of address units), the same representation as the full array. In Forth address arithmetic is used for that, but we cannot use that in Safe Forth, so we provide array slices instead. In the simplest case an array slice starts at some element of the array it is based on (with index 0 in the array slice), and has a length at most as long as the remaining elements of the base array.

Figure 3 shows an example of an array slice. This assumes (object-oriented) dynamic dispatch for \rightarrow [] to work. Once we have polymorphism for array access words, we can have more fancyful kinds of array slices beyond what Forth can represent with address and length, e.g., with strided access.

3.11 Strings and String Buffers

Standard Forth uses c-addr u to represent both strings (e.g., in type) and string buffers (e.g., in read-file). In some cases (e.g., move), string buffers are represented by the address alone, and the word cannot prevent buffer overflows.

⁷A disadvantage of this approach is that [] and ->[] have a stack effect that depends on the passed array, which makes the code harder to analyse. Alternatively, we could have stack-effect-specific array access words such as o[] ->o[] [] ->[] f[] ->f[].



Figure 4: Source code for creating a string buffer, and for storing a literal string there, and the resulting memory

The use of two cells for this purpose leads to deep stacks and related complications, and so a significant number of programmers advocates counted strings or other alternative single-cell representations. So in Safe Forth we use a single reference on the object stack for representing a string or a string buffer.

A string buffer has a maximum length (used for words that write to the buffer, such as read-file), and an actual length (used for words that read from the string, such as type); see Fig. 4. Trying to store a too-long string into a string buffer results in an exception.

For read-only strings the maximum length is unnecessary. Such a specialized representation can easily be implemented in an object-oriented Safe Forth in addition to string buffers. Trying to write to a read-only string results in an exception.

3.12 Execution tokens

In Forth, execute, compile, and defer! take an xt from the data stack. In Safe Forth, we need to put execution tokens on the object stack; however, the execution tokens in Safe Forth will likely have a different representation than those in Forth, because it needs a type field like other objects referenced from the object header. One way to achieve this on top of an unchanged Forth system is to create objects that contain a type field and the Forth-level execution token. In Gforth a more efficient approach (one memory access less) would be to add a type field to the word header [PE19], but that requires deeper changes.

3.13 does> and >body

Create is eliminated. Instead, does> is combined with oconstant⁸ and the code behind does> starts with the value of the oconstant pushed onto the object stack. Correspondingly, >body produces the value of the oconstant from its xt. E.g., the following is a possible implementation of constant in a non-object-oriented memory-safe Forth (Section 3.7):

```
begin-structure const-struct
  value: val
end-structure
```

```
: constant ( n "name" -- )
  const-struct new odup to val oconstant
does> ( -- n )
  ( const-struct ) val ;
```

3.14 Garbage collection

There are conservative garbage collectors that do not move the data around, and do not need to know if a cell contains a memory reference or some other data. The existing Forth garbage collector⁹ is conservative.

Alternatively, precise garbage collection needs to know which cells contain memory references and which don't; the benefit is that it can move the data around, which eliminates fragmentation and makes allocation faster.

In the absence of tagging, it is difficult to keep track of all memory references in all situations: It's relatively straightforward to know it for object fields: objects are headed with a class address, and the class can contain the necessary information. But for locals, things are more difficult; either we have separate locals stacks for data and for object references, or we need some way to know which cells on the locals stack or return stack are references and which are data. These ways either require some runtime overhead or significant compiler complications.

To avoid such complications, we stick to conservative garbage collection.

4 Words

In order to see how similar and how different Safe Forth is from Forth, in this section we look at the Forth-2012 core words, and determine which are unchanged, which are changed, and how substantial the needed changes are.

⁸Oconstant is the object-stack equivalent of constant. An alternative view is that it is like **ovalue** except that you cannot use to on its children. Note that you can put mutable objects into oconstants

⁹http://www.complang.tuwien.ac.at/forth/ garbage-collection.zip

In some cases one might choose the break in compatibility to perform other changes as well, e.g., to change the input stream handling, but in this paper we do not go into that and only work out changes that are related to the requirements of memorysafety.

4.1 Unchanged

These words typically work just on the data stack, but in some cases some stack items are taken off or pushed on the object stack, FP stack, or systemreturn-stack as discussed above: execution tokens are on the object stack, system compilation types (e.g., control-flow stack items like orig) are on the control-flow stack, system execution types (e.g., nest-sys, i.e., return addresses) are on the return stack, and floating-point values are on the FP stack.

```
# #S ' ( * */ */MOD + +LOOP - . ." /
/MOD O< O= 1+ 1- 2* 2/ 2DROP 2DUP 2OVER
2SWAP : ; < <# = > >IN ?DUP ABORT ABORT"
ABS AND BEGIN BL CHAR CELL+ CELLS CHAR+
CHARS CONSTANT CR DECIMAL DEPTH DO DROP
DUP ELSE EMIT EXECUTE FM/MOD HOLD I IF
IMMEDIATE INVERT J KEY LEAVE LITERAL
LOOP LSHIFT M* MAX MIN MOD NEGATE OR OVER
POSTPONE QUIT RECURSE REPEAT ROT RSHIFT
S>D SIGN SM/REM SPACE SPACES SWAP THEN U.
U< UM* UM/MOD UNTIL WHILE XOR [ ['] [CHAR]
]
```

CELL+ CELLS CHAR+ CHARS are listed above, because they can be used to compute sizes or offsets, but they are not very useful in most Safe Forth variants (except those that use sizes and offsets for arrays instead of numbers of elements or indexes).

4.2 Adapted stack effects

```
#> ( xd -- string )
>BODY ( xt -- object )
>NUMBER ( ud1 string -- ud2 stringslice )
ACCEPT ( stringbuf -- )
COUNT ( string -- c stringslice )
ENVIRONMENT? ( string -- false | ... true )
EVALUATE ( ... string -- ... )
FILL ( stringbuf c -- )
FIND ( string -- xt +-1 | string 0 )
MOVE ( string stringbuf -- )
S" ( run-time: -- string )
SOURCE ( -- string )
TYPE ( string -- )
WORD ( c -- string )
```

Among these, count is useful only in its meaning as alias for c@+.

4.3 Slight changes

DOES> now works on oconstants.

EXIT now works in counted loops without preceding unloop.

4.4 Substantial changes

© is deleted. Values and value-flavoured words push their value, and [] loads a value from an array.

! is deleted. to is used for storing into values and fields, is for storing into deferred words, and ->[] for storing into arrays.

+! is deleted. The system may have +to.

Allot is deleted. Words like new or array are used instead.

State is replaced with the value state⁰. Base is replaced with the value base⁰.

4.5 Deleted words

! +! , 2! 20 >R @ ALIGN ALIGNED ALLOT BASE C! C, C@ CREATE HERE R> R@ STATE UNLOOP VARIABLE

4.6 New words

base@ (-- u)
null= (o --)
o= (o1 i2 --)
odup? (o -- null | o o)
oconstant (o "name" --)
odrop (o --)
odup (o -- o o)
oliteral (o --) (run-time: -- o)
over (o1 o2 -- o1 o2 o1)
orot (o1 o2 o3 -- o2 o3 o1)
state@ (-- f)
oswap (o1 o2 -- o2 o1)
[] (u array -- v)
->[] (v u array --)

This set of words only allows individual values and array data. You typically also want to add some words for defining classes, fields and methods (not listed here).

4.7 Statistics

Relative to a base of 133 Core words in Forth-2012, 96 (72%) are unchanged, 14 (11%) have adapted stack effects and 2 (2%) have other small changes. 21 (16%) are deleted, and 14 (11%) are new.

5 Advanced topics

5.1 Looping over arrays

Arrays are often accessed in loops, e.g., iterating from the first to the last element. The bounds checks (and type checks) for these accesses can often be optimized away, and many memory-safe languages employ compiler optimization based on some form of data-flow analysis [BGS00] to achieve that.

Of course we want to use a simpler way in Forth. One way is to have array-walking words that walk the whole array (or array slice) and don't need to perform bounds checking. This could look as follows:

```
: type ( string -- )
arraydo emit arrayloop ;
```

Arraydo would take an array and push one element of the array (from first to last) in every iteration; the loop would be closed with arrayloop.

In addition one might want variants that write an element in every iteration, or that push an element from one array and store a result into another array, etc. You may also want to work with a strided array slice, possibly with negative stride (for walking the array backwards). One problem with flexible **arraydos** that can take arrays of various types, and array slices with all kinds of strides is that the way the array is handled is only known at run-time, so one typically has to call a run-time-dispatched handler. One could avoid that by having a variant of **arraydo** for every kind of array (slice) it can be applied to, but that leads to an explosion of words and would result in less flexible words that use these words.

An alternative to a do...loop-like control structure is to define a word like Postscript's forall or Oforth's apply that takes an array and an xt, and for each element of the array, pushes the element and calls the xt. One disadvantage of this approach is that either the code in the xt cannot access locals of the definition containing the forall, it requires explicit passing of the locals [EP18], or a complex implementation; by contrast, arraydo...arrayloop supports access to locals in the loop body.

5.2 Escape hatch

Memory-safe languages often have an escape hatch into code that is not guaranteed to be safe: E.g., Modula-2 has the module SYSTEM that allows access to low-level facilities, Java has the Java native interface (JNI) that allows calling C functions, and Rust has unsafe blocks.

The purpose of such an escape hatch is twofold:

- It allows doing things that are impossible in the memory-safe language, such as low-level access to I/O devices.
- It allows doing things more efficiently that are inefficient in the memory-safe language. E.g., arraydo...arrayloop could be implemented in

Safe Forth by accessing each element individually and incurring a bounds check for each element, but it is more efficient to write these words in Forth without bounds checks (all accesses are within the array).

The typical approach is not to use the escape hatch at each place in application code that needs to deal with, e.g., I/O devices, but to define a memorysafe interface to these I/O devices, and use the escape hatch to implement this interface. This keeps the unsafe code to a minumum.

Two people reading a draft version of this paper suggested to include a way to specify absolute addresses for memory-mapped I/O in Safe Forth. We know of no way to achieve this without opening a hole that may subvert the memory-safety guarantees of Safe Forth. But using the escape hatch to achieve this is appropriate and seems simple enough: E.g., one could define words for the individual registers of the I/O device, or alternatively define the I/O device as a slice in an array of bytes (specifying the address through the escape hatch), and use offsets in that array to access various registers. In either case, the programmer of code beyond the escape hatch would guarantee the memory-safety of the words added to Safe Forth, or of the data structures modified through the escape hatch.

An advantage of having an escape hatch is that Safe Forth does not need to include words for every contingency; instead, you can define them as needed.

For Safe Forth implemented on top of Forth, the obvious escape hatch language is Forth, and the escape hatch is relatively simple to implement: Safe Forth provides its words in a wordlist different from the wordlists providing unsafe words, and in Safe Forth only this wordlist and wordlists defined in memory-safe code are on the wordlist. The escape-hatch word forth makes the Forth wordlist available again.

There may also be cases where you want to weld the escape hatch shut, in particular when you want to process untrusted code (e.g., coming from the Internet). It is straightforward to have a mechanism for disabling the escape hatch.

5.3 Multi-threading

Some of the challenges of multi-threaded multitasking are: Single-threaded stop-the-world garbage collection is relatively simple and is implemented in an existing garbage collector for Forth; extending it for a single-threaded cooperative multi-tasker is relatively easy, but has the unpleasant effect of stopping all tasks while it collects. Things become really complex when multi-threading is involved, because other threads may be in states that are not safe for garbage collection. There are solutions to these problems, but they are quite complex.

An alternative is to set the system up such that only per-thread/task garbage collection is necessary. One way to do that is that every thread/task has its own memory and collects its own memory. The tasks communicate through channels, mailboxes, or the like, but cannot pass object references across these communication channels. Instead, if you want to pass a data structure to another task, it has to be marshalled (serialized) on the sender and unmarshalled on the receiver.

The disadvantage of this approach is that the marshalling and unmarshalling constitutes an overhead; the advantage is that programs organized in this way can put the tasks into different processes, and actually even different computers.

Alternative approaches are to avoid garbage collection, e.g., with a reference-counting scheme, or to implement full-blown multi-threaded garbage collection.

6 Implementation efficiency

This section does not describe the implementation in detail, but addresses performance concerns you may have. The implementation approaches suggested in this section are designed to go with an object-oriented system where every selector can be used with any class (duck typing), with single inheritance (especially of fields), where all methods of a class are defined before the first object of the class is created.

In this section, we describe the implementation of some Safe Forth features as Forth code, but it could just as well be some other lower-level language, e.g., assembly language.

The performance claims are not supported empirically in this paper, possibly in a future paper.

6.1 Type equality

Field accesses to structures that do not support extensions only have to check the structure type for equality. So an access to field intlist-val in Fig. 2 could be implemented in Forth as follows:

```
: intlist-val ( o -- n )
    o> dup @ intlist = if
        2 cells + @ exit then
    type-error throw ;
```

On processors with out-of-order cores (such as the performance cores on desktop, server, and current smartphone CPUs) the **if** will usually be predicted correctly, which means that the code needed to compute the condition (in **bold red**) is not on

```
selector sum
selector foreach
object class
  ovalue: next
  m: foreach ... ;m
end-class list
list class
  value: val
  m: sum ... ;m
```

end-class intlist



Figure 5: Simple example of some classes and objects. The **bold red** parts are used for subtype testing, the *slanted blue* parts for method dispatch.

the critical path; it costs resources (of which most such CPUs have plenty), but not latency. Only the *slanted blue* part is on the critical path for computing the result. So, on this class of CPUs this checked version will be about as fast as the unchecked version, at least in latency-limited code (the usual case).

6.2 Subtype test

If the Safe Forth supports structure extension, or equivalently inheritance of fields in classes, we need to check if the type of the structure/object is a subtype of the type the field was defined for.

We use Cohen's approach to subtype testing, [Coh91], see Fig. 5: Each class has a subtype table (shown in **bold red**) containing its own address, and the addresses of all its ancestor classes. The primal ancestor (object) has offset -1 cells, the next generation (list in the example) has offset -2 cells, etc. For each class the offset at which it is to be found is known. E.g., list and all of its descendents will find the address of list at offset -2 cells in their subtype table; nondescendents will either have a higher (closer-to-zero) class-limit, or will have a different class at offset -2 cells. So the code for an access to field next with a subtype check looks as follows:

```
: next ( o1 -- o2 )
    o> dup @ dup @ -2 cells <= if
        -2 cells + @ list = if
        cell+ @ >o exit then then
    type-error throw;
```

Concerning performance, the latency in the usual correctly-predicted case is again the same as for the unchecked case, but the check needs more resources than a type equality check.

Note that when accessing a field of this (the object used for method dispatch), an ancestor class of this is known, and if the field belongs to an ancestor of that class (the usual case), no check at run-time is needed.

6.3 Method dispatch

We use a per-class method table with bounds checking (a bounds-checked version of unhashed general selectors [Ert12, Section 3.1]). The table is shown in the blue part of Fig. 5: method-limit contains the offset from the start of the class descriptor (where the class addresses point to) to just beyond the last method implemented for the class. The code for a method dispatch looks as follows:

: sum (o -- n)
 o> dup @ dup cell+ @ 3 cells u>= if
 2 cells + @ execute exit then
 not-understood ;

Again, the bounds check (in red) does not cost latency on an out-of-order CPU, and the whole dispatch is usually as fast as the unchecked version.

6.4 Array access

An array access as a colon definition has to check the type, and the bounds. If the array access is implemented as a method, the method dispatch has to be performed, but there is no need to check the type. The bounds check has to be implemented in any case. Here's how f[] implemented as method for farray (Fig. 3) might look:

```
m: f[] ( n farray -- r )
  ( farray is in THIS )
  dup length u< if
    floats values + f@ exit then
    bound-error throw ;m</pre>
```

The bounds check is in red, and if the **if** is correctly predicted (the usual case), it does not contribute to the latency. A correctly predicted method dispatch also does not contribute to the latency.

7 Status and further work

For now Safe Forth is a paper design. Implementing it and evaluating this implementation is on my agenda, but currently not at the top, and it depends on the interest of the community if it ever reaches the top.

One could implement it as a layer on top of Forth relatively easily, but that would mean that the object-stack access is slow. For decent performance, the object stack needs to be implemented with its stack pointer in a register and maybe an OTOS (top-of-object-stack) register, and a **this** register, which requires changing an existing system at a pretty basic level and is somewhat more involved.

8 Related work

For the main contribution of the present work, the use of a separate stack and value-flavoured words to reduce the need for static or dynamic type checking, there is surprisingly little related work. A number of Forth systems have a separate FP stack (standardized in Forth-2012), but the reason for that is not type-safety, and the separation ends as soon as the stack contents are stored to memory.

Similarly, a string stack has often been proposed for dealing with strings [MM81], but again, type safety has not been a primary goal. A vector stack has been used for dealing with vectors [Ert17]; there the main point is to provide vectors as an opaque data type. Still, the object stack can be seen as a generalization of the string and vector stacks.

There are several memory-safe languages based on Forth, e.g., Oforth¹⁰ and Factor [PEG10]. However, Oforth uses type tagging and Factor uses static type checking in combination with run-time type checking, while Safe Forth uses the division between object references and integer/FP data to get rid of a large part of the type checking.

Apart from that, many design decisions in Oforth¹¹ are similar to those in Safe Forth: Oforth initializes all locations to zero. You can only read from and write to fields (with @field !field), not take their address; field accesses are allowed only to fields of self's class, and no class check is necessary. Oforth keeps only system-defined stuff on the return stack, and it uses a separated control-flow stack. Oforth has no variables, only (task-local) values. Execute is a method selector for objects. Does> is eliminated, because it can be replaced with object-oriented dispatch. Unlike Safe Forth, Oforth implements control flow similar to Factor or Postscript: by passing closures (quotations with lexical scoping)

¹⁰http://www.oforth.com/

 $^{^{11}\}mathrm{Personal}$ communication with Franck Bensus an

to control-flow words that **execute** the control-flow word multiple times).

There is a large body of work on subtype testing and method dispatch; Ducournau [Duc11] gives an excellent, although somewhat abstract overview. We choose Cohen's subtype testing approach [Coh91] because we comply with its singleinheritance limitation and because it is simple to implement incrementally. For method dispatch in objects 2 [Ert12] we proposed using a number of these techniques (to allow different space/time tradeoffs), here we select one of those and enhance it with bounds checking similar to that used in Oforth [Ben18]; however, Oforth has a table of classes per selector, while the unhashed general selectors in objects2 and in the present work have a table of selectors per class.

9 Conclusion

Memory-safe languages eliminate a significant class of bugs and vulnerabilities. Forth can be turned into a memory-safe language by eliminating all operations involving addresses, e.g., **@** and !. In order to be still useful as a general-purpose language, we replace addresses with object references, but they have to be distinguished from other data. Other languages and virtual machines use tagging and/or static type checking to distinguish them; we instead put object references on an object stack, and have **ovalue** and other defining words that keep object references separated from other data.

Starting from this premise, and otherwise keeping relatively close to standard Forth results in surprisingly few changes to the core vocabulary.

Acknowledgments

Franck Bensusan and the reviewers provided helpful comments that helped improve the paper.

References

- [Ben18] M. Franck Bensusan. Method dispatch in Oforth. In 34th EuroForth Conference, pages 31–36, 2018. 8
- [BGS00] Rastislav Bodik, Rajiv Gupta, and Vivek Sarkar. ABCD: eliminating array bounds checks on demand. In Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2000 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, pages 321–333, 2000. 2, 5.1
- [Coh91] Norman H. Cohen. Type-extension type tests can be performed in constant time.

ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems, 13(4):626–629, October 1991. Technical Correspondence. 6.2, 8

- [Duc11] Roland Ducournau. Implementing statically typed object-oriented programming languages. ACM Computing Surveys, 43(3):Article 18, April 2011. 8
- [EP18] M. Anton Ertl and Bernd Paysan. Closures — the Forth way. In 34th EuroForth Conference, pages 17–30, 2018. 5.1
- [Ert12] M. Anton Ertl. Methods in objects2: Duck typing and performance. In 28th EuroForth Conference, pages 96–103, 2012. 6.3, 8
- [Ert17] M. Anton Ertl. SIMD and vectors. In 33rd EuroForth Conference, pages 25–36, 2017. 8
- [Gay20] Alex Gaynor. What science can tell us about C and C++'s security. Blog posting, https: //alexgaynor.net/2020/may/27/ science-on-memory-unsafety-and-security/, 2020. 1
- [MM81] Michael McCourt and Richard A. Marisa. The string stack. Forth Dimensions, III(4):121–124, 1981. 8
- [PE19] Bernd Paysan and M. Anton Ertl. The new Gforth header. In 35th EuroForth Conference, pages 5–20, 2019. 3.12
- [PEG10] Sviatoslav Pestov, Daniel Ehrenberg, and Joe Groff. Factor: a dynamic stack-based programming language. In William D. Clinger, editor, Proceedings of the 6th Symposium on Dynamic Languages, DLS 2010, October 18, 2010, Reno, Nevada, USA, pages 43–58. ACM, 2010. 8
- [RCM96] Elizabeth D. Rather, Donald R. Colburn, and Charles H. Moore. The evolution of Forth. In *History of Programming Languages*, pages 625–658. ACM Press/Addison-Wesley, 1996. 3













Euroforth 2022



FQL Result Set Analysis

New scanning words needed

: SQSKIP (c-addr,u---c-addr',u') \ Skip over leading occurrences of any non-printable character, or comma

: SQSCAN (c-addr,u---c-addr',u') \ Scan to the first occurrence of any non-printable character, or comma

: SQWORD (caddr1,u1---caddr2,u2,caddr3,u3) \ Identify the first word in an SQL string

Euroforth 2022



FQL Result Set Analysis

How to identify the column names?

First idea:

• Create local value for each column

• Populate set of values for each row read

Euroforth 2022



FQL Result Set Analysis

Better idea: Local functions!

: SQL-COLCOMP, (xt) \ Compiling action of a child of SQL-MAKECOL >BODY @ CLIT, \ The column number POSTPONE PCOLCONV \ Fetches column data, converting to number if appropriate
;
: SQL-MAKECOL (paddr,pu) \ Make a column function Z" r-" PAD2 2 MOVE \ Set prefix >R \ Save length PAD2 2+ R@ MOVE \ Copy name >TEMP-DICT \ Switch to local dictionary PAD2 R2 2+ (\$CREATE) \ Create the column word SQL-COLNUM, \ Set the column number ['] SQL-COLCOMP, SET-COMPILER \ When a child is being compiled >REAL-DICT \ Back to normal dictionary
;





"Crash often crash early!" - but automated

Correctness Notions

What's in a word?

- When is a word correct?
 - · need to describe the behaviour of a word
 - an approach: a word does a state transition
 - from a current state
 - to a next state
 - can be deterministic or non deterministic



States

- States can be complicated
 - · not just labels as with finite state machines
 - Forth System State: includes the stack and return stack content, all dictionary content, the existing definitions, etc.
 - Computer State: contents of files, memory content, etc.
 - Environment State: relevant state of external components
- · Think of states as huge records or vectors
- A state or sets of states can be described by conditions

"the (set of all) states that satisfy the condition"

State Transitions

- many aspects of a state are not relevant for the transition and stay as they are
- a transition (i.e. the behaviour of a word) can be described by a pre-condition P and a post-condition Q

Stack Comments

• We describe conditions already in Forth with stack comments

0< (n -- flag)

n : The condition *TOS is a natural number* in the current state -- : symbolizes the transition

flag: the condition TOS is with all bits set (true) or all bits reset (false), i.e. a flag in the next state

 stack diagrams are not sufficient to specify the operation exactly 0> has the same stack effect but a different behaviour.

Stack Comments

0< (n -- flag)

...

flag: the condition TOS is with all bits set (true) or all bits reset (false), *i.e. a flag* in the next state

- the post-stack-condition is too weak
- stronger post condition for 0<: flag where TOS'=true if TOS<0, TOS'=false if TOS>=0
- appropriate pre- and post-condition can describe the behaviour of a word as precisely as desired, but they may be difficult to specify

Partial Correctness of a word (a transition)

A word ist partially correct with respect to conditions P and Q:

• if the current state satisfies the pre-condition P and **if the word terminates** (i.e. does not crash) then the next state satisfies the post-condition Q

if the current state does not satisfy the pre-condition then the next state is undefined (computer scientists model this often with non-terminating programs or arbitrary results).

Total Correctness of a word (a transition)

A word is totally correct with respect to conditions P and Q:

• if the current state satisfies the pre-condition P then the word terminates (i.e. does not crash) and the next state satisfies the post-condition Q

if the current state does not satisfy the pre-condition then the next state is undefined.

Robustness of a word (a transition)

A word is robust with respect to P and Q

- if it always does a transition to a next state.
- is totally correct with respect to P and Q
- if the current state does not satisfy the pre-condition then an error is signalled. Fuzzing checks if an application i.e. its top-level words are robust
 - throw an exception

• return an distinct error value

Fuzzing

What the fuzz?

• ...

Fuzzing checks if an application i.e. its top-level words are robust

- · top level words are accessible for outside
- realize outside interfaces
- Fuzzing
 - invoke a top-level words with arbitary data
 - · check if the system crashes
- Random data → generators and mutators
- best no crashes → sanitizers





Generators

How to create random data?

- · create normal distribution from even distribution
- different algorithms such as Marsaglia polar method or Box Muller Transform require floating point
- Rule of 12 (sum and average) is simple and works on integers
 - · but only valid if random delivers independent random values
 - linear congruence generators (such as random earlier) do not have this property, KISS does.

```
: CHOOSE ( u1 -- u2 ) KISS UM* NIP ;
: NORMAL ( u1 -- u2 )
0 12 0 DO OVER CHOOSE + LOOP 12 / SWAP DROP ;
```



Mutators How to change existing data? · Modify random composed data structures such as structs and · arrays or · linked lists, etc. by defining appropriate (recursive) mutators. person-mut (addr1 rate -- addr2) ... ; Sanitizers How to detect and signal crashes? • If application crash, then it is hard to monitor them. → Turn crashes into reported errors · Sanitizers check if inputs are valid · Memory sanitizers - detect illegal memory access, throw for memory faults · Stack Sanitizers - detect stack over and underflow · Control flow sanitizers - check for valid return addresses on EXIT • ... Sanitizers How to detect and signal crashes? Memory sanitizers - detect illegal memory access, throw for memory faults • @ ! c@ c! with valid memory test, throw memory-fault on invalid address linked list of valid regions that are checked on access bit-field of valid memory words or bytes ?valid (addr -- addr) dup valid? 0= #memory-fault and throw ; @ (addr -- x) ?valid @ ; ! (x addr --) ?valid ! ;

Sanitizers How to detect and signal crashes?

· Stack Sanitizers - detect stack underflow



- and overflows
 - much harder to detect, every push must check
 - might need hardware support

Sanitizers

How to detect and signal crashes?

· Control flow sanitizers - check for valid return addresses on EXIT

```
: exit ( i*x u -- i*x ) rdrop
r@ invalid-return-addess? #return-stack-imbalance and throw
```

- others:
 - check exception stack
 - ...

[1] ftp://ftp.taygeta.com/pub/Forth/Applications/ANS/tester.fr

Tests

How do we test?

• A popular framework for tests of forth words are testers derived from John Hayes ANS Forth tester [1]



- Tests + on a single value.
- We can elaborated test suites from this, as Gerry Jackson does for Forth200x compliance.

Fuzzing What the fuzz?

- · In order to fuzz our applications
 - run the Hayes style unit tests fix all bugs
 - define the top-level words (TLW) using sanitizers
 - run the Hayes style unit tests no issue expected
 - run fuzz tests in this style

```
\ assuming TLW ( c-addr1 u1 c-addr2 u2 -- c-addr3 u3)
many times DO
   { 100 $gen S" secret" 75 $mut TLW clearstack -> }
LOOP
```

Fuzzing Forth Apply Fuzz Tests to Forth

Conclusion

What's below the bottom line?

- Correctness Notions partial, total correctness, robustness
 Questions?
- Generators KISS generator, rule of 12
- Mutators change existing data
- · Sanitizers make crashes into reported errors
- Tests Hayes style testing
- Fuzzing stressing top level words (interfaces)

progress towards porting EISPACK to forth
Krishna Myneni
EuroForth 2022
V1.0
CCC († O Attribution-ShareAlike 2.0 Generic
(CC BY-SA 2.0)
 numerical linear algebra source libraries for scientific computing
 numerical linear algebra modules in the FSL
 basic forms of linear systems problems I
 basic forms of linear systems problems II
overview of EISPACK
 goals of porting EISPACK to Forth
 challenges of translating unstructured Fortran to Forth
 status of EISPACK port to Forth port
 what remains to be done?
numerical linear algebra source libraries for scientific computing
LAPACK (1992, UTenn)
LINPACK (1979, ANL)
EISPACK (1974, ANL) [†] BLAS [‡] Level 1
• EISPACK and LINPACK were developed in 1970s – 1980s to provide well-documented, well-tested
source libraries for scientific computing.
• EISPACK solves eigensystems of equations. Code is translated from $Algol^{*} \rightarrow Fortran (\rightarrow Forth)$.
 LINFACK Solves lineal systems of equations. Uses BLAS (Basic Linear Algebra Subprograms) Level 1. LAPACK combines functionality of LINPACK and EISPACK. It factors core matrix and vector
computations (BLAS Level 3). Matlab, R, and other software use LAPACK.
† T. Haigh, "An interview with Jack J. Dongarra," 26 April 2004, Soc. Industr. Appl. Math.; http://history.siam.org/pdfs2/Dongarra_returned_SIAM_copy.pdf + C L Lawson et al. A CM Transactions on Math. Software 5, pp 308–323 (1979); https://doi.org/10.1145/355841.355847

¥ J. H. Wilkinson and C. Reinsch, <u>Handbook for Automatic Computation: vol II Linear Algebra</u>, Part 2, Springer-Verlag, New York 1972.



overview of	EISPACK				
"EISPACK is a systematized collection of [For	tran] subroutines [†] which compute				
the eigenvalues and/or eigenvectors of six classes of matrices" Lecture Notes in Computer Science Lecture					
EISPACK Guide [‡] provides recommended calli "EISPACK path", for a given problem class, e.	ng sequence of routines, the group where the group of the second				
<pre>call balanc() call elmhes() call eltran() call hqr2() call balbak()</pre>					
to find all eigenvalues and eigenvectors for a r	real general matrix.				
† Fortran source library from August 1983 release is at ‡ B. T. Smith, et al., <u>Matrix Eigensystem Routines – El</u>	t https://netlib.org/eispack/ <u>SPACK Guide</u> 2 nd ed., Springer-Verlag 1976.				
goals of porting EISP	ACK routines to Forth				
 provide library of eigensystems in Forth 	solvers to support scientific computing				
 provide <u>source</u> library in Forth for debugging, and ability to modify 	 provide <u>source</u> library in Forth for portability, ease of use, ease of debugging, and ability to modify/adapt the code 				
 translate unstructured Fortran to comprehensibility 	 translate unstructured Fortran to structured Forth for improved source comprehensibility 				
 work with FSL style matrices an 	ıd arrays				
 provide test code and examples 	s in library				
 check results of Forth computat 	tions against "original" Fortran				
challenges of translating u	unstructured Fortran to Forth				
subroutine imtql1(n,d,e,ierr)	: imtql1 (n d e ierr)				
c look for small sub-diagonal element 105 do 110 m = 1, n	: \ look for small sub-diagonal element BEGIN				
: if (r .eq. 0.0d0) go to 210	N I DO :				
200 continue	<pre>virial virial viri</pre>				
e(1) = g e(m) = 0.000	ELSE d{ I } f@ p f@ f- d{ I } f!				
<pre>go to 105 c recover from underflow 210 d(i+1) = d(i+1) - p e(m) = 0.0d0</pre>	g t@ e{ I } f! THEN 0.0e0 e{ m } f! REPEAT				
go to 105 c order eigenvalues	\ order eigenvalues				
c for i=1 step -1 until 2 do do 230 ii = 2, 1	0 = 1r p f@ d{ 0 } f! ELSE				
i = 1 + 2 - ii if (p.ge. d(i-1)) go to 270 d(i) = d(i-1)	\ for i=1 step -1 until 2 do I 2+ 1 DO J 1+ I - to ii				
230 continue c	<pre>p f@ d{ ii 1- } f@ f>= IF LEAVE THENY</pre>				
250 $i = 1$ 270 $d(i) = p$ 290 continue	THEN d{ ii 1- } f@ d{ ii } f! LOOP				
	p f@ d{ ii } f! THEN LOOP \ end main loop				

status of EISPACK port to Forth

word	description	In Pr	C/N.T.	C/T	Demo
balanc	balance a real matrix	1			
balbak	form eigenvectors of a general real balanced matrix		1		
elmhes	reduce submatrix of real general matrix to upper Hessenberg form		1		
eltran	accumulate similarity transforms for reduction of real general matrix		1		
hqr2	find eigenvalues and eigenvectors of real general matrix	1			
htribk	form eigenvectors of complex Hermitian matrix			1	cherm-01.4th
htridi	reduce complex Hermitian matrix to real symmetric tridiagonal			1	cherm-01.4th
imtql1	find the eigenvalues of a real symmetric tridiagonal matrix			1	rsymm-01.4th
imtql2	find eigenvalues and eigenvectors of real symmetric tridiag matrix			1	rsymm-02.4th
tred1	reduce real symmetric matrix to tridiagonal matrix			1	rsymm-01.4th
tred2	reduce real symmetric matrix to symmetric tridiagonal matrix			1	rsymm-02.4th

In $Pr = Fortran \rightarrow Forth$ translation in progress C/N.T. = Completed translation, not tested C/T = Completed translation, tested

https://github.com/mynenik/kForth-64/tree/master/forth-src/eispack

C/T Forth code may be found at

complex general complex Hermitian ✓ real general real symmetric ✓ real symmetric tridiagonal ✓ real special tridiagonal

what remains to be done?

- complete translation and testing of words needed to solve eigensystems for *real* general matrices (target date: end of 2022)
- begin translation of words for solution of *complex* general matrices (2023)
- write demo programs to test and illustrate use of EISPACK in Forth (2023 2024)
- testing, testing, testing ...

applications are the payoff!

The Left-Hand Path dark confessions of a Forth hobbyist
Glyn Faulkner EuroForth 2022
2022-09-17
This is the gateway to Hell, baby Welcome to The Underworld. — Kassandra Cross
The Left-hand Path
In Western Esotericism
Left-hand path magic used for evil, or without consideration of morality
In Forth The Right-hand Path Forth used as a powerful tool to solve real-world problems quickly and efficiently The Left-hand Path writing many Forth and Forth-adjacent language interpreters that the world <i>definitely</i> doesn't need

Joy: the Gateway Drug

The original concatenative functional language by Manfred von Thun $% \left({{{\left({{{{\bf{n}}_{{\rm{s}}}}} \right)}_{{\rm{s}}}}} \right)$

```
calc ==
  [ numerical ]
  [ ]
  [ unswons
    [ dup [+ - * /] in ]
    [ [ [calc] map uncons first ] dip call ]
    [ "bad operator\n" put ]
    ifte ]
    ifte;
```

From Joy to Funeral

A concatenative functional language in Polish notation

Funeral (2011-12)

```
Used for HTML generation
html body div h1 "Hello World"
def html
           [ newTag "html" setDefault
               xmlns="http://www.w3.org/1999/xhtml" ]
def body
           [ newTag "body" ]
           [ newTag "div" ]
def div
def h1
            [ newInlineTag "h1" ]
including some ugly proprietary markup needed for a work project
def guess_value_from_name [
    doif
        [prepend "<<IPF~" append ">>" drop]
        [prepend "<<" append cons .. append ">>" ]
    = "IPQ" dup take 3 dup
]
```

Cantilever (2014)

An indirect-threaded Forth-like written in 32-bit x86 assembly, inspired by JonesForth with influences from Joy and Funeral

```
: -- [ '\n' = ] scan-in ; #immediate
-- and now we have comments. Yay!
```

First class dates

```
0,1 ok 2022-02-28 1 + putdate nl
2020-02-28 1 + putdate ;
2022-03-01
2020-02-29
And times
0,1 ok 11:33:30 32 + puttime ;
11:34:02
```

The downward spiral

```
HackForth (2014)
word NextWord 8 "nex" # ( -- label )
    call SkipSpaces
    call MakeLabel
    addl %ecx, %edx
    movl %edx, (next_input)
end
Thing (2014)
prim compile_lit ",lit" # ( n -- )
    m_dup
    movl $lit, %eax
    call compile_call
    stosl
    m_drop
ret
```

The Quest for Minimalism

STTW (2015)

op fetch "@" _dup ; mov (%edx), %eax op store "!" mov %eax, (%edx) ; _drop

TinyASM (2018)

(?0 w1 w2 ... if x is non-zero skip w1)
: ?0 (x --) 0<> cell-size and >r + r> ;

FifthWheel (2018)

?: dup (n -- n n) dsp0 0 ;
?: drop (x --) dsp0 cell+ dsp! ;

Rage-coding

Projects I started due to anger or frustration, then quickly abandoned once I had calmed down.

WebOfHate (2018)

A small memory-footprint web browser that puts the user, instead of coporations, back in control (reaction to trying to compile Chromium from source)

BootstrapFromMBR (2020)

Let's throw our operating systems away and return to the stone-age (reaction to *all* modern operating systems!)

Wide (2021)

A tiny Forth IDE, intended to include compiler, debugging tools and full-featured editor (reaction to learning that the Atom editor exists)

The Need for Speed (of development) OneDayProject (2022-03-08)

A native code compiler in approximately sixty x86 machine instructions. despatch: # read a 16-bit token and despatch

```
# based on the two high-bits.
```

```
_dup
xor %eax, %eax
mov _src, %esi
subl $1, _slen
jc bye
lodsw
mov %esi, _src
xor %ecx, %ecx
shld $2, %ax, %cx
shl $2, %ax
mov handlers(,%ecx,4), %ecx
jmp *%ecx
```

Lessons learned walking the left-hand path

- Replacing lods with a separate move from memory and add is often a performance gain for ITC code
- Replacing lods with pop also works (bigger difference on Intel)!
- You can implement direct-threading using ret as NEXT and ESP as the instruction-pointer. But just don't.
- Binary source code generally isn't a great idea...
- ... but having a binary-token intermediate representation simplifies your compiler and speeds the process of bootstrapping a new Forth.
- It does not appear to be possible to fit a useful Forth system into the 510 bytes available on an x86 boot sector.
- You can write an assembler in Forth using only c,... if you enjoy pain.
- Forth can be bootstrapped using a subset of Forth, without the need for compile-time execution, as if and recurse represent predictable sequences of instructions.
- It is possible to bring-up a rudimentary Forth system in one day, even in assembly.
- GNU assembler isn't as bad as you think.
- Rage-programming is rarely productive!

```
Where next?
How about a parameterised Forth interpreter generator?
[marsu@celaeno 4g]$ ./4g -t ITC -T -m ANSI -o forth
Indirect-threaded x86_64 Linux ANSI Forth
Options: top-of-stack in register, linked-list dictionary
Generating forth.S
gcc -m64 forth.S -o forth
Done
[marsu@celaeno 4g]$ ./forth
Ask me how this is going next year!
```

Comments/Questions?

Forth

and German Academia Report of a Field Trip

Klaus Schleisiek kschleisiek at freenet.de

The Event

38th workshop of the Programming Languages and Computation Concepts section of Gesellschaft für Informatik.

At present, Type Checking is the pig that is chased thru the computer science village.

After it became clear to me that this implies an automatic stack checker for Forth, I am all for it.

One presentation dealt with the design of an extensible language. The chosen implementation strategy was very complex.

New Trend

It seems that there is a growing discontent of conventional compiling strategies that use Phrase Structure Grammar, characterized by BNF specifications.

Instead Dependency Grammar based on a dictionary or lexicon is considered to be the more flexible approach.

It has been shown that both phrase structure grammar and dependency grammar cover the same set of linguistic constructs, namely context free grammars.

Scheme, Forth, Prolog, Smalltalk, APL, and LISP are examples of dependency grammar systems.

See: https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3133850.3133859

Open Issues

In the paper, these topics are considered "open issues":

1. User Defined Data Structures

Create ... Does>

- 2. Nesting Lexicons and Introducing ScopesVocabulary Tree
- 3. Handling Ambiguity
 - Vocabularies and Redefinitions
- 4. Dynamic Binding
- 5. Higher Order Words (Metaprogramming)
 - immediate

evaluat

Academia and Forth

The academic world does not know about the simplicity of the Forth approach.

Therefore, I am going to hold a presentation next year:

"Poor Man's Compilers - How Forth Treats its Source Code"

Conclusion

The academic computer science and the Forth communities use different terminology.

We don't understand each other.

We have to learn their terminology in order to be understood.

volksForth will be re-engineered to serve as a Model Forth System in order to understand how it works.



μCore

Progress Report

Klaus Schleisiek kschleisiek at freenet.de

Bytes

I implemented IP/UDP and (R)ARP on μ Core. It worked pretty efficiently, although μ Core is a cell addressed processor.

Looking at the **amount of code** needed for a full IP protocol stack implementation I concluded that it would be more efficient to realize **byte addressing** in μ Core rather then recoding the entire protocol stack for **cell addressing**.

Because a byte addressed processor can re-use most of MPE's IP protocol stack.

Byte Adressing

Realizing a byte addressed µCore turned out to take much less time then I wasted during the past 20 years explaining why byte addressing is not needed at all.

An new VHDL constant byte_addr_width has been introduced. It may take the following values:

- 0 Cell addressed, no bytes, data_width may take any value.
- 1 Byte addressed 16 bit machine, data_width = 16.
- 2 Byte addressed 32 bit machine, data_width = 32.

A byte addressed machine uses about 10% more logic resources.

Division / Multiplication

In the past I used fuzzy tests for the signed/unsigned division and multiplication instructions. But it always gave me an uneasy feeling.

An exhaustive test routine that would test all possible numbers dividing a double integer dividend by a single integer divisor. It compiled into 1020 instructions and therefore, it would be executible by a 10 bit machine.

This reduced the time needed for a full test to about 5 hours.

Test Routine

Basically, the test routine works as follows: Dividend 2@ Divisor @ m/mod Divisor @ m* rot s>d d+

If the result equals the dividend, we have a correct result and should have no overflow. The following four cases may occur:

- 1. Correct result, overflow not set -
- Correct result, overflow set error
- 3. Incorrect result, overflow set ok
- 4. Incorrect result, overflow not set error

Several case 4 errors popped up and I was able to debug the overflow generation code.

Links

microCore is available on git:

https://github.com/microCore-VHDL

and here is documentation:

https://github.com/microCore-VHDL/microCore/tree/master/documents







Are locals inevitably slow?

M. Anton Ertl, TU Wien

How to code 3dup?

: 3dup.3 {: a b c :} a b c a b c ; instr. bytes system 41 158 Gforth AMD64 16 44 iforth 5.0.27 (plus 20 bytes entry and return code) 7 19 lxf 1.6-982-823 32-bit 41 149 SwiftForth 3.11.0 32-bit (calls LSPACE) 26 92 VFX Forth 64 5.11 RC2 $\ \$ lxf code eax , [ebp] mov [ebp-Ch] , eax mov eax , [ebp+4h] mov [ebp-8h] , eax mov [ebp-4h] , ebx mov ebp , [ebp-Ch] lea retnear VICHECK from Nick Nelson's "Better Values" : VICHECK {: pindex paddr -- pindex' paddr :} $\ \$ Checks for valid index \ paddr is the address of the data, the first cell of which contains the array size pindex 0 paddr @ WITHIN IF \ Index is valid pindex paddr ELSE \ Index is invalid \ code for reporting the error elided THEN ; : VICHECKs (pindex paddr -- pindex' paddr) \ Checks for valid index \ paddr is the address of the data, the first cell of which contains the array size over 0 2 pick @ WITHIN IF \ Index is valid \ the stack already contains the stuff ELSE \ Index is invalid \setminus code for reporting the error elided THEN ;



Enums in Forth

Best Practices and Alternatives Impromptu Talk

EuroForth'22 conference 2022-09



Overview

Enums in Forth

- Enums in Forth
 - Explicit using Forth Phrases™
 - Nice Syntax give names for phrases



Enums in Forth

- · enumerations give names to values
- you don't remember all the numbers
- Nick Nelson: "I don't like magic numbers."
- or they are likely to change
- · or they are different on different systems
- use CONSTANTs

Enums in Forth

enumerations give Names to values - explicit with Constants

6	Constant black						
۲	constant black						
1	Constant red						
2	Constant green						
3	3 Constant yellow						
	color (c -)						
I.							
	dup black = IF drop ." black" EXIT THEN						
	dup red = IF drop " red" FXIT THEN						
	dup ieu – ir diop . ieu – Exil inEx						
	dup green = IF drop ." green" EXIT THEN						
	dup yellow = IF drop ." yellow" EXIT THEN						
	." color " . ;						

Enums in Forth

doing the calculations on your own

```
0
dup Constant black 1+ \setminus 0
                        1+ \ 1
dup Constant red
dup Constant green 1+ \setminus 2
dup Constant yellow 1 + \setminus 3
drop
```

- · let the Forth interpreter do the calculation
- enum operations dup and 1+ are in different parts → combine them

1+ dup Constant x \rightarrow dup 1+ swap Constant x

Enums in Forth

0

doing the calculations on your own

```
dup 1+ swap Constant black \ 0
dup 1+ swap Constant red
dup 1+ swap Constant green
                                   \ 1
                                   \ 2
dup 1+ swap Constant yellow \ 3
drop
```

- explicit with Forth Phrases[™]
- dup 1+ swap • a Forth Phrases is a sequence of inline forth words with no name
- Attention! Repeated phrases might be sign of bad factoring
- factorization given a name to phrases over + swap -> bounds

Enums in Forth

- name the calculation use the name to do the calculation implicitly
- traditionally (math) names this iota (greek letter ι)

```
: iota ( x -- x+1 x ) dup 1+ swap ;
0
iota Constant black \ 0
iota Constant red \ 1
iota Constant green \ 2
iota Constant yellow \ 3
drop
```

Enums in Forth

• name the calculation - use the name to do the calculation implicitly

1 under+

traditionally (math) names this iota (greek letter ι)

```
: t ( x -- x+1 x ) dup 1+ swap ;
0
t Constant black \ 0
t Constant red \ 1
t Constant green \ 2
t Constant yellow \ 3
drop
```







Encoding ASCII into cf2022 colorForth tokens

EuroForth 2022 Sep 18

Cakes and Biscuits

Flour plus :

Name	Fat	Egg(s)	Raising Agent	Topping
Pancake	0.5	1	0	Maple Syrup
Biscuit	0.5	0	Soda	Chocolate
Cake	1	2	Soda	lcing
Bread	0	0	Yeast	Butter
Jaffa Cake	0.25	0.5	Soda	Chocolate

Encoding ASCII into cf2022 colorForth tokens

EuroForth 2022 Sep 18

Cakes and Biscuits

Computer plus :

Name	File	ASCII, Unicode	Raising Agent	Topping
C Source File	1	1, UTF-8	Pre-processor	Libraries
Word Docx	1	1, *	Templates	Styles
Forth Source	1	1, UTF-8	Forth	Source Database
PDF file	1	1, UTF-8	Forth-like	Zip, Signing
colorForth	0.01	0.01, UTF-8	Forth	Chocolate

Encoding ASCII into cf2022 colorForth tokens

EuroForth 2022 Sep 18



<pre>showShannonFanc: ; (token ; ASCII / UTF8 support. If th ; display the next 24 bits as mov SCRATCH, TOS and SCRATCH, TOS and SCRATCH, 0x0000000 jnz.forward ; display as three ASCII . mov _SCRATCH, _ TOS_ mov _SCRATCH, _ TOS_ mov _TOS_, SCRATCH shr _TOS_, 0x000000FF jz .null_terminator call emit_ mov _TOS_, 120 and _TOS_, 0x00000FF jz .null_terminator DUP_ call emit_ </pre>	<pre>\ display the Shannon-Fano encoded e first Shannon-Fano encoded letter i three ASCII characters. ; save the token value characters</pre>	token on TOS s a 4 bit NULL,
mov _TOS_, SCRATCH_ shr _TOS_, 0x000000FF jz .null_terminator _DUP_ call_emit_		
; arrive here if an ASCII .null terminator:	character is an ASCII NULL, or if al	l three have been emitted
call space_ DROP	; display a space character at the	end of the word
Encoding ASCII into	cf2022 colorForth tokens	EuroForth 2022 Sep 18
<pre>lowercase: ; display a white text call white showsF EDI: ; () \ display a Sh DUPmov _TOS_, [(edi * 4) - 0x04 call showShannonFano .forward: ; display as Shannon-Fano encode and _TOS_, byte -0x10 ; and _T lowercasePrimitive: ; (token) \ call unpack jz lowercasePrimitiveEnd call unpack jz lowercasePrimitiveEnd call space jmp lowercasePrimitive lowercasePrimitiveEnd: call space </pre>	<pre>word in normal lower-case letters anon-Fano encoded token pointed to by] ; fetch the next token - drops th d token name OS_, 0xFFFFFF0 ignore token colour v display the given Shanon-Fano encode</pre>	y edi in the current colour wrough to showShannonFano when displaying the letters ad word in the current colour
Encoding ASCII into	cf2022 colorForth tokens	EuroForth 2022 Sep 18
This simple change to th corresponding editor dis to use 32 bit "colored" t ToDo: Add keyboard sup	ne colorForth pre-pai splay words, allows t cokens, and also supp oport to type ASCII /	rsed source format, and the he colorForth system to continue oort ASCII / UTF-8 characters. UTF-8 characters !
Encoding ASCII into	cf2022 colorForth tokens	EuroForth 2022 Sep 18