

# GOOL: A Generic Object-Oriented Language

Anonymous Author(s)

## Abstract

We present GOOL, a Generic Object-Oriented Language. It demonstrates that a language, with the right abstractions, can capture the essence of object-oriented programs. We show how GOOL programs can be used to generate human-readable, documented and idiomatic source code in multiple languages. Moreover, in GOOL, it is possible to express common programming idioms and patterns, from simple library-level functions, to simple tasks (command-line arguments, list processing, printing), to more complex patterns, such as methods with a mixture of input, output and in-out parameters, and finally Design Patterns (such as Observer, State and Strategy). GOOL is an embedded DSL in Haskell that can generate code in Python, Java, C#, and C++.

**Keywords** Code Generation, Domain Specific Language, Haskell, Documentation

## 1 Introduction

Java or C#? At the language level, this is close to a non-question: the two languages are so similar that only issues external to the programming language itself would be the deciding factor. Unlike say the question “C or Prolog?”, which is almost non-sensical, as the kinds of applications where each is well-suited are vastly different. But, given a single paradigm, for example object-oriented (OO), would it be possible to write a unique meta-language that captures the essence of writing OO programs? After all, they generally all contain (mutable) variables, statements, conditionals, loops, methods, classes, objects, and so on.

Of course, OO programs written in different languages appear, at least at the surface, to be quite different. But this is mostly because the syntax of different programming languages is different. Are they quite so different in the utterances that one can say in them? In other words, are OO programs akin to sentences in Romance languages (French, Spanish, Portuguese, etc) which, although different at a surface level, are structurally very similar?

This is what we set out to explore. One non-solution is to find an (existing) language and try to automatically translate it to the others. Of course, this can be made to work — one could engineer a multi-language compiler (such as gcc) to de-compile its Intermediate Representation (IR) into most of its input languages. The end-results would however be wildly unidiomatic; roughly the equivalent of a novice in a new (spoken) language “translating” word-by-word.

What if, instead, there was a single meta-language designed to embody the common semantic concepts of a number of OO languages, encoded so that the necessary information for translation is present? This source language could be agnostic about what eventual target language will be used — and free of the idiosyncratic details of any given language. This would be quite the boon for the translator. In fact, we could go even further, and attempt to teach the translator about idiomatic patterns of each target language.

Trying to capture all the subtleties of each language is hopeless — akin to capturing the rhythm, puns, metaphors, similes, and cultural allusions of a sublime poem in translation. But programming languages are most often used for much more prosaic tasks: writing programs for getting things done. This is closer to translating technical textbooks, making sure that all of the meaningful material is preserved.

Is this feasible? In some sense, this is already old hat: modern compilers have a single IR, used to target multiple processors. Compilers can generate human-readable symbolic assembly code for a large family of CPUs. But this is not the same as generating human-readable, idiomatic high-level code.

More precisely, we are interested in capturing the conceptual meaning of OO programs, in such a way as to fully automate the translation from the “conceptual” to human-readable, idiomatic code, in mainstream languages.

At some level, this is not new. Domain-Specific Languages (DSL), are high-level languages with syntax and semantics tailored to a specific domain [17]. A DSL abstracts over the details of “code”, providing notation to specify domain-specific knowledge in a natural manner. DSL implementations often work via translation to a GPL for execution. Some generate human-readable code [5, 12, 18, 22].

This is what we do, for the domain of OO programs.

We have a set of new requirements:

1. The generated code should be human-readable,
2. The generated code should be idiomatic,
3. The generated code should be documented,
4. The generator expresses common OO patterns.

Here we demonstrate that all of these requirements can be met. GOOL<sup>1</sup> is implemented as a DSL embedded in Haskell that can currently generate code in Python, Java, C#, and C++. Others could be added, with the implementation effort being commensurate to the (semantic) distance to the languages already supported.

First we expand on the high-level requirements for such an endeavour, in Section 2. To be able to give concrete examples,

PL’20, January 01–03, 2018, New York, NY, USA  
2020.

<sup>1</sup>Source is publicly available; link will be provided after blind period

we show the syntax of GOOL in Section 3. The details of the implementations, namely the internal representation and the family of pretty-printers, is in Section 4. Common patterns are illustrated in Section 5. We close with a discussion of related work in Section 6, plans for future improvements in Section 7, and conclusions in Section 8.

## 2 Requirements

While we outlined some of our requirements above, here we give a complete list, as well as some reasoning behind each.

**mainstream** Generate code in mainstream object-oriented languages.

**readable** The generated code should be human-readable,

**idiomatic** The generated code should be idiomatic,

**documented** The generated code should be documented,

**patterns** The generator should allow one to express common OO patterns.

**expressivity** The language should be rich enough to express a set of existing OO programs, which act as test cases for the language.

**common** Language commonalities should be abstracted.

Targetting OO languages (**mainstream**) is primarily because of their popularity, which implies the most potential users — in much the same way that the makers of Scala and Kotlin chose to target the JVM to leverage the Java ecosystem, and Typescript for Javascript.

The **readable** requirement is not as obvious. As DSL users are typically domain experts who are not “programmers”, why generate readable code? Few Java programmers ever look at JVM bytecode, and few C++ programmers at assembly. But GOOL’s aim is different: to allow writing high-level OO code once, but have it be available in many GPLs. One use case would be to generate libraries of utilities for a narrow domain. As needs evolve and language popularity changes, it is useful to have it immediately available in a number of languages. Another use, which is a core part of our own motivation, is to have *extremely well documented* code, indeed to a level that would be unrealistic to do by hand. But this documentation is crucial in domains where *certification* is required. And **readable** is a proxy for *understandable*, which is also quite helpful for debugging.

The same underlying reasons for **readable** also drive **idiomatic** and **documented**, as they contribute to the human-understandability of the generated code. **idiomatic** is important as many human readers would find the code “foreign” otherwise, and would not be keen on using it. Note that documentation can span from informal comments meant for humans, to formal, structured comments useful for generating API documentation with tools like Doxygen, or with a variety of static analysis tools. Readability (and thus understandability) are improved when code is pretty-printed [7]. Thus taking care of layout, redundant parentheses, well-chosen variable names, using a common style with lines that

are not too long, are just as valid for generated code as for human-written code. GOOL does not prevent users from writing undocumented or complex code, if they choose to do so. It just makes it easy to have **readable**, **idiomatic** and **documented** code in multiple languages.

The **patterns** requirement is typical of DSLs: common programming idioms can be reified into a proper linguistic form instead of being merely informal. Even some of the *design patterns* of [10] can become part of the language itself. While this does make writing some OO code even easier in GOOL than in GPLs, it also helps keep GOOL language-agnostic and facilitates generating idiomatic code. Examples will be given in Section 5. But we can indicate now how this helps: Consider Python’s ability to return multiple values with a single return statement, which is uncommon in other languages. Two choices might be to disallow this feature in GOOL, or throw an error on use when generating code in languages that do not support this feature. In the first case, this would likely mean unidiomatic Python code, or increased complexity in the Python generator to infer that idiom. The second option is worse still: one might have to resort to writing language-specific GOOL, obviating the whole reason for the language! Multiple-value return statements are always used when a function returns multiple outputs; what we can do in GOOL is to support such multiple-output functions, and then generate the idiomatic pattern of implementation in each target language.

**expressivity** captures the idea that GOOL is supposed to express (the ideas contained in) OO programs. As a requirement, it reminds us to test it against real-world examples.

The last requirement (**common**) that language commonalities be abstracted, is internal: we noticed a lot of repeated code in our initial backends, something that ought to be distasteful to most programmers. For example, writing a generator for both Java and C# makes it incredibly clear how similar the two languages are.

## 3 Creating GOOL

How do we go about creating a “generic” object-oriented language? We chose an incremental abstraction approach: start from OO programs written in two different languages, and unify them *conceptually*.

We abstract from concrete OO programs, not just to meet our **expressivity** requirement, but also because that is our “domain”. Although what can be said in any given OO language is quite broad, what we *actually want to say* is often much more restricted. And what we *need to say* is often even more concise. For example, Java offers introspection features, but C++ doesn’t, so abstracting from portable OO will not feature introspection (although it may be the case that generating idiomatic Java may later use it); thus GOOL as a language does not encode introspection. C++ templates are different: while other languages do not necessarily have

comparable meta-programming features, as GOOL is a code generator, it is not only feasible but in fact easy to provide template-like features, and even aspects of partial evaluation directly. Thus we do not need to generate templates. In other words, we are trying to abstract over the fundamental ideas expressed via OO programs, rather than abstracting over the languages — and we believe the end result better captures the essence of OO programs. Of course, some features, such as types, which don't exist per se in Python but are required in Java, C# and C++, will be present as doing full type inference is unrealistic.

Some features of OO programs are not operational: comments and formatting decisions amongst them. To us, programs are a bidirectional means of communication; they must be valid, executable programs by computers, but also need to be readable and understandable by humans. Generating code for consumption by machines is well understood and performed by most DSLs, but generating code for human consumption has been given less attention. We tried to pay close attention to program features — such as the habits of programmers to write longer methods as blocks separated by (at least) blank lines, often with comments — which make programs more accessible to human readers.

Finding commonalities between OO programs is most easily done from the core imperative language outwards. Most languages provide similar basic types (variations on integers, floating point numbers, characters, strings, etc.) and functions to deal with them. The core expression language tends to be extremely similar across languages. One then moves up to the statement language — assignments, conditionals, loops, etc. Here we start to encounter variations, and choices can be made; we'll cover that later.

For ease of experimentation, GOOL is an Embedded Domain Specific Language (EDSL) inside Haskell. Haskell is very well-suited for this, offering a variety of features (GADTs, type classes, parametric polymorphism, kind polymorphism, etc.) that are quite useful for building languages. Its syntax is also fairly liberal, so that with *smart constructors*, one can somewhat mimic the usual syntax of OO languages.

### 3.1 GOOL Syntax: Imperative core

Basic types in GOOL are `bool` for Booleans, `int` for integers, `float` for doubles, `char` for characters, `string` for strings, `infile` for a file in read mode, and `outfile` for a file in write mode. Lists can be specified with `listType`; `listType int` specifies a list of integers. Objects are specified using `obj` followed by a class name.

Variables are specified with `var` followed by the variable name and type. For example, `var "ages" (listType int)` represents a variable called “ages” that is a list of integers. For common constructions, it is useful to offer shortcuts for defining them; for example, the above can also be done via `listVar "ages" int`. Typical use would be

```
let ages = listVar "ages" int in
so that ages can be used directly from then on. Other means
for specifying variables is shown in Table 1.
```

**Table 1.** Syntax for specifying variables

GOOL Syntax	Semantics
<code>extVar</code>	for a variable from an external library
<code>classVar</code>	for a variable belonging to a class
<code>objVar</code>	for a variable belonging to an object
<code>\$-&gt;</code>	infix operator form of <code>objVar</code>
<code>self</code>	for referring to an object in the definition of its class

Note that GOOL distinguishes a variable from its value<sup>2</sup>. To get the value of `ages`, one must write `valueOf ages`. This distinction is motivated by semantic considerations; it is beneficial for stricter typing and enables convenient syntax for **patterns** that translate to more idiomatic code.

Syntax for literal values is shown in Table 2 and for operators on values in Table 3. Each operator is prefixed with an additional symbol based on type. Boolean-valued with `?`, numeric by `#`, and others by `$`.

**Table 2.** Syntax for literal values

GOOL Syntax	Semantics
<code>litTrue</code>	literal Boolean true
<code>litFalse</code>	literal Boolean false
<code>litInt i</code>	literal integer i
<code>litFloat f</code>	literal float f
<code>litChar c</code>	literal character c
<code>litString s</code>	literal string s

Table 4 shows conditional expressions and function application. `selfFuncApp` and `objMethodCallNoParams` are two shortcuts for when a method is being called on `self` or when the method takes no parameters.

Variable declarations are statements, and take a variable specification as an argument. For `foo = var "foo" int`, the corresponding variable declaration would be `varDec foo`, and initialized declarations are `varDecDef foo (litInt 5)`. Assignments are represented by `assign a (litInt 5)`. Convenient infix and postfix operators are also provided, prefixed by `&`: `&=` is a synonym for `assign`, and C-like `&+=`, `&++`, `&-=` and `&--` (the more intuitive `&--` cannot be used as `--` starts a comment in Haskell).

Other simple statements include `break` and `continue`, `returnState` (followed by a value to return), `throw` (followed by an error message to throw), `free` (followed by a

<sup>2</sup> as befits the use-mention distinction from analytic philosophy



**Table 3.** Operators for making expressions

GOOL Syntax	Semantics
?!	Boolean negation
?&&	conjunction
?	disjunction
?<	less than
?<=	less than or equal
?>	greater than
?>=	greater than or equal
?==	equality
?!=	inequality
#~	numeric negation
#/^	square root
#	absolute value
#+	addition
#-	subtraction
#*	multiplication
#/	division
#^	exponentiation

**Table 4.** Syntax for conditionals and function application

GOOL Syntax	Semantics
inlineIf	conditional expression
funcApp	function application (list of parameters)
extFuncApp	function application, for external library
newObj	for calling an object constructor
objMethodCall	for calling a method on an object

variable to free from memory), and comment (followed by a string used as a single-line comment).

A single OO method is frequently laid out as a sequence of blocks of statements, where each block represents a meaningful task. In GOOL, block is used for this purpose. Thus bodies are not just a sequence of statements (as would be natural if all we cared about was feeding a compiler), but instead a body is a list of blocks. A body can be used as a function body, conditional body, loop body, etc. This additional level of organization of statements is operationally meaningless, but represents the actual structure of OO programs as written by humans. This is because programmers (hopefully!) write code to be read by other programmers, and blocks increase human-readability. Naturally, shortcuts are provided for single-block bodies (bodyStatements) and for the common single-statement case, oneLiner.

GOOL has two forms of conditionals: if-then-else via ifCond (which takes a list of pairs of conditions and bodies) and if-then via ifNoElse. For example:

```
ifCond [
  (foo ?> litInt 0, oneLiner (
    printStrLn "foo is positive")),
```

```
(foo ?< litInt 0, oneLiner (
  printStrLn "foo is negative"))]
(oneLiner $ printStrLn "foo is zero")
```

GOOL also supports switch statements.

There are a variety of loops: for-loops (for), which are parametrized by a statement to initialize the loop variable, a condition, a statement to update the loop variable, and a body; forRange loops, which are given a starting value, ending value, and step size; and forEach loops. For example:

```
for (varDecDef age (litInt 0))
  (age < litInt 10) (age &++) loopBody
forRange age (litInt 0) (litInt 9)
  (litInt 1) loopBody
forEach age ages loopBody
```

While-loops (while) are parametrized by a condition and a body; try-catch (tryCatch) is parameterized by two bodies.

### 3.2 GOOL Syntax: OO features

A function declaration is followed by the function name, scope, binding type (static or dynamic), type, list of parameters, and body. Methods (method) are defined similarly, with the addition of the the containing class' name. Parameters are built from variables, using param or pointerParam. For example, assuming variables "num1" and "num2" have been defined, one can define an add function as:

```
function "add" public dynamic_ int
  [param num1, param num2]
  (oneLiner (returnState (num1 #+ num2)))
```

The pubMethod and privMethod shortcuts are useful for public dynamic and private dynamic methods, respectively. mainFunction defines the main function of a program. docFunc generates a documented function from a function description and a list of parameter descriptions, an optional description of the return value, and the function itself. This generates Doxygen-style comments.

Classes are defined with buildClass followed by the class name, name of the parent class (if applicable), scope, list of state variables, and list of methods. State variables can be built by stateVar followed by scope, static or dynamic binding, and the variable itself. constVar can be used for constant state variables. Shortcuts for state variables include privMVar for private dynamic, pubMVar for public dynamic, and pubGVar for public static variables. For example:

```
buildClass "FooClass" Nothing public
  [pubMVar 0 var1, privMVar 0 var2]
  [mth1, mth2]
```

Nothing here indicates that this class does not have a parent, privClass and pubClass are shortcuts for private and public classes, respectively. docClass is like docFunc.

### 3.3 GOOL syntax: modules and programs

Akin to Java packages and other similar constructs, GOOL has modules (buildModule) consisting of a name, a list of libraries to import, a list of functions, and a list of classes. Module-level comments are done with docMod.

At the top of the hierarchy are programs, auxiliary files, and packages. A program (prog) has a name and a list of files. A package is a program and a list of auxiliary files; these are non-code files that augment the program. Examples are a Doxygen configuration file (doxConfig), and a makefile (makefile). A parameter of makefile toggles generation of a make doc rule, to compile the Doxygen documentation with the generated Doxygen configuration file.

## 4 GOOL Implementation

There are two “obvious” means of dealing with large embedded DSLs in Haskell: either as a set of Generalized Algebraic Data Types (GADTs), or using a set of classes, in the “finally tagless” style [8] (we will refer to it as simply *tagless* from now on). The current implementation uses a “sophisticated” version of tagless. A first implementation of GOOL, modelled on the multi-language generator SAGA [5] used a straightforward version of tagless, which did not allow for enough generic routines to be properly implemented. This was replaced by a version based on GADTs, which fixed that problem, but did not allow for *patterns* to be easily encoded. Thus the current version has gone back to tagless, but also uses *type families* in a crucial way.

In tagless the means of encoding a language, through methods from a set of classes, really encodes a generalized *fold* over any *representation* of the language. Thus what looks like GOOL “keywords” are either class methods or generic functions that await the specification of a dictionary to decide on the final interpretation of the representation. We typically instantiate these to language renderers, but we’re also free to do various static analysis passes.

Because tagless representations give an embedded syntax to a DSL while being polymorphic on the eventual semantic interpretation of the terms, [8] dubs the resulting classes “symantic”. Our language is defined by a hierarchy of 43 of these symantic classes, grouped by functionality, as illustrated in Figure 1. For example, there are classes for programs, bodies, control blocks, types, unary operators, variables, values, selectors, statements, control statements, blocks, scopes, classes, modules, and so on. These define 328 different methods — GOOL is not a small language!

For example, here is how variables are defined:

```
class (TypeSym repr)
=> VariableSym repr where
  type Variable repr
  var :: Label -> repr (Type repr)
    -> repr (Variable repr)
```




Figure 1. Dependency graph of all of GOOL’s type classes

As variables are typed, their representation must be aware of types and thus that capability (the `TypeSym` class) is a constraint. The *associated type* `Variable` `repr` is a representation-dependent type-level function. Each instance of this class is free to define its own internal representation of what a `Variable` is. `var` is then a constructor for variables, which takes a `Label` and a representation of a type, returning a representation of a variable. Specifically, `repr` has kind `* -> *`, and thus `Variable` has kind `(* -> *) -> *`. In `repr (X repr)`, the type `variable repr` appears twice because there are two layers of abstraction: over the target language, handled by the outer `repr`, and over the underlying types to which GOOL's types map, represented by the inner `repr`.

We make use of this flexibility of per-target-language representation variation to record more (or less) information for successful idiomatic code generation. For example, the internal representation for a state variable in C++ stores the corresponding destructor code, but not in the other languages.

For Java, we instantiate the `VariableSym` class as follows:

```
instance VariableSym JavaCode where
  type Variable JavaCode = VarData
  var = varD
```

where `JavaCode` is essentially the `Identity` monad:

```
newtype JavaCode a = JC {unJC :: a}
```

The `unJC` record field is useful for type inference: when applied to an otherwise generic term, it lets Haskell infer that we are wishing to only consider the `JavaCode` instances. `VarData` is defined as

```
data VarData = VarD {
  varBind :: Binding,
  varName :: String,
  varType :: TypeData,
  varDoc :: Doc}
```

Thus the representation of a (Java) variable consists of more than just its printed representation (the `Doc` field), but also its binding time, name, and type of the variable. `Doc` comes from the package `Text.PrettyPrint.HughesPJ` and represents formatted text. It is common in OO programs to declare some variables as `static` to signify that the variable should be bound at compile-time. The `Binding`, either `Static` or `Dynamic`, is thus part of a variable's representation. That a variable is aware of its type makes the generation of declarations simpler. The inclusion of a name, as a `String`, makes generating meta-information, such as for logging, easier.

All representing structures contain at least a `Doc`. It can be considered to be our *dynamic* representation of code, from a partial-evaluation perspective. The other fields are generally *static* information used to optimize the code generation.

We prefer generic code over representation-specific code, so there is little code that works on `VarData` directly. Instead,

there are methods like `variableDoc`, part of the `VariableSym` type class, with signature:

```
variableDoc :: repr (Variable repr)
            -> Doc
```

which acts as an accessor. For `JavaCode`, it is simply:

```
variableDoc = varDoc . unJC
```

Other uses of additional information are for uniform documentation, builds and better arrangement of parentheses. A common documentation style for methods is to provide a description of each of the method's parameters. The representation for `Methods` stores the list of parameters, which is then used to automate this pattern of documentation. Makefiles are often used to compile OO programs, and this process sometimes needs to know which file contains the main module or method. Since GOOL includes the option of generating a Makefile as part of a `Package`, the representation for a `Method` and a `Module` store information on whether it is the main method or module. Redundant parentheses are typically ignored by compilers, but programmers still tend to minimize them in their code – it makes the code more human-readable. Operator precedence is used for this purpose, and thus we also store precedence information in the representations for `Values`, `UnaryOperators` and `BinaryOperators` to elide extra parentheses.

Note that the `JavaCode` instance of `VariableSym` defines the `var` function via the `varD` function:

```
varD :: (RenderSym repr) => Label ->
      repr (Type repr) -> repr (Variable repr)
varD n t = varFromData Dynamic n t
        (varDocD n)
```

```
varDocD :: Label -> Doc
varDocD = text
```


`varD` is generic, i.e. works for all instances, via dispatching to other generic functions, such as `varFromData`:

```
varFromData :: Binding -> String ->
             repr (Type repr) -> Doc ->
             repr (Variable repr)
```

This method is in class `InternalVariable`. Several of these “internal” classes exist, which are not exported from GOOL's interface. They contain functions useful for the language renderers, but not meant to be used to construct code representations, as they reveal too much of the internals (and are rather tedious to use). One important example is the `cast` method, which is never needed by user-level code, but frequently used by higher-level functions.

`varDocD` can simply be `text` as `Label` is an alias for a `String` – and Java variables are just names, as with most OO languages.

We have defined 300 functions like `varDocD`, each abstracting a **commonality** between target languages. This makes writing new renderers for new languages fairly straightforward. GOOL's Java and C# renderers demonstrate this well. Out of 328 methods across all of GOOL's type classes, the instances of 229 of them are shared between the Java and C# renderers, in that they are just calls to the same common function. A further 37 are partially shared, for example they call the same common function but with different parameters. The numbers of common methods between each pair of renderers are shown in Figure 2. It is clear from the graph that Python is the least similar to the other target languages, whereas C# has the most in common with the others, closely followed by Java. 143 methods are actually the same between all 4 languages GOOL currently targets. This might indicate that some should be generic functions rather than class methods, but we have not yet investigated this in detail.



**Figure 2.** Number of common methods between renderers

Examples from Python and C# are not shown because they both work very similarly to the Java renderer. There are `PythonCode` and `CSharpCode` analogs to `JavaCode`, the underlying types are all the same, and the methods are defined by calling common functions, where possible, or by constructing the GOOL value directly in the instance definition, if the definition is unique to that language.

C++ is different since most modules are split between a source and header file. To generate C++, we traverse the code twice, once to generate the header file and a second time to generate the source file corresponding to the same module. This is done via two instances of the classes, for two different types: `CppSrcCode` for source code and `CppHdrCode` for header code. Since a main function does not require a header file, the `CppHdrCode` instance for a module containing only a main function is empty. The renderer optimizes empty modules/files away — for all renderers.

As C++ source and header should always be generated together, a third type, `CppCode` achieves this:

```
data CppCode x y a =
  CPPC {src :: x a, hdr :: y a}
```

The type variables `x` and `y` are intended to be instantiated with `CppSrcCode` and `CppHdrCode`, but they are left generic so that we may use an even more generic `Pair` class:

```
class Pair (p :: (* -> *) -> (* -> *)
  -> (* -> *)) where
  pfst :: p x y a -> x a
  psnd :: p x y b -> y b
  pair :: x a -> y a -> p x y a
```

```
instance Pair CppCode where
  pfst (CPPC xa _) = xa
  psnd (CPPC _ yb) = yb
  pair = CPPC
```

`Pair` is a *type constructor* pairing, one level up from Haskell's own `(,)` :: `* -> * -> *`. It is given by one constructor and two destructors, much as the Church-encoding of pairs into the  $\lambda$ -calculus.

To understand how this works, here is the instance of `VariableSym`, but for C++:

```
instance (Pair p) => VariableSym
  (p CppSrcCode CppHdrCode) where
  type Variable
    (p CppSrcCode CppHdrCode) = VarData
  var n t = pair
    (var n $ pfst t) (var n $ psnd t)
```

The instance is generic in the pair representation `p` but otherwise concrete, because `VarData` is concrete. The actual instance code is straightforward, as it just dispatches to the underlying instances, using the generic wrapping/unwrapping methods from `Pair`. This pattern is used for all instances, so adapting it to any other language with two (or more) files per module is straightforward.

At the program level, the difference between source and header is no longer relevant, so they are joined together into a single component. For technical reasons, currently `Pair` is still used, and we arbitrarily choose to put the results in the first component. Since generating some auxiliary files, especially Makefiles, requires knowledge of which are source files and which are header files, GOOL's representation for files stores a `FileType`, either `Source` or `Header` (or `Combined` for other languages).

GOOL's `ControlBlockSym` class is worth drawing attention to. It contains methods for certain OO patterns, and they return `Blocks`, not `Statements`. So in addition to automating certain tasks, these methods also save the user from having to manually specify the result as a block.



While “old” features of OO languages — basically features that were already present in ancestor procedural languages like Algol — have fairly similar renderings, more recent (to OO languages) features, such as for-each loops, show more variations. More precisely, the first line of a for-each loop in Python, Java, C# and C++ are (respectively):

```
for age in ages:

for (int age : ages) {

foreach (int age in ages) {

for (std::vector<int>::iterator age \
    = ages.begin(); age != ages.end(); \
    age++) {
```

where we use backslashes in generated code to indicate manually inserted line breaks so that the code fits in this paper’s narrow column margins. By providing `forEach`, GOOL abstracts over these differences.

## 5 Encoding Patterns

There are various levels of “patterns” to encode. The previous section documented how to encode the programming language aspects. Now we move on to other patterns, from simple library-level functions, to simple tasks (command-line arguments, list processing, printing), on to more complex patterns such as methods with a mixture of input, output and in-out parameters, and finally on to design patterns.

### 5.1 Internalizing library functions

Consider the simple trigonometric sine function, called `sin` in GOOL. It is common enough to warrant its own name, even though in most languages it is part of a library. A GOOL expression `sin foo` can then be seamlessly translated to `yield math.sin(foo)` in Python, `Math.sin(foo)` in Java, `Math.Sin(foo)` in C#, and `sin(foo)` in C++. Other functions are handled similarly. This part is easily extensible, but does require adding to GOOL classes.

### 5.2 Command line arguments

A slightly more complex task is accessing arguments passed on the command line. This tends to differ more significantly across languages. GOOL offers an abstraction of these mechanisms, through an `argsList` function that represents the list of arguments, as well as convenience functions for common tasks such as indexing into `argsList` and checking if an argument at a particular position exists. For example, these functions allow easy generation of code like `sys.argv[1]` in Python.

### 5.3 Lists

Variations on lists are frequently used in OO code, but the actual API in each language tends to vary considerably; we need to provide a single abstraction that provides sufficient functionality to do useful list computations. Rather than abstracting from the functionality provided in the libraries of each language to find some common ground, we instead reverse engineer the “useful” API from actual use cases.

One thing we immediately notice from such an exercise is that lists in OO languages are rarely *linked lists* (unlike in Haskell, our host language), but rather more like a dynamically sized vector. In particular, indexing a list by position, which is a horrifying idea for linked lists, is extremely common.

This narrows things down to a small set of functions and statements, shown in Table 5. For example, `listAccess`

**Table 5.** List functions

GOOL Syntax	Semantics
<code>listAccess</code>	access a list element at a given index
<code>listSet</code>	set a list element at a given index to a given value
<code>at</code>	same as <code>listAccess</code>
<code>listSize</code>	get the size of a list
<code>listAppend</code>	append a value to the end of a list
<code>listIndexExists</code>	check whether the list has a value at a given index
<code>indexOf</code>	get the index of a given value in a list

`(valueOf ages) (litInt 1)` will generate `ages[1]` in Python and C#, `ages.get(1)` in Java, and `ages.at(1)` in C++. List slicing is a very convenient higher-level primitive. The `listSlice` statement gets a variable to assign to, a list to slice, and three values representing the starting and ending indices for the slice and the step size. These last three values are all optional (we use Haskell’s `Maybe` for this) and default to the start of the list, end of the list and 1 respectively. To take elements from index 1 to 2 of `ages` and assign the result to `someAges`, we can use

```
listSlice someAges (valueOf ages)
    (Just $ litInt 1) (Just $ litInt 3)
    Nothing
```

List slicing is of particular note because the generated Python is particularly simple, unlike in other languages; the Python:

```
someAges = ages[1:3:]
```

while in Java it is

```
ArrayList<Double> temp = \
    new ArrayList<Double>(0);
for (int i_temp = 1; i_temp < 3; \
    i_temp++) {
```



```

881     temp.add(ages.get(i_temp));
882 }
883 someAges = temp;

```

This demonstrates GOOL's idiomatic code generation, enabled by having the appropriate high-level information to drive the generation process.

#### 5.4 Printing

Printing is another feature that generates quite different code depending on the target language. Here again Python is more “expressive” so that printing a list (via `println ages`) generates `print(ages)`, but in other languages we must generate a loop; for example, in C++:

```

895 std::cout << "[";
896 for (int list_i1 = 0; list_i1 < \
897     (int)(myName.size()) - 1; list_i1++) {
898     std::cout << myName.at(list_i1);
899     std::cout << ", ";
900 }
901 if ((int)(myName.size()) > 0) {
902     std::cout << \
903         myName.at((int)(myName.size()) - 1);
904 }
905 std::cout << "]" << std::endl;

```

In addition to printing, there is also functionality for reading input.

#### 5.5 Procedures with input, output and input-output parameters

Moving to larger-scale patterns, we noticed that our codes had methods that used their parameters differently: some were used as inputs, some as outputs and some for both purposes. This was a *semantic* pattern that was not necessarily obvious in any of the implementations. However, once we noticed it, we could use that information to generate better, more idiomatic code in each language, while still capturing the higher-level semantics of the functionality we were trying to implement. More concretely, consider a function `applyDiscount` that takes a price and a discount, subtracts the discount from the price, and returns both the new price and a Boolean for whether the price is below 20. In GOOL, using `inOutFunc`, assuming all variables mentioned have been defined:

```

927 inOutFunc "applyDiscount" public static_
928     [discount] [isAffordable] [price]
929     (bodyStatements [
930         price &-= valueOf discount,
931         isAffordable &=
932             valueOf price ?< litFloat 20.0])

```

`inOutFunc` takes three lists of parameters, the input, output and input-output, respectively. This function has two outputs—price and `isAffordable`—and multiple outputs are not directly supported in all target languages. Thus we need to use different features to represent these. For example, in Python, return statement with multiple values is used:

```

942 def applyDiscount(price, discount):
943     price = price - discount
944     isAffordable = price < 20
945
946     return price, isAffordable

```

In Java, the outputs are returned in an array of Objects:

```

949 public static Object[] applyDiscount( \
950     int price, int discount) \
951     throws Exception {
952     Boolean isAffordable;
953
954     price = price - discount;
955     isAffordable = price < 20;
956
957     Object[] outputs = new Object[2];
958     outputs[0] = price;
959     outputs[1] = isAffordable;
960     return outputs;
961 }

```

In C#, the outputs are passed as parameters, using the `out` keyword, if it is only an output, or the `ref` keyword, if it is both an input and an output:

```

965 public static void applyDiscount( \
966     ref int price, int discount, \
967     out Boolean isAffordable) {
968     price = price - discount;
969     isAffordable = price < 20;
970 }

```

And in C++, the outputs are passed as pointer parameters:

```

971 void applyDiscount(int &price, \
972     int discount, bool &isAffordable) {
973     price = price - discount;
974     isAffordable = price < 20;
975 }

```

Here again we see how a natural task-level “feature”, namely the desire to have different kinds of parameters, end up being rendered differently, but hopefully idiomatically, in each target language. GOOL manages the tedious aspects of generating any needed variable declarations and return statements. To call an `inOutFunc` function, one must use `inOutCall` so that GOOL can “line up” all the pieces properly.

## 5.6 Getters and setters

Getters and setters are a mainstay of OO programming. Whether these achieve encapsulation or not, it is certainly the case that saying to an OO programmer “variable foo from class FooClass should have getters and setters” is enough information for them to write the code. And so it is in GOOL as well. Saying `getMethod "FooClass" foo` and `setMethod "FooClass" foo`. The generated set method in Python, Java, C# and C++ are:

```
def setFoo(self, foo):
    self.foo = foo

public void setFoo(int foo) \
    throws Exception {
    this.foo = foo;
}

public void setFoo(int foo) {
    this.foo = foo;
}

void FooClass::setFoo(int foo) {
    this->foo = foo;
}
```

The point is that the conceptually simple “set method” contains a number of idiosyncracies in each target language. These details are irrelevant for the task at hand, and this tedium can be automated. As before, there are specific means of calling these functions, `get` and `set`.

## 5.7 Design Patterns

Finally we get to the design patterns of [10]. GOOL currently handles three design patterns: Observer, State, and Strategy.

For Strategy, we draw from partial evaluation, and ensure that the set of strategies that will effectively be used are statically known at generation time. This way we can ensure to only generate code for those that will actually be used. `runStrategy` is the user-facing function; it needs the name of the strategy to use, a list of pairs of strategy names and bodies, and an optional variable and value to assign to upon termination of the strategy.

For Observer, `initObserverList` generates an observer for a list. More specifically, given a list of (initial values), it generates a declaration of an observer list variable, initially containing the given values. `addObserver` can be used to add a value to the observer list, and `notifyObservers` will call a method on each of the observers. Currently, the name of the observer list variable is fixed, so there can only be one observer list in a given scope.

The State pattern is here specialized to implement *Finite State Machines* with fairly general transition functions.

Transitions happen on checking, not on changing the state. `initState` takes a name and a state label and generate a declaration of a variable with the given name and initial state. `changeState` changes the state of the variable to a new state. `checkState` is more complex. It takes the name of the state variable, a list of value-body pairs, and a fallback body; and it generates a conditional (usually a switch statement) that checks the state and runs the corresponding body, or the fallback body, if none of the states match.

Of course the design patterns could already have been coded in GOOL, but having these as language features is useful for two reasons: 1) the GOOL-level code is clearer in its intent (and more concise), and 2) the resulting code can be more idiomatic.

Below is a complete example of a GOOL function. The recommended style is to name all strings (to avoid hard-to-debug typos) and variables, then write the code proper.

```
patternTest :: (MethodSym repr) =>
    repr (Method repr)
patternTest = let
    fsmName = "myFSM"
    offState = "Off"
    onState = "On"
    noState = "Neither"
    obsName = "Observer"
    obs1Name = "obs1"
    obs2Name = "obs2"
    printNum = "printNum"
    nName = "n"
    obsType = obj obsName
    n = var n int
    obs1 = var obs1Name obsType
    obs2 = var obs2Name obsType
    newObs = extNewObj obsName
        obsType []

in mainFunction (body [block [
    varDec n,

    initState fsmName offState,
    changeState fsmName onState,
    checkState fsmName
    [(litString offState,
        oneLiner $ printStrLn offState),
     (litString onState,
        oneLiner $ printStrLn onState)]
    (oneLiner $ printStrLn noState)],

    block [
        varDecDef obs1 newObs,
```

```

varDecDef obs2 newObs],
block [
  initObserverList obsType
    [valueOf obs1],
  addObserver $ valueOf obs2,
  notifyObservers (func printNum
    void []) obsType]])

```

## 6 Related Work

We divide the Related Work into the following categories

- General-purpose code generation
- Multi-language OO code generation
- Design pattern modeling and code generation

which we present in turn.

### 6.1 General-purpose code generation

**Haxe** [3] is a general-purpose multi-paradigm language and cross-platform compiler. It compiles to all of the languages GOOL does, and many others. However, it is designed as a more traditional programming language, and thus does not offer the high-level abstractions that GOOL provides. Furthermore Haxe strips comments and generates source code around a custom framework; the effort of learning this framework and the lack of comments makes the generated code not particularly readable. The internal organization of Haxe does not seem to be well documented.

**Protokit** [14] is a DSL and code generator for Java and C++, where the generator is designed to produce general-purpose imperative or object-oriented code. The Protokit generator is model-driven and uses a final “output model” from which actual code can be generated. Since the “output model” is quite similar to the generated code, it presented challenges with regards to semantic, conventional, and library-related differences between the target languages [14]. GOOL’s finally-tagless approach and syntax for high-level tasks, on the other hand, help overcome differences between target languages.

**ThingML** [11] is a DSL for model-driven engineering targeting C, C++, Java, and JavaScript. It is specialized to deal with distributed reactive systems (a nevertheless broad range of application domains). This means that this not quite a general-purpose DSL, unlike GOOL. ThingML’s modelling-related syntax and abstractions stand in contrast to GOOL’s object-oriented syntax and abstractions. The generated code lacks some of the pretty-printing provided by GOOL, specifically indentation, which detracts from readability.

### 6.2 Object-oriented generators

There are a number of code generators with multiple target OO languages, though all for more restricted domains than GOOL, and thus do not meet all of our requirements.

**Google protocol buffers** [2] is a DSL for serializing structured data, which can be compiled into Java, Python, Objective C, and C++. **Thrift** [20] is a Facebook-developed tool for generating code in multiple languages and even multiple paradigms based on language-neutral descriptions of data types and interfaces. **Clearwater** [21] is an approach for implementing DSLs with multiple target languages for components of distributed systems. The **Time Weaver** tool [9] uses a multi-language code generator to generate “glue” code for real-time embedded systems. The domain of mobile applications is host to a bevy of DSLs with multiple target languages, of which **MobDSL** [15] and **XIS-Mobile** [19] are two examples. **Conjure** [1] is a DSL for generating APIs. It reads YML descriptions of APIs and can generate code in Java, TypeScript, Python, and Rust.

### 6.3 Design Patterns

A number of languages for modeling design patterns have been developed. The **Design Pattern Modeling Language** (DPML) [16] is similar to the Unified Modeling Language (UML) but designed specifically to overcome UML’s shortcomings so as to be able to model all design patterns. DPML consists of both specification diagrams and instance diagrams for instantiations of design patterns, but does not attempt to generate actual source code from the models. The **Role-Based Metamodeling Language** [13] is also based on UML but with changes to allow for better models of design patterns, with specifications for the structure, interactions, and state-based behaviour in patterns. Again, source code generation is not attempted. Another metamodel for design patterns includes generation of Java code [4], and IBM’s DSL for generation of OO code based on design patterns [6]. IBM’s DSL was in the form of a visual user interface rather than a programming or modeling language. The languages that generate code do so only for design patterns, not for any general-purpose code, as GOOL does.

## 7 Future Work

Currently GOOL code is typed based on what it represents: variable, value, type, or method, for example. The type system does not go “deeper”, so that variables are untyped, and values (such as booleans and strings) are simply “values”. This is sufficient to allow us to generate well-formed code, but not to ensure that it is well-typed. For example, it is unfortunately possible to pass a value that is known to be a non-list to a function (like `listSize`) which requires it. This will generate a compile-time error in generated Java, but a run-time error in generated Python. We have started to statically type GOOL, by making the underlying representations for GOOL’s Variables and Values Generalized Algebraic Data Types (GADTs), such as this one for Variables:

```

data TypedVar a where
  BVr :: VarData -> TypedVar Boolean

```

```
IVr :: VarData -> TypedVar Integer
...
```

This will allow variables to have different types, and Haskell will catch these. We would be re-using Haskell's type system to catch (some) of the type errors in GOOL. Because we do not need to type arbitrary code in any of the target languages, but only what is expressible in GOOL, we can engineer things so as to encode quite a wide set of typing rules.

GOOL is currently less-than-precise in the list of generated import statements; we want to improve the code to track precise dependencies, and only generate imports for the features we actually use. This could be done via weaving some state at generation-time for example. In general, we can do various kinds of static analyses to help enhance the code generation quality. For example, we ought to be much more precise about throws `Exception` in Java.

Another important future feature is being able to interface to external libraries, instead of just already-known libraries. In particular, we have a need to call external Ordinary Differential Equations (ODEs) solvers; we do not want to restrict ourselves to a single function, but have a host of different functions implementing different ODE-solving algorithms available. The structure of code that calls ODE solvers varies considerably, so that we cannot implement this feature with current GOOL features. In general, we believe that this requires a multi-pass architecture: an initial pass to collect information, and a second to actually generate the code.

Some implementation decisions, such as the use of `ArrayList` to represent lists in Java, are hard-coded. But we could have used `Vector` instead. We would like such a choice to be user-controlled. Another such decision point is to allow users to choose which specific external library to use.

And, of course, we ought to implement more of the common OO patterns.

## 8 Conclusion

Conceptually, mainstream object-oriented languages are similar enough that it is indeed feasible to create a single “generic” object-oriented language that can be “compiled” to them. Of course, these languages are syntactically quite different in places, and each contains some unique ideas as well. In other words, there exists a “conceptual” object-oriented language that is more than just “pseudocode”: it is a full-fledged executable language (through generation) that captures the common essence of mainstream OO languages.

GOOL is an unusual DSL, as its “domain” is actually that of object-oriented languages. Or, to be more precise, of conceptual programs that can be easily written in languages containing a procedural code with an object-oriented layer on top — which is what Java, Python, C++ and C# are.

Since we are capturing *conceptual programs*, we can achieve several things that we believe are *together* new:

- generation of idiomatic code for each target language,

- turning coding patterns into language idioms,
- generation of human-readable, well-documented code.

We must also re-emphasize this last point: that for GOOL, the generated code is meant for human consumption as well as for computer consumption. This is why semantically meaningless concepts such as “blocks” exist: to be able to chunk code into pieces meaningful for the human reader, and provide documentation at that level as well.

## References

- [1] [n. d.]. Conjure: a code-generator for multi-language HTTP/JSON clients and servers. <https://palantir.github.io/conjure/#/> Accessed 2019-09-16.
- [2] [n. d.]. Google Protocol Buffers. <https://developers.google.com/protocol-buffers/> Accessed 2019-09-16.
- [3] [n. d.]. Haxe - The cross-platform toolkit. <https://haxe.org> Accessed 2019-09-13.
- [4] Hervé Albin-Amiot and Yann-Gaël Guéhéneuc. 2001. Meta-modeling design patterns: Application to pattern detection and code synthesis. In *Proceedings of ECOOP Workshop on Automating Object-Oriented Software Development Methods*.
- [5] Lucas Beyak and Jacques Carette. 2011. SAGA: A DSL for story management. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.0776* (2011).
- [6] Frank J. Budinsky, Marilyn A. Finnie, John M. Vlissides, and Patsy S. Yu. 1996. Automatic code generation from design patterns. *IBM systems Journal* 35, 2 (1996), 151–171.
- [7] Raymond PL Buse and Westley R Weimer. 2009. Learning a metric for code readability. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 36, 4 (2009), 546–558.
- [8] Jacques Carette, Oleg Kiselyov, and Chung-chieh Shan. 2009. Finally tagless, partially evaluated: Tagless staged interpreters for simpler typed languages. *Journal of Functional Programming* 19, 5 (2009), 509–543.
- [9] Dionisio de Niz and Raj Rajkumar. 2004. Glue code generation: Closing the loophole in model-based development. In *10th IEEE Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium (RTAS 2004). Workshop on Model-Driven Embedded Systems*. Citeseer.
- [10] Erich Gamma. 1995. *Design patterns: elements of reusable object-oriented software*. Pearson Education India.
- [11] Nicolas Harrand, Franck Fleurey, Brice Morin, and Knut Eilif Husa. 2016. Thingml: a language and code generation framework for heterogeneous targets. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 19th International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*. ACM, 125–135.
- [12] Sungpack Hong, Hassan Chafi, Edic Sedlar, and Kunle Olukotun. 2012. Green-Marl: a DSL for easy and efficient graph analysis. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News* 40, 1 (2012), 349–362.
- [13] Dae-Kyoo Kim, Robert France, Sudipto Ghosh, and Eunjee Song. 2003. A uml-based metamodeling language to specify design patterns. In *Proceedings of Workshop on Software Model Engineering (WiSME), at UML 2003*. Citeseer.
- [14] Gábor Kövesdán and László Lengyel. 2017. Multi-Platform Code Generation Supported by Domain-Specific Modeling. *International Journal of Information Technology and Computer Science* 9, 12 (2017), 11–18.
- [15] Dean Kramer, Tony Clark, and Samia Oussena. 2010. MobDSL: A Domain Specific Language for multiple mobile platform deployment. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Networked Embedded Systems for Enterprise Applications*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [16] David Mapelsden, John Hosking, and John Grundy. 2002. Design pattern modelling and instantiation using DPML. In *Proceedings of the Fortieth International Conference on Tools Pacific: Objects for internet*,



- mobile and embedded applications. Australian Computer Society, Inc., 3–11.
- [17] Marjan Mernik, Jan Heering, and Anthony M Sloane. 2005. When and how to develop domain-specific languages. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 37, 4 (2005), 316–344.
- [18] Arjan J Mooij, Jozef Hooman, and Rob Albers. 2013. Gaining industrial confidence for the introduction of domain-specific languages. In *2013 IEEE 37th Annual Computer Software and Applications Conference Workshops*. IEEE, 662–667.
- [19] André Ribeiro and Alberto Rodrigues da Silva. 2014. Xis-mobile: A dsl for mobile applications. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*. ACM, 1316–1323.
- [20] Mark Slee, Aditya Agarwal, and Marc Kwiatkowski. 2007. Thrift: Scalable cross-language services implementation. *Facebook White Paper* 5, 8 (2007).
- [21] Galen S Swint, Calton Pu, Gueyoung Jung, Wenchang Yan, Younggyun Koh, Qinyi Wu, Charles Consel, Akhil Sahai, and Koichi Moriyama. 2005. Clearwater: extensible, flexible, modular code generation. In *Proceedings of the 20th IEEE/ACM international Conference on Automated software engineering*. ACM, 144–153.
- [22] Daniel C Wang, Andrew W Appel, Jeffrey L Korn, and Christopher S Serra. 1997. The Zephyr Abstract Syntax Description Language.. In *DSL*, Vol. 97. 17–17.