



IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON

VALUE DEPENDENT TYPES FOR THE CLI

Type equality constraints

Author:
Fraser WATERS
fraser.waters08@imperial.ac.uk

Supervisor:
Professor Sophia DROSSOPOULOU

June 7, 2013

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Generalized algebraic data types	1
1.2	Example	2
2	Specification changes	5
2.1	Generic constraints	5
2.2	Assignment compatability	6
2.2.1	<i>equality-assingable-to</i>	6
2.3	Method calls	6
2.4	Metadata tables	6
3	Implementation changes	8
3.1	Assembler	8
3.2	Runtime	8
4	References	9

Abstract

Type equality constraints would allow the CLI to better express generalized algebraic data types.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Generalized algebraic data types

This report looks into how to add type equality constraints to the CLI. Type equality constraints for C# are described in [2], we'll be using these ideas but for the CLI not C#. The basic idea is to extend generic constraints to allow equality constraints on generic types, section 3.1 (Equational constraints for C#) of [2] describes this extension. This would allow a generic type to be declared equal to another type, this would be checked statically at compile time. For example a list flatten method could check that the list was a list of lists by the addition of the `where T=List<U>` clause.

```
public abstract class List<T> {
    ...
    public abstract List<T> Append(List<T> list);
    public abstract List<U> Flatten<U>() where T=List<U>;
}

public class Nil<T> : List<T> {
    public override List<U> Flatten<U>() {
        return new Nil<U>;
    }
}

public class Cons<T> : List<T> {
    T head; List<T> tail;
    public override List<U> Flatten<U>() {
        return this.head.Append(this.tail.Flatten());
    }
}
```

Calling Flatten on a List<T> would statically check that T=List<U> where U is any type. Thus in the method body of flatten we can assume that the type of head is List<U> which has an Append method. While the paper suggests this as a C# extension generic constraints are currently encoded at the CLI level and so we could add this as a CLI extension, thus allowing this to be added to C# and other languages easily.

1.2 Example

The following shows a minimal list example, in both C# and CIL.

Listing 1.1: Type equality constraints in extended C#

```
public abstract class List<T>
{
    public abstract List<T> Append(List<T> list);
    public abstract List<U> Flatten<U>() where T>List<U>;
}

public class Nil<T> : List<T>
{
    public override List<T> Append(List<T> list)
    {
        return list;
    }
    public abstract List<U> Flatten<U>()
    {
        return new Nil<U>();
    }
}

public class Cons<T> : List<T>
{
    T Head;
    List<T> Tail;

    public Cons(T head, List<T> tail)
    {
        Head = head;
        Tail = tail;
    }

    public override List<T> Append(List<T> list)
    {
        return new Cons<T>(Head, Tail.Append(list));
    }

    public override List<U> Flatten<U>()
    {
        return Head.Append(Tail.Flatten<U>());
    }
}
```

Listing 1.2: Corresponding CIL

```
.class public abstract auto ansi beforefieldinit List<T>
extends [mscorlib]System.Object
{
    .method family hidebysig specialname rtspecialname instance void .ctor()
```

```

        cil managed
    {
        .maxstack 8
        ldarg.0
        call instance void [mscorlib]System.Object::.ctor()
        ret
    }

    .method public hidebysig newslot abstract virtual instance class
        Test.List`1<T> Append(class Test.List`1<T> list) cil managed
    {
    }

    .method public hidebysig newslot abstract virtual instance class
        Test.List`1<!!U> Flatten<= T List<!!0> U>() cil managed
    {
    }
}

.class public auto ansi beforefieldinit Nil<T>
    extends Test.List`1<T>
{
    .method public hidebysig specialname rtspecialname instance void .ctor()
        cil managed
    {
        .maxstack 8
        ldarg.0
        call instance void Test.List`1<T>::.ctor()
        ret
    }

    .method public hidebysig virtual instance class
        Test.List`1<T> Append(class Test.List`1<T> list) cil managed
    {
        .maxstack 1
        ldarg.1
        ret
    }

    .method public hidebysig virtual instance class
        Test.List`1<!!U> Flatten<= T List<!!0> U>() cil managed
    {
        .maxstack 1
        newobj instance void Test.Nil`1<!!U>::.ctor()
        ret
    }
}

.class public auto ansi beforefieldinit Cons<T>
    extends Test.List`1<T>
{
    .method public hidebysig specialname rtspecialname instance void
        .ctor(!T head, class Test.List`1<T> tail) cil managed

```

```

{
    .maxstack 2
    ldarg.0
    call instance void Test.List`1<!T>::ctor()
    ldarg.0
    ldarg.1
    stfld !0 Test.Cons`1<!T>::Head
    ldarg.0
    ldarg.2
    stfld class Test.List`1<!0> Test.Cons`1<!T>::Tail
    ret
}

.method public hidebysig virtual instance class
    Test.List`1<!T> Append(class Test.List`1<!T> list) cil managed
{
    .maxstack 3
    ldarg.0
    ldfld !0 Test.Cons`1<!T>::Head
    ldarg.0
    ldfld class Test.List`1<!0> Test.Cons`1<!T>::Tail
    ldarg.1
    callvirt instance class Test.List`1<!0>
        Test.List`1<!T>::Append(class Test.List`1<!0>)
    newobj instance void Test.Cons`1<!T>::ctor(!0, class Test.List`1<!0>)
    ret
}

.method public hidebysig virtual instance class
    Test.List`1<!!U> Flatten<= T List<!!0> U>() cil managed
{
    .maxstack 2
    nop
    ldarg.0
    ldfld !0 Test.Cons`1<!T>::Head
    ldarg.0
    ldfld class Test.List`1<!0> Test.Cons`1<!T>::Tail
    callvirt instance class Test.List`1<!!0>
        Test.List`1<!T>::Flatten<!!U>()
    callvirt instance class Test.List`1<!0>
        Test.List`1<!!U>::Append(class Test.List`1<!0>)
    ret
}

.field private !T Head
.field private class Test.List`1<!T> Tail
}

```

The syntax here is purely to demonstrate the intuition of the feature. Exact syntax will be expanded on as we explore how this can be added to the CLI specification.

Chapter 2

Specification changes

2.1 Generic constraints

Section II.9.11 (Constraints on generic parameters)[1] specifies generic constraints. A type parameter that has been constrained must be instantiated with an argument that is assignable to each of declared constraints, and that satisfies all special constraints.

The special constraints are, `+`, `-`, `class`, `valuetype` and `.ctor`. `class` constrains the argument to be a reference type. `valuetype` constrains the argument to be a value type, except for any instance of `System.Nullable<T>`. `.ctor` constrains the argument to a type that has a public default constructor (implicitly this means all value types as value types always have a public default constructor). Finally `+` and `-` are used to denote the parameter is covariant or contravariant respectively.

While it might seem that this is a good place to add our extension type equality constraints are a constraint on the entire parameter list, not on each individual parameter. There's also the potential to add an equality constraint to a non-generic method.

```
class Foo<T>
{
    public void Bar(List<int> list) where T = int
    {
        ...
    }

    public void Baz(List<string> list) where T = string
    {
        ...
    }
}
```

In this example `Bar` can only be called if `Foo<T>` was initialized with `int`, and `Baz` only if it was initialized with `string`. A similar thing can be done with non-generic inner types. So we need to look to add this new syntax somewhere separate to the generic parameter list. Preferably it would have similar syntax for both methods and types (as generic parameters look the same on a type declaration or method declaration). A type declaration currently follows the pattern `".class ClassAttr* Id ['<' GenPars '>'] [extends TypeSpec [implements TypeSpec] ['>', ' TypeSpec']*]"`, while method declarations follow the pattern `".method MethAttr* [CallConv] Type [marshal '(' [NativeType] ')'] MethodName ['<' GenPars '>'] '(' Parameters ')' ImplAttr"`.

Adding a new clause `"where [Type '=' Type['>', ' Type '=' Type]*]"` to method declarations after the parameter list gives us a list of Types that must be equal to other types. It's not strictly necessary to

have this clause on type declarations as for top level types it makes very little sense and for inner types it can be emulated by adding the clause to each method.

2.2 Assignment compatability

Assignment compatability is defined in section I.8.7 of [1], further to this verification assignment compatability is defined in III.1.8.1.2.3. Verification assignment compatability is mostly defined in terms of general assignment compatability from I.8.7.3.

Verification assignment compatability is used by the verifier for determining if method calls, field references and loads and stores are valid for a given type and signature. If verification assignment compatability is extended to understand type equality constraints then operations that were unverifiable but type correct can now be checked as verifiable as well.

The rules for *verifier-assignable-to* are already reflexive and transitive, adding another rule *equality-assignable-to* to the list that defines the rules for type equality constraints is all that's needed to define type equality constraints.

2.2.1 *equality-assignable-to*

$$\text{eq-hyp} \frac{T = U \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash T = U}$$

General assignment compatability is defined in section I.8.7.3, which is reproduced here.

b if method requires a this pointer, as specified by its method signature I.8.6.1.5, then one is on the stack and its verification type is verifier-assignable-to III.1.8.1.2.3 the this signature of the method's signature;

2.3 Method calls

2.4 Metadata tables

Metadata tables are specified in section 22 (Metadata logical format: tables). We're mostly interested in section 22.21 (GenericParamConstraint), which explains how generic constraints are stored in the assembly.

The GenericParamConstraint table has the following columns:

- Owner (an index into the GenericParam table, specifying to which generic parameter this row refers)
- Constraint (an index into the TypeDef, TypeRef, or TypeSpec tables, specifying from which class this generic parameter is constrained to derive; or which interface this generic parameter is constrained to implement; more precisely, a TypeDefOrRef (§24.2.6) coded index)

The GenericParamConstraint table records the constraints for each generic parameter. Each generic parameter can be constrained to derive from zero or one class. Each generic parameter can be constrained to implement zero or more interfaces.

Conceptually, each row in the GenericParamConstraint table is owned by a row in the GenericParam table.

All rows in the GenericParamConstraint table for a given Owner shall refer to distinct constraints.

We need a similar table for our equality constraints. It will need an owner (a type or method) and then two types that are constrained to be equal within the owner. Another column that isn't necessary but could be useful is a flags field describing the relationship between the two types, currently this would

always be set to equal, however the system could be extended at a later date to allow less than and greater than relationships as well.

So the TypeRelationshipConstraint table has the following columns:

- Owner (an index into the TypeDef or MethodDef table, specifying the Type or Method to which this constraint applies; more precisely, a TypeOrMethodDef (§24.2.6) coded index)
- Flags (a 1-byte flag bitmask currently always set to 1. To be used for extensions)
- ConstraintA (an index into the TypeDef, TypeRef, or TypeSpec tables, specifying the first type; more precisely, a TypeDefOrRef (§24.2.6) coded index)
- ConstraintB (an index into the TypeDef, TypeRef, or TypeSpec tables, specifying the second type; more precisely, a TypeDefOrRef (§24.2.6) coded index)

Chapter 3

Implementation changes

3.1 Assembler

The mono assembler is found in `/mcs/ilasm`.

3.2 Runtime

The runtime needs to be changed to load and understand equality constraint metadata, these changes will be focused on `/mono/metadata`.

Chapter 4

References

Bibliography

- [1] Ecma-335 common language infrastructure (cli), 2012.
- [2] Andrew Kennedy and Claudio V Russo. Generalized algebraic data types and object-oriented programming, 2005.