Compiler Construction 2010/2011 Polymorphic Types and Generics

Peter Thiemann

January 25, 2011

Outline

Polymorphic Types and Generics

- A function is <u>polymorphic</u> if it can be applied to arguments of different types
- Strachey distinguishes several kinds of polymorphism
 - <u>ad-hoc polymorphism</u>: different code runs depending on the type of the arguments
 - dependency on static type: overloading
 - dependency on dynamic type: <u>run-time (multi) dispatch</u> only possible in languages with subtyping
 - parametric polymorphism / generics: same code runs for all types of arguments, the type of the code can be parameterized

Example (Java)

```
abstract class IntList {
  IntList append (IntList more);
class IntCons extends IntList {
  Integer head; IntList tail;
  IntList append (IntList more) {
    return new IntCons (head, tail.append (more));
class IntNull extends IntList {
  IntList append (IntList more) {
    return more;
```

Example (Java)

```
abstract class IntList {
  IntList append (IntList more);
class IntCons extends IntList {
  Integer head; IntList tail;
  IntList append (IntList more) {
    return new IntCons (head, tail.append (more));
class IntNull extends IntList {
  IntList append (IntList more) {
    return more;
```

Nothing in this code depends on the element type Integer

Example (Obsolete Solution Using Object)

```
abstract class List {
  List append (List more);
class Cons extends List {
  Object head; List tail;
  List append (List more) {
    return new Cons (head, tail.append (more));
class Null extends List {
  List append (List more) {
    return more;
```

Example (Obsolete Solution Using Object)

```
abstract class List {
  List append (List more);
class Cons extends List {
  Object head; List tail;
  List append (List more) {
    return new Cons (head, tail.append (more));
class Null extends List {
  List append (List more) {
    return more;
```

- Extracting elements from List requires type casts ⇒ unsafe
- List may be heterogeneous



Outline

Parametric Polymorphism

- Let f(T x) be a polymorphic function where T is a type parameter
- f can be used with all instantiations of T
- Explicit style specifies instantiation at function call:
 - f(Int)(42)
 - f(String)("foo")
- Implicit style: instantiation left to the compiler
 - f(42)
 - f("foo")

Generic Java (GJ)

Syntax

```
ClassDecl = class id TyParams Ext
                      { VarDecl* MethodDecl* }
Ext
               = extends Type
MethodDecl
               = public TyParams Type id(FormalList)
                      { VarDecl* Statement* return Exp;}
               = \(\langle id Ext TyParRest^* \rangle \)
TyParams
TyParRest
               = , id Ext
         = \cdots \mid id\langle Type\ TypeRest^*\rangle
Type
TypeRest = , Type
               = \cdots \mid \text{new id} \langle \textit{Type TypeRest}^* \rangle ()
Exp
```

Example (Solution Using GJ)

```
abstract class List<X> {
  List<X> append (List<X> more);
class Cons<X> extends List<X> {
  X head; List<X> tail;
  List<X> append (List<X> more) {
    return new Cons<X> (head, tail.append (more));
class Null<X> extends List<X> {
  List<X> append (List<X> more) {
    return more;
```

Improvement over Object solution

- No type casts required for using List<X>
- List<X> is homogeneous



Using the Generic List Class

List of Integer

```
List<Integer> list42 =
  new Cons<Integer> (new Integer(4),
    new Cons<Integer> (new Integer(2),
    new Null<Integer>()));
```

List of list

```
List<List<Integer>> 11 =
  new Cons<List<Integer>>(list42,
    new Null<List<Integer>>());
```

Bounded Polymorphism

- Type parameters can be restricted by (upper) bounds
- Every instantiation must be a subtype of the bound
- Can be used to force homogeneous composites

Example (Bounded Polymorphism)

```
abstract class Printable { void print_me(); }
class PrintableInt extends Printable {
    int x:
    void print_me () { System.out.println(x); }
class PrintableBool extends Printable {
    boolean b;
    void print me () { System.out.println (b); }
class GPair<X extends Printable> extends Printable {
    X a; X b;
    void print_me () { a.print_me (); b.print_me (); }
new GPair<PrintableInt>
 (new PrintableInt (17), new PrintableInt (4)); // ok
new GPair<PrintableInt>
 (new PrintableInt (17), new PrintableBool (false)); //
                                    4日 → 4周 → 4 目 → 4 目 → 9 Q P
```

Generics and Subtyping

- If class Triple extends Pair, then Triple is subtype of Pair
- If class GTriple<X extends Printable> extends
 GPair<X>, then
 GTriple<PrintableInt> is subtype of
 GPair<PrintableInt>
 GTriple<PrintableBool> is subtype of
 GPair<PrintableBool>
- If class MyInt extends PrintableInt, then
 GPair<MyInt> is not subtype of
 GPair<PrintableInt>
 GTriple<MyInt> is not subtype of
 GPair<PrintableInt>
- GTriple and GPair are type constructors, not types, so it makes no sense to put them in subtype relation

Outline

Polymorphic Type Checking

The language of types comprises

```
primitive types int, boolean
```

type applications $c\langle t_1,\ldots,t_n\rangle$ where c is a type constructor of arity n

type variables customarily called X, Y, Z, ...

Conventions

- All class identifiers are considered polymorphic. If n = 0, then write c⟨⟩.
- Abbreviate extends to ⊲
- All bounds are explicit, missing ones are Object
- N stands for non-variable type expression

Well-formedness and Subtyping

Judgments $\Delta \vdash t$ OK (Well-formedness) and $\Delta \vdash s <: t$ (Subtyping)

 $\Delta \vdash c\langle t_1,\ldots,t_n\rangle <: t$

Type-Checking Expressions

Judgment Δ , $\Gamma \vdash e : t$

$$\Delta, \Gamma, x: t \vdash x: t$$

$$\underline{\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e: t \quad N = \text{getBound}(\Delta, t) \quad s = \text{fieldType}(f, N)}$$

$$\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e: t$$

$$\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e: t$$

$$\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e: t \quad N = \text{getBound}(\Delta, t)$$

$$\langle Y_1 \lhd P_1, \dots, Y_n \lhd P_n \rangle (U_1 \ x_1, \dots, U_m \ x_m) \rightarrow U = \text{methodType}(m, N)$$

$$\Delta \vdash V_1 \text{ OK} \dots \Delta \vdash V_n \text{ OK}$$

$$\Delta \vdash V_1 <: [V_i/Y_i]P_1 \dots \Delta \vdash V_n <: [V_i/Y_i]P_n$$

$$\Delta \vdash t_1 <: [V_i/Y_i]U_1 \dots \Delta \vdash t_m <: [V_i/Y_i]U_m$$

$$\Delta, \Gamma \vdash e.m \langle V_1, \dots, V_n \rangle (e_1, \dots, e_m) : [V_i/Y_i]U$$

 $\frac{\Delta \vdash N \text{ OK}}{\Delta \cdot \Gamma \vdash \text{new } N()}$

Type-Checking Expressions

Auxiliary Judgments

$$\frac{X \lhd N \in \Delta}{N = \mathsf{getBound}(\Delta, X)} \qquad N = \mathsf{getBound}(\Delta, N)$$

$$\frac{\mathsf{class}\; c\langle X_1 \lhd N_1, \dots, X_n \lhd N_n \rangle \lhd N\{\dots U \, f \dots\}}{[T_i/X_i]U = \mathsf{fieldType}(f, c\langle T_1, \dots, T_n \rangle)}$$

$$\frac{Class\; c\langle X_1 \lhd N_1, \dots, X_n \lhd N_n \rangle \lhd N\{\dots \mathsf{without}\; f \dots\}}{T = \mathsf{fieldType}f, [T_i/X_i]N}$$

$$T = \mathsf{fieldType}(f, c\langle T_1, \dots, T_n \rangle)$$

Type-Checking Expressions

Auxiliary Judgments

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{class } c\langle X_1 \lhd N_1, \dots, X_n \lhd N_n \rangle \lhd N \\ \underbrace{\{\dots \langle Y_1 \lhd P_1, \dots, Y_n \lhd P_n \rangle U \ m(U_1 \ X_1, \dots, U_m \ X_m) \dots \}}_{ [T_i/X_i](\langle Y_1 \lhd P_1, \dots, Y_n \lhd P_n \rangle (U_1 \ X_1, \dots, U_m \ X_m) \to U) } \\ = \text{methodType}(m, c\langle T_1, \dots, T_n \rangle) \\ \\ \underbrace{class \ c\langle X_1 \lhd N_1, \dots, X_n \lhd N_n \rangle \lhd N \{\dots \text{ without } m \dots \}}_{mt = \text{ methodType}(m, [T_i/X_i]N)} \\ \\ \underline{mt = \text{methodType}(m, c\langle T_1, \dots, T_n \rangle)} \\ \end{array}$$

Type-Checking Class Definitions

$$\Delta = X_1 \lhd N_1, \ldots, X_n \lhd N_n$$

$$\Delta \vdash N \text{ OK} \qquad \Delta \vdash N_1 \text{ OK} \ldots \Delta \vdash N_n \text{ OK}$$

$$md_j = \langle Y_1 \lhd P_1, \ldots, Y_k \lhd P_k \rangle U \text{ } m(U_1 \text{ } x_1, \ldots, U_l \text{ } x_l) \{ \text{return } \textbf{e} \}$$

$$\Delta_j = \Delta, Y_1 \lhd P_1, \ldots, Y_k \lhd P_k \qquad \Delta_j \vdash U \text{ OK}$$

$$\Delta_j \vdash U_1 \text{ OK} \ldots \Delta_j \vdash U_l \text{ OK} \qquad \Delta_j \vdash P_1 \text{ OK} \ldots \Delta_j \vdash P_k \text{ OK}$$

$$\Delta_j, \text{this} : \textbf{c} \langle X_1, \ldots, X_n \rangle, x_1 : U_1, \ldots, x_l : U_l \vdash \textbf{e} : T$$

$$\Delta_j \vdash T <: U$$

$$\langle Z_1 \lhd Q_1, \ldots, Z_k \lhd Q_k \rangle V(V_1, \ldots, V_l) = \text{methodType}(m, N)$$

$$V_i = [\overline{Z}/\overline{Y}]U_i \qquad Q_i = [\overline{Z}/\overline{Y}]P_i \qquad \Delta_j \vdash [\overline{Z}/\overline{Y}]U <: V$$

$$\text{class } \textbf{c} \langle X_1 \lhd N_1, \ldots, X_n \lhd N_n \rangle \lhd N \{ md_1 \ldots md_m \}$$

Outline

Translation of Polymorphic Programs

- Expansion Create a fresh copy of a generic class for each type instantiation
 - Casting Generate a single copy and insert appropriate casts
- Erasure Generate a single class and operate directly on it
- Type-passing Generate a template class and pass type parameters at run time

Translation by Expansion

- Heterogeneous translation
- Terminates always (unlike inline expansion), but might cause exponential blowup
- Different instances are unrelated
- See C++ templates, Ada
- Compatible with Java
- Compiled code efficient

Translation by Casting

- Homogeneous translation
- Erase all type parameters
- Replace type variables by their bounds
- Translation of GPair

```
class GPair extends Printable {
  Printable a; Printable b;
  void print_me () {
    a.print_me (); b.print_me ();
  }
}
```

Translation by Casting

- Run-time checks although the casts always succeed
- Class construction cannot be applied to type variables

Translation by Erasure

- Direct translation to machine code
- Homogeneous translation w/o casts
- No code duplication and no run-time casts
- Incompatible with the JVM

Translation by Type-passing

Types become value parameters:

```
<X extends C> int m (X x, int y)
gets translated to
int m (Class X, X x, int y)
```

- The C# way
- Class construction with type variables possible
- Class descriptors can be separated from objects
- Run-time cost of type passing
- Incompatible with standard JVMs

Pointers, Integers, and Boxing

- Polymorphism in GJ only for object types, not for int and boolean
- Wrapper classes required
- Since Java 1.5: autoboxing
- Why boxed values are good for polymorphism:
 - All objects have the same size
 - Boxed values can contain class descriptors