

# Making PT accessible

## *Implementing PT in TypeScript*

Petter Sæther Moen



Thesis submitted for the degree of  
Master in Informatics: Programming and System  
Architecture  
60 credits

Department of Informatics  
Faculty of mathematics and natural sciences

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Spring 2021



# **Making PT accessible**

*Implementing PT in TypeScript*

Petter Sæther Moen

© 2021 Petter Sæther Moen

Making PT accessible

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Printed: Reprosentralen, University of Oslo

# **Abstract**



# Acknowledgements





# Contents

<b>I</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	What is PT? . . . . .	3
1.2	Purpose of implementing PT in TS . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Package Templates . . . . .	5
2.2	TypeScript . . . . .	5
2.2.1	JavaScript / ECMAScript . . . . .	5
<b>II</b>	<b>The project</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Planning the project</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	What Do We Need? . . . . .	9
3.2	Syntax . . . . .	9
3.3	TypeScript vs JavaScript . . . . .	11
3.3.1	Verifying templates . . . . .	11
3.4	Choosing the right approach . . . . .	11
3.4.1	Preprocessor for the TypeScript Compiler . . . . .	11
3.4.2	TypeScript Compiler Plugin / Transform . . . . .	11
3.4.3	Babel plugin . . . . .	12
3.4.4	TypeScript Compiler Fork . . . . .	12
<b>4</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1	Architecture / Parts of the compiler / PP . . . . .	13
4.1.1	Lexer and Parser . . . . .	13
4.1.2	Instantiation and Renaming . . . . .	13
4.1.3	Verification of Templates . . . . .	13
4.1.4	Code Generation . . . . .	13
4.2	Notes on Performance . . . . .	13
4.3	Does PTS fulfill the requirements of PT? . . . . .	13
4.3.1	Verifying Templates . . . . .	13
<b>5</b>	<b>Difference between PTS and PTj</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1	Nominal vs. Structural Typing . . . . .	15
5.1.1	What is structural typing? . . . . .	17
5.1.2	Which Better Fits PT? . . . . .	17

<b>III Conclusion</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>6 Results</b>	<b>21</b>

# List of Figures



# List of Tables



# Preface





## **Part I**

# **Introduction**



# **Chapter 1**

## **Introduction**

**1.1 What is PT?**

**1.2 Purpose of implementing PT in TS**



## Chapter 2

# Background

### 2.1 Package Templates

essay

### 2.2 TypeScript

#### 2.2.1 JavaScript / ECMAScript

When I talk about JavaScript in this thesis I will be refering to the ECMAScript standard (More precisely ES6(Kanskje ikke så viktig å spesifisere dette?)).



## **Part II**

# **The project**





## Chapter 3

# Planning the project

### 3.1 What Do We Need?

- The ability to add custom syntax (access to the tokenizer / parser)
- Some semantic analysis.

### 3.2 Syntax

For the implementation of PT we need syntax for the following:

- Defining packages (`package` in PTj)
- Defining templates (`template` in PTj)
- Instantiating templates (`inst` in PTj)
- Renaming classes (`=>` in PTj)
- Renaming methods (`->` in PTj)
- Additions to classes (`addto` in PTj)

`template` and `inst` are both not in use nor reserved in the ECMAScript standard or in TypeScript, and can therefore be used in PTScript(Midlertidlig navn) without any issues.

The keyword `package` in TS / ES is as of yet not in use, however the ECMAScript standard has reserved it for future use. In order to "future proof" our implementation we should avoid using this reserved keyword, as it could have some conflicts with a potential future implementation of packages in ECMAScript. It could also be beneficial to not share the keyword in order avoid creating confusion between the future ES packages and PT Packages. `module` is also a keyword that could be used to describe a PT package, however this is already used in the ES standard, and should therefore also be avoided for similar reasons to `package`, to avoid confusion. We will therefore use (`pack` eller `bundle`? Må nok se litt mer på dette) instead.

For renaming classes PTj uses `=>`, however in ES this is used in arrow-functions[2]. To avoid confusion and a potentially ambiguous grammar we will have to choose a different syntax for renaming classes. PTj, for historical purposes, uses a different operator (`->`) for renaming class methods, however for keeping PTScript(Midlertidlig navn) simple we will stick to only having one common operator for renaming.

ECMAScript currently supports renaming of destructured fields using the `:`(colon) operator and aliasing imports using the keyword `as`. Even though we opted to choose a different keyword for packages, we will here re-use the already existing `as` keyword for renaming as the concepts are so closely related.

PTScript(Midlertidlig navn):

```
template T {
  class A {
    function f() : String {
      ...
    }
  }
}

pack P {
  inst T with A as A (f as g); // Function overloading not supported
  addto A {
    i : number = 0;
  }
}
```

PTj:

```
template T {
  class A {
    String f() {
      ...
    }
  }
}

package P {
  inst T with A => A (f() -> g());
  addto A {
    int i = 0;
  }
}
```

## 3.3 TypeScript vs JavaScript

### 3.3.1 Verifying templates

One of the requirements for PT is that each template should be verifiable. There is no easy way to verify if some JavaScript code is verifiable without executing it. With TypeScript on the other hand, with the language being statically typed, we can, at least to a much larger extent, verify if some piece of code is valid. And thus we can also use this to validate each separate template in PT.

Now it should be noted that due to TypeScript's type system being unsound one could argue that this requirement of PT is not met. While this is true it still outperforms JavaScript on this remark, and we will later in section 4.3.1 on page 13 discuss more in-depth to what extent this requirement is met.

## 3.4 Choosing the right approach

Before jumping into a project of this magnitude it is important to find out what approach to use. The goal of this project is to extend TypeScript with the Package Templates language mechanism, this can be achieved as following:

- Making a fork of the TypeScript compiler
- Making a preprocessor for the TypeScript compiler
- Making a compiler plugin / transform
- Making a custom compiler from scratch

### 3.4.1 Preprocessor for the TypeScript Compiler

More work than ex plugin / transformer.

### 3.4.2 TypeScript Compiler Plugin / Transform

As of the time of writing this the official TypeScript compiler does not support compile time plugins. The plugins for the TypeScript compiler is, as the TypeScript compiler wiki specifies, "for changing the editing experience only"[4]. However there are alternatives that do enable compile time plugins / transformers;

- ts-loader[6], for the webpack ecosystem
- Awesome Typescript Loader[5], for the webpack ecosystem. Deprecated
- ts-node[7], REPL / runtime
- ttypescript[3], TypeScript tool TODO: Les mer på dette

Unfortunately ts-loader, Awesome Typescript Loader and ts-node does not support adding custom syntax, as it only transforms the AST produced by the TypeScript compiler. Because of this they are not a viable option for our use-case and will therefore be discarded.

### 3.4.3 Babel plugin

Babel isn't strictly for TypeScript, but for JavaScript as a whole, however we could write our plugin to be dependent on the TypeScript transformation plugin.

Making a Babel plugin will make it very accessible as most web-projects use Babel, and the upkeep is cheap, as plugins are loosely coupled with the core.

In order for a Babel plugin to support custom syntax it has to provide a custom parser, a fork of the Babel parser. Through this we can extend the TypeScript syntax with our syntax for PT. This is all hidden away from the user, as this custom parser is a dependency of our Babel plugin.

Seeing as we have to make a fork of the parser in order to solve our problem, the upkeep will not be as cheap as first anticipated. However being able to have most of the logic loosely coupled with the compiler core it will still make it easier to keep updated than through a fork of the TypeScript compiler.

TODO: Er det støttet å bruke flere plugins med forskjellige parsere? E.g. babel-plugin-typescript + vårt babel plugin?

### 3.4.4 TypeScript Compiler Fork

Possible, however not as accessible as other alternatives and will make upkeep expensive.

The TypeScript compiler is a monolith. It has about 2.5 million lines of code, and therefore has a quite steep learning curve to get into. If we were to go with this route it would be quite hard to keep up with the TypeScript updates, as updates to the compiler might break our implementation. However as we have seen, going the plugin / transform route also requires us to fork the underlying compiler and make changes to it, however with the majority of the implementation being loosely coupled it would still make it easier to keep up-to-date. That being said it will probably be a lot easier to do semantic analysis in a fork of the TypeScript compiler vs in a plugin / transform.

## Chapter 4

# Implementation

In this chapter we are going to look at the implementation for PT in TypeScript.

### 4.1 Architecture / Parts of the compiler / PP

#### 4.1.1 Lexer and Parser

tree-sitter grammar extending tree-sitter-typescript

#### 4.1.2 Instantiation and Renaming

#### 4.1.3 Verification of Templates

ts api

#### 4.1.4 Code Generation

generate ts and compile ts to js through ts api.

### 4.2 Notes on Performance

Very slow compiler/PP because of the chosen implementation, with tree traverser for every step.

### 4.3 Does PTS fulfill the requirements of PT?

#### 4.3.1 Verifying Templates

Talk about unsoundness of TypeScript. Talk about unsoundness of Java [1] Talk about since the requirement is met with Java we assume it is adequately met with TypeScript as well.



## Chapter 5

# Difference between PTS and PTj

### 5.1 Nominal vs. Structural Typing

One of the most notable differences between PTS and PTj are the underlying languages type systems. PTS, as an extension of TypeScript, has structural typing, while PTj on the other hand, an extension of Java, has nominal typing.

Nominal and structural are two major categories of type systems. Nominal is defined as "being something in name only, and not in reality" in the Oxford dictionary. Nominal types are as the name suggests, types in name only, and not in the structure of the object. They are the norm in mainstream programming languages, such as Java, C, and C++. A type could be A or BinTree, and checking whether an object conforms to a type restriction, is to check that the type restriction is referring to the same named type, or a subtype. Structural types on the other hand is not tied to the name of the type, but to the structure of the object. These are not as common in mainstream programming languages, but are very prominent in research literature. However, in more recent (mainstream) programming languages, such as Go, TypeScript and Julia (at least for implicit typing), structural typing is becoming more and more common. A type in a structurally typed programming language, are often defined as records, and could for example be `name: string`.

#### 5.1.1 Advantages of Nominal Types

##### Subtypes

In nominal type systems it is trivial to check if a type is a subtype of another, as this has to be explicitly stated, while in structural type systems this has to be structurally checked, by checking that all members of the super type, are also present in the subtype. Because of this each subtype relation only has to be checked once for each type, which makes it easier to make a more performant type checker for nominal type systems. However, it is also possible to achieve similar performance in structurally typed languages

through some clever representation techniques. We can see an example of subtype relations in both nominal and structural type systems, in a Java-like language, in listing ?? . It is important to note that even though C is a *subtype* of A in a structural language, it is not a *subclass* of A.

Listing 5.1: Example of subtype relations in nominal and structural typing, with a Java-like language.

```
// Given the class A
class A {
    void f() { ... }
}

// A subtype, B, in nominal typing
class B extends A { ... }

// A subtype, C, in structural typing
class C {
    void f() { ... }
    int g() { ... }
}
```

## Recursive types

Recursive types are types that mention itself in its definition, and are widely used in datastructures, such as lists and trees. Another advantage in nominal typing is how natural and intuitive recursive types are in the type system. Referring to itself in a type definition is as easy as referring to any other type. It is however just as easy to do this in structural type systems as well, however for calculi such as proofs, recursive types come for free in nominal type systems, while it is a bit more cumbersome in structurally typed systems, especially with mutually recursive types.[**tapl**] Listings 5.1 on page 15 and 5.1 on page 15 shows the use of recursive types in TypeScript(structurally typed) and Java(nominally typed), respectively.

```
interface BinTree<T> {
    getData(): T;
    getChildren(): [BinTree<T> | null, BinTree<T> | null];
}

interface BinTree<T> {
    T getData();
    Pair<BinTree<T>, BinTree<T>> getChildren();
}
```

## Runtime Type Checking

Often runtime-objects in nominally typed languages are tagged with the types(a pointer to the "type") of the object. This makes it cheap and easy to



do runtime type checks, like in upcasting or doing a instanceof check in Java.

### 5.1.2 Advantages of Structural Types

#### 5.1.3 What Difference Does This Make For PT?

*// Given the following class definitions for A, B and C:*

```
class A {  
    void f() {  
        ...  
    }  
}  
  
class B extends A {  
    ...  
}  
  
class C {  
    void f() {  
        ...  
    }  
}
```

*// And a consumer with the following type:*

```
void g(A a) { ... }
```

*// Would result in the following*

```
g(new A()); // Ok  
g(new B()); // Ok  
g(new C()); // Error, C not of type A
```

#### 5.1.4 What is structural typing?

*// Given the same class definitions and the same consumer as in the ex*

*// Would result in the following*

```
g(new A()); // Ok  
g(new B()); // Ok  
g(new C()); // Ok, because C is structurally equal to A
```

#### 5.1.5 Which Better Fits PT?



# **Part III**

## **Conclusion**



## **Chapter 6**

# **Results**



# Bibliography

- [1] Nada Amin and Ross Tate. ‘Java and scala’s type systems are unsound: the existential crisis of null pointers’. In: *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 51.10 (Dec. 2016), pp. 838–848. ISSN: 0362-1340. DOI: 10 . 1145 / 3022671 . 2984004. URL: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3022671.2984004>.
- [2] *Arrow function expressions - JavaScript* | MDN. URL: [https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Functions/Arrow%7B%5C\\_%7Dfunctions](https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference/Functions/Arrow%7B%5C_%7Dfunctions) (visited on 19/10/2020).
- [3] Cevek. *ttypescript*. URL: <https://github.com/cevek/ttypescript>.
- [4] Microsoft. *microsoft/TypeScript*. URL: <https://github.com/microsoft/TypeScript/wiki/Writing-a-Language-Service-Plugin>.
- [5] Stanislav Panferov. *Awesome TypeScript Loader*. URL: <https://github.com/s-panferov/awesome-typescript-loader>.
- [6] TypeStrong. *ts-loader*. URL: <https://github.com/TypeStrong/ts-loader>.
- [7] TypeStrong. *ts-node*. URL: <https://github.com/TypeStrong/ts-node>.