# The refchecks phase (Part 1) $\mathbb{P}^{(1)}$

© Miguel Garcia, LAMP, EPFL http://lamp.epfl.ch/~magarcia

September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011

#### Abstract

TODO

	phase name	id 	description
	parser	1	parse source into ASTs, perform simple desugaring
	namer	2	resolve names, attach symbols to named trees
P	ackageobjects	3	load package objects
	typer	4	the meat and potatoes: type the trees
S	uperaccessors	5	add super accessors in traits and nested classes
/	pickler	6	serialize symbol tables
/*	refchecks	7	reference/override checking, translate nested objects
	liftcode	8	reify trees
	uncurry	9	uncurry, translate function values to anonymous classes
	tailcalls	10	replace tail calls by jumps
	specialize	11	Ospecialized-driven class and method specialization
	explicitouter	12	this refs to outer pointers, translate patterns
	erasure	13	erase types, add interfaces for traits
	lazyvals	14	allocate bitmaps, translate lazy vals into lazified defs
	lambdalift	15	move nested functions to top level
	constructors	16	move field definitions into constructors
	flatten	17	eliminate inner classes
	mixin	18	mixin composition
	cleanup	19	platform-specific cleanups, generate reflective calls
	icode	20	generate portable intermediate code
	inliner	21	optimization: do inlining
	closelim	22	optimization: eliminate uncalled closures
	dce	23	optimization: eliminate dead code
	jvm	24	generate JVM bytecode
	terminal	25	The last phase in the compiler chain

# Contents

1	Intro 1.1 Type rewriting	<b>3</b> 3		
2	Lowering of modules2.1Top-level module2.2A non-overridding module that has no outer instance2.3An overridding module that has outer instance	<b>4</b> 4 6 7		
3	First lowering of lazy vals	7		
4	4 Checks			

### 1 Intro

The refchecks phase is an InfoTransform whose transformer (RefCheckTransformer) is tasked with most of the transform's bookkeeping (Figure 1). In terms of line count, AST checking takes the lion share, followed by term rewriting and a very focused type rewriting (Sec. 1.1).

- 1. Term rewriting comprises:
  - (a) module lowering, Sec. 2
  - (b) first part of lazy val lowering, Sec. 3
  - (c) Import nodes are sent into oblivion. Just an example why refactorings can't be made much later than typer.
- 2. Checks comprise:

TODO

### 1.1 Type rewriting

Type rewriting is fairly simple:

```
// in reflect.internal.transform.RefChecks
def transformInfo(sym: Symbol, tp: Type): Type =
    if (sym.isModule && !sym.isStatic) NullaryMethodType(tp)
    else tp
// in nsc.typechecker.RefChecks
override def transformInfo(sym: Symbol, tp: Type): Type = {
    if (sym.isModule && !sym.isStatic) sym setFlag (lateMETHOD | STABLE)
    super.transformInfo(sym, tp)
}
```

The "!sym.isStatic" guard is a consequence of the way that top-level (i.e., static) modules are lowered as compared to non-static ones (i.e, those having an outer instance). Internally, the class of non-static modules will be an inner class. If this is all new to you, here's a good tutorial<sup>1</sup>.

At the risk of stepping ahead of ourselves (details in Sec. 2): the main difference between lowering top-level vs. non-static modules is that the module's symbol becomes associated to a static field (for a top-level module) or to an instance getter (for a non-static module). Thus the NullaryMethodType for the latter.

The following excerpt from the SLS helps in seeing why those lowerings have to be different ("Object definitions", SLS  $\S5.4$ ).

[An object definition] is roughly equivalent to the following definition of a lazy value:

lazy val m = new sc with mt1 with . . . with mtn { this: m.type => stats }

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>http://weblogs.java.net/blog/cayhorstmann/archive/2011/08/05/ inner-classes-scala-and-java



Figure 1: Sec. 1

... The expansion given above is not accurate for top-level objects. It cannot be because variable and method definitions cannot appear on the top-level outside of a <u>package object</u> (§9.3). Instead, top-level objects are translated to static fields.

## 2 Lowering of modules

This lowering is self-contained, so we review it first:

```
private def eliminateModuleDefs(tree: Tree): List[Tree]
```

Before looking at the translation recipe, it's useful to keep in mind that the module's symbol is mentioned in general in other trees. Given that eliminateModuleDefs() doesn't return the original ModuleDef, among the trees it returns one should fulfill the role of "module getter" (and carry the ModuleDef's symbol).

Common to all the code generation alternatives below (Sec. 2.1 to Sec. 2.3) a tree is built for the "invisible" *module class* of the module (Listing 1). This tree ("cdef" for short) carries the existing *module class* symbol:

#### 2.1 Top-level module

In this case, no other tree is returned. Where does the module symbol go, then? It's still reachable via sourceModule in cdef's ModuleClassSymbol (Figure 2). Please notice this navigation path is not shown in Listing 1.

Listing 1: Sec. 2

The internal representation of classes and objects:

```
class Foo is "the class" or sometimes "the plain class"
object Foo is "the module"
class Foo$ is "the module class" (invisible to the user: it implements object Foo)
class Foo <
  ^ (2)
          \
  L
           ١
| (5) |
           (3)
١
(1) v v
              \
object Foo (4)-> > class Foo$

    companionClass

(2) companionModule
(3) linkedClassOfClass
(4) moduleClass
(5) companionSymbol
```

In order to see that no other phase further processes cdef, let's -Xprint-icode -uniqid the following:

```
object p
class C { def m = p }
```

Say the module symbol has id #7576. Throughout all phases, an access to p points to that symbol, and what is returned is an instance of its module class (whose id is #7577):

Further AST processing *does* come into play, at the very last minute. GenJVM and in GenMSIL add a static field (and its initializer) to the class emitted for cdef (look for addModuleInstanceField()):

val MODULE\_INSTANCE\_FIELD: NameType = NameTransformer.MODULE\_INSTANCE\_NAME // "MODULE\$"

Additionally, LOAD\_MODULE is translated as getstatic (JVM) or ldsfld (MSIL) of that field.

```
TODO Scala.Net: if cdef is polymorphic, then a naive translation would result in several instances for the same module.
```

```
/** A class for module class symbols
 * Note: Not all module classes are of this type; when unpickled, we get
    plain class symbols.
class ModuleClassSymbol(owner: Symbol, pos: Position, name: TypeName)
extends ClassSymbol(owner, pos, name) {
  private var module: Symbol = null
  def this(module: TermSymbol) = {
    this(module.owner, module.pos, module.name.toTypeName)
    setFlag(module.getFlag(ModuleToClassFlags) | MODULE)
    sourceModule = module
  override def sourceModule = module
  private var implicitMembersCacheValue: List[Symbol] = List()
  private var implicitMembersCacheKey: Type = NoType
  def implicitMembers: List[Symbol] = {
    val tp = info
    if (implicitMembersCacheKey ne tp) {
      implicitMembersCacheKey = tp
      implicitMembersCacheValue = tp.implicitMembers
    implicitMembersCacheValue
  }
  override def sourceModule_=(module: Symbol) { this.module = module }
}
```

Figure 2: Sec. 2.1

#### 2.2 A non-overridding module that has no outer instance

If there's an outer class, then it's possible to rephrase (module def, module access) in terms of (field, getter) in addition to the module class cdef that's already built. That's a good approximation, however the field is sometimes a variable (dubbed "mod-var") because the (mod-var, getter) may also end up being added to a method, for example:

```
class MethodModuleExample { def m() { object p } }
or to a block:
class BlockModuleExample {
   def m(b: Boolean) {
      if(b) {
        object p
      }
   }
   Don't worry too much about this because anyway you won't learn the full
   because anyway you won't learn the full
```

bon t worry too much about this because anyway you won't learn the full story by looking at refchecks alone. The lowering of modules is completed in mixin. For now, we can see how refchecks adds mod-var + getter for all the shapes above ("module in class", "module in method", "module in statement block").

A piece of information that will be useful later: the mode-var is always annotated @volatile whether it's a field or local (the method in Listing 2 is invoked with accessor bound to ModuleDef.symbol). On related note, @volatile is cru-

```
Listing 2: Sec. 2.2
```

// TreeGen.scala

```
def mkModuleVarDef(accessor: Symbol) = {
  val mval = (
   accessor.owner.newVariable(accessor.pos.focus, nme.moduleVarName(accessor.name))
   setInfo accessor.tpe.finalResultType
   setFlag (MODULEVAR)
  )
  mval.addAnnotation(AnnotationInfo(VolatileAttr.tpe, Nil, Nil))
  if (mval.owner.isClass) {
    mval setFlag (PRIVATE | LOCAL | SYNTHETIC)
    mval.owner.info.decls.enter(mval)
   }
   ValDef(mval)
}
```

cial in connection with lazy vals (the condition of mkDoubleCheckedLocking() has to access a volatile, the Int holding a bitmap). But that's another story.

```
TODO Summarize where:
        - cdef,
        - the mod-var with type ModuleDef.symbol.info.finalResultType, and
        - the getter
    end up being added to.
    Also: what the body of the getter is, which phases further process it.
Cheat-sheet:
    - when the getter ends up in a trait,
    it just consists of New of cdef, the module class.
    - otherwise the getter consists of "{ lhs = rhs ; lhs }"
    where 'rhs' is as above and lhs is mod-var's symbol.
```

#### 2.3 An overridding module that has outer instance

```
TODO
/**
 * -Y "Private" settings
 */
val overrideObjects = BooleanSetting ("-Yoverride-objects", "Allow member objects to be overridden.")
```

## 3 First lowering of lazy vals

refchecks does some rewriting for this construct, and lazyvals and mixin do the rest.

Some background: the symbol of a lazy val has something called "lazyAccessor" (a MethodSymbol, actually, while the surface-syntax construct has a TermSymbol):

```
/** For a lazy value, its lazy accessor. NoSymbol for all others. */
```

def lazyAccessor: Symbol = NoSymbol

Basically, makeLazyAccessor(tree, rhs): List[Tree] replaces the original ValDef whose symbol.isLazy (whether owned by a class, object, method, or block) by one of the shapes below. Similarly to the lowering of objects, the original tree is not returned:

1. a lazy val of Unit type is replaced by a single "getter" whose symbol is the lazyAccessor and whose body is the original rhs of the surface-syntax construct.

TODO reachability of the symbol of the original ValDef afterwards

- 2. otherwise, a lazy val owned by a trait is replaced by a pair (ValDef, getter) where
  - (a) an un-initialized ValDef is returned (different from the original one but with its same symbol)
  - (b) the getter's body is the **rhs** of the original **ValDef**. Its symbol is the lazyAccessor.

So far, a reshuffling.

- 3. otherwise, a pair (ValDef, getter) is returned where
  - (a) the ValDef is as above.
  - (b) the getter's body is of the form "{ lhs = rhs ; lhs }" where the lhs points to the ValDef.

Also in this case, pretty much a reshuffling.

Common to all three codegen alternatives above is the emitted DefDef with a lazyAccessor symbol (thus explaining the name of this tree builder, makeLazyAccessor()). From now on, other trees will interact only with that getter to side-effect the ValDef variable (if any).

## 4 Checks

TODO