

# Variance in Type Systems and Variance-Based Parametric Types

Based on Igarashi and Viroli's paper from ECOOP 2002 (excellent paper! Value more in taste, than in novelty)

- This is a mechanism that got integrated in Java generics with different syntax

## Subtyping

- Roughly, when a type is a subset of another
- What does that mean for method signatures? (covariance/contravariance of arguments result types)
- Consider (which one really defines a subset?):

```
interface I1 {  
    Animal foo(Dog d);  
}  
interface I2 extends I1 {  
    Dog foo(Animal d);  
}  
interface I3 extends I1 {  
    Object foo(PrettyDog d);  
}  
interface I4 extends I2 {  
    Dog foo(Dog d);  
}
```

## Variance Flavors

- Covariance:  $R <: S \Rightarrow C\langle R \rangle <: C\langle S \rangle$
- Contravariance:  $R <: S \Rightarrow C\langle S \rangle <: C\langle R \rangle$
- Bivariance:  $C\langle R \rangle <: C\langle S \rangle$ , for all  $R$  and  $S$
- Invariance:  $C\langle R \rangle <: C\langle S \rangle \Rightarrow R = S$

### Question: How Can We Have Safe Variance?

Two basic principles, applied in a variety of mechanisms:

- $C$  covariant in  $X$  means that  $X$  should not be the type of a public (and writeable—e.g., non-final) field or an argument type of a public method
- $C$  contravariant in  $X$  means that  $X$  should not be the type of a public, readable field, or the return type of a public method

## Classical, Restrictive Approach

```
class Pair<X extends Object,  
          Y extends Object> {  
    private X fst;  
    private Y snd;  
    Pair(X fst, Y snd) {  
        this.fst = fst;  
        this.snd = snd;  
    }  
    void SetFst(X fst) {  
        this.fst = fst;  
    }  
    Y getSnd() { return snd; }  
}
```

- Pair is covariant in Y, contravariant in X  
- why don't constructors matter?
- E.g. Pair<Object, Integer> can be used  
where Pair<String, Number> is expected
- (Integer <: Number <: Object)

## Limitations of Classical Approach

Usually we use the type parameter both in covariant and in contravariant roles

```
class Vector<X> {
  private X[] ar;

  Vector(int size){ar = new X[size];}
  int size(){return ar.length;}
  X getElementAt(int i){return ar[i];}
  void setElementAt(X t,int i) {
    ar[i] = t;
  }
}
```

- Too conservative to infer variance from code

## New Insight

- Instead of conservatism, disallow some uses of methods based on the statically known type information
- Think of the same single code for Vector as defining 4 classes:
  - the regular Vector
  - the covariant Vector (with only read-only methods)
  - the contravariant Vector (only write-only methods)
  - the bivariant Vector (no methods with Xs in their parameter or return list—“frozen” Vector)

## Variance Annotations

Three kinds of annotations:

- $+$  : covariance (think “const” or “read-only”)
- $-$  : contravariance (think “write-only”)
- $*$  : bivariance (think “contents not touched”)

Interpretation:

- $C<+T>$  : the union of all invariant types of the form  $C<S>$ , where  $S <: T$ 
  - $C$  with  $T$  used only to read from
- $C<-T>$  : the union of all invariant types of the form  $C<S>$ , where  $T <: S$ 
  - $C$  with  $T$  used only to write to
- $C<*>$  : all invariant types of the form  $C<S>$

(Note I say “union”—types are sets of values)

## Rules

(For multiple type parameters, the rules apply by varying a single parameter and keeping all others the same)

$C\langle T \rangle <: C\langle +T \rangle$

-  $\text{Vector}\langle \text{Integer} \rangle <: \text{Vector}\langle +\text{Integer} \rangle$

$C\langle T \rangle <: C\langle -T \rangle$

-  $\text{Vector}\langle \text{Integer} \rangle <: \text{Vector}\langle -\text{Integer} \rangle$

$C\langle +T \rangle <: C\langle * \rangle$

-  $\text{Vector}\langle +\text{Integer} \rangle <: \text{Vector}\langle * \rangle$

$C\langle -T \rangle <: C\langle * \rangle$

-  $\text{Vector}\langle -\text{Integer} \rangle <: \text{Vector}\langle * \rangle$

$S <: T \Rightarrow C \langle +S \rangle <: C\langle +T \rangle$

-  $\text{Vector}\langle +\text{Integer} \rangle <: \text{Vector}\langle +\text{Number} \rangle$

$S <: T \Rightarrow C \langle -T \rangle <: C\langle -S \rangle$

-  $\text{Vector}\langle -\text{Number} \rangle <: \text{Vector}\langle -\text{Integer} \rangle$



## Example Applications: Covariance

```
class Vector<X> {  
    ...  
    void fillFrom(Vector<+X> v, int i) {  
        for (int j=i; j<v.size(); j++)  
            setElementAt(  
                v.getElementAt(j-i), j);  
    }  
}
```

Fills a vector (beginning at position *i*) by reading the contents of another vector. *v* is read-only, the method is covariant

```
Vector<Number> vn =  
    new Vector<Number>(20);  
Vector<Integer> vi = new  
    Vector<Integer>(10);  
Vector<Float> vf = new  
    Vector<Float>(10);  
  
vn.fillFrom(vi, 0);  
vn.fillFrom(vf, 10);
```

## Example Applications: Covariance

```
class Vector<X> {
    ...
    void fillFromVector(
        Vector<+Vector<+X>> vv) {
        int pos = 0;
        for (int i=0; i<vv.size(); i++) {
            Vector<+X> v = vv.elementAt(i);
            if (pos+v.size() >= size()) break;
            fillFrom(v, pos);
            pos +=v.size();
        }
    }
}
```

Fills a vector with the contents of all vectors in a vector-of-vectors

E.g. the `Vector<X>` object (`this`) can be `Vector<Number>`, while `vv` is a `Vector<Vector<+Number>>` (e.g., holding a vector of Integers and a vector of floats)

## Example Applications: Contravariance

```
class Vector<X> {  
    ...  
    void fillTo(Vector<-X> v, int i) {  
        for (int j=i; j<v.size(); j++)  
            v.setElementAt(  
                getElementAt(j), j-i);  
    }  
}
```

Fills vector `v` by reading the contents of another vector (beginning at position `i`). `v` is write-only, the method is contravariant

```
Vector<Number> vn =  
    new Vector<Number>(20);  
Vector<Integer> vi = new  
    Vector<Integer>(10);  
Vector<Float> vf = new  
    Vector<Float>(10);  
  
vi.fillTo(vn, 0);  
vf.fillTo(vn, 10);
```

## Example Applications: Bivariance

```
int countVec(Vector<+Vector<*>> vv) {
    int sz = 0;
    for (int i=0; i < vv.size(); i++) {
        sz += vv.elementAt(i).size();
    }
    return sz;
}
```

We count all elements of members of a vector-of-vectors. The second level vectors are not touched, the vector-of-vectors is only read

As another example, think of a vector of pairs, where only the first element of each pair is read and the Vector is not modified:

```
Vector<+Pair<+X, *>>
```

## Assessment

- The variance annotations (which could be inferred if all the code is available for analysis) yield more generic code
- Similar to parametric (template) methods, with bounds on the template parameters
  - but need lower bounds, in addition to the usual “X extends C” (upper bound)
  - the mechanisms are complementary—each can do some things better than the other (read the paper for details!)
- Informally, parametric types with variance are like bounded existential types: e.g.,  
Vector<+C> is like a type  
`<exists X <: C> Vector<X>`