1 Synopsys

We promote the use of type-level module aliases, a trivial extension of the ML module system, which helps avoiding code dependencies, and provides an alternative to strengthening for type equalities.

2 Background

The richness of ML’s module system theoretically allows one to flexibly structure libraries, without requiring extra features found in other languages, such as namespaces. Nested structures allow one to define hierarchies of modules, and functors provide flexible linking.

However, while this may be true from an internal point of view, the module system alone does not account for all aspects of libraries. A prominent problem is how to map module names to the file system. Another is how to support separate compilation, in a way that minimizes recompilations.

OCaml [5] chooses an extremely simple approach: module names which are not found in the internal environment are searched on the file system (under the same name), using a library path which is just an ordered list of directories. Such external modules are called compilation units. Separate compilation is supported by providing separate interface files for compilation units, containing only their signatures, which allows one to compile other units independently of the concrete implementation. Since the pair of a compilation unit’s interface and implementation can be understood as a module with an opaque signature, this mechanism directly fits inside the semantics of the language. Coherence is enforced by keeping digests of all dependencies in compiled files. Smart recompilation is left to external tools.

However, this simplicity comes at a cost: the file system view of modules being completely flat, there is no way to have two compilation units with the same name linked into the same program. For programs relying on multiple libraries, this can be a severe stumbling block.

Since Objective Caml 3.05, this problem can be avoided by combining several compilation units as submodules of a packed unit. Note however that this packed unit completely replaces the original compilation units, and the packed unit’s implementation must contain (or link) the implementations of all its submodules. This means that using any of these submodules requires you to link all of them. In that respect, one can say that it weakens separate compilation, even though what is no longer separate is not compilation but rather the result of compilation.

3 Aliases for equality

Originally, the idea of using module aliases in signatures was not related to separate compilation. It was introduced by Nakata and Garrigue in Traviata [7], as a mechanism to allow type reconstruction for recursive modules. It was later recognized that it was also useful in the absence of recursive modules, as it improves the behavior of OCaml style applicative functors [3]. See the following example, where Set.Make builds a module containing an ADT t together with some set operations.

module StringSet1 = Set.Make(String)
module StringSet2 = Set.Make(String)
module S = String
module StringSet3 = Set.Make(S)

Since OCaml’s functors are applicative, the identity of nominal types produced by a functor application only depends on the functor’s arguments. Here this means that StringSet1.t and StringSet2.t are equal. However, while it is clear from the source code that modules S and String are equal, we need type-level module aliases to derive a type equality between StringSet1.t
and StringSet3.t.

In presence of module aliases, the signature of module
S = String becomes

module S = String

or, using a syntax reminiscent of singleton kinds,

module S : (module String)

In this approach, one checks type equality by normalizing
module paths, which is stronger than just expanding
strengthened type definitions.

4 Aliases for independence

While useful, these extra type equalities alone would
have been a weak justification for extending the language.
However, module aliases have another important benefit:
the information provided by types does not need to be
duplicated in the implementation code, avoiding depend-
encies. For instance, consider the following compilation
unit Mylib:

module A = MylibA
module B = MylibB

Since the aliases for A and B are revealed by its interface,
the compiled implementation does not reference MylibA
and MylibB. Which in turn means that a program using
Mylib.A but not Mylib.B needs only to link MylibA, not
MylibB. This avoids the loss of independence observed
when compiling the interface for Mylib as a result, the
compiled interface of Mylib is completely independent of
MylibA and MylibB. There is no need to link a compiled
implementation for it.

At the interface level, we can also remove dependencies:
the interfaces for MylibA and MylibB are not accessed
when compiling the interface for Mylib. As a result, the
compiled interface of Mylib is completely independent of
MylibA and MylibB. There is no need to recompile it when
they change, and it is even possible to compile it before
them. We will see that this provides a possible design for
hierarchized libraries.

5 Application to namespaces

The approach we have just seen already gives us a way
to avoid name clashes when building libraries: one should
just prefix all unit names in the library with a common
library name (here, Mylib). Ease of use by clients of the li-
brary is preserved by accessing it through the Mylib mod-
ule. For instance, one can use open Mylib to make all
submodules accessible through their non-prefixed names,
without other side effects. However, comfort would not
be complete if we were not able to use non-prefixed names
inside the library implementation. Fortunately, due to

\[ S = \text{String} \]

the absence of dependency between Mylib and its com-
ponents at the interface level, one can actually use open
Mylib inside MylibA and MylibB, without creating circu-
lar dependencies.

To summarize, one can replace packed units by applying
the following recipe.

1. Create an interface unit whose role is only to map
short names to prefixed names, for all member units.
2. Open this unit in all members, so that one can use
short names inside them.
3. Create an export unit, which again maps short names
to prefixed names, but may choose to omit some in-
ternal modules.

To stay closer to the packed approach, OCaml 4.02 pro-
vides an -open command line option, which avoids adding
the open explicitly to source files inside the library.

An important testbed for module aliases has been
the Core/Async family of libraries, developed by Jane
Street [4]. Originally, they used packed units to avoid
name clashes, and provide coherent naming schemes for
their module hierarchies. However, this resulted in long
compilation times and large executables. Using implicit
module aliases already helps, by reducing the size of compiled
interfaces (read during compilation) by an average
of 3. Moreover, using techniques such at the above, they
could keep the same naming scheme, but remove depen-
dencies, and reduce executable sizes on average by a factor
of 2 (up to a factor of 10 in some concrete cases) [6, 8].

6 Limitations and future work

In order to avoid a number of practical and theoretical
issues, the current implementation of modules aliases in
OCaml 4.02 introduces a number of restrictions on which
module aliases can be reflected in types. Namely, the
following kinds of module expressions (and their submod-
ules) cannot generate type-level aliases.

- Plain structures and functors.
- Functor applications.
- Opaque coercions.
- Functor arguments.
- Recursive modules.

While the first one is essential, as it would amount to
including the full language inside signatures, we believe
that all other restrictions could be eventually removed,
making this feature more elegant.

\[ \text{Actually this behavior is not backward compatible if MylibB}
\text{contains side-effects. For this reason it is enabled by the compiler}
\text{option -no-alias-deps.} \]

\[ \text{In OCaml, open only makes components of a module directly}
\text{accessible locally, it does not re-export them.} \]
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