CS 4110

Programming Languages & Logics

Lecture 25 Records and Subtyping

Records

We've seen binary products (pairs), and they generalize to *n*-ary products (tuples).

Records are a generalization of tuples where we mark each field with a label.

Records

We've seen binary products (pairs), and they generalize to *n*-ary products (tuples).

Records are a generalization of tuples where we mark each field with a label.

Example:

 $\{foo = 32, bar = true\}$

is a record value with an integer field foo and a boolean field bar.

Records

We've seen binary products (pairs), and they generalize to *n*-ary products (tuples).

Records are a generalization of tuples where we mark each field with a label.

Example:

```
\{foo = 32, bar = true\}
```

is a record value with an integer field foo and a boolean field bar.

Its type is:

{foo:int,bar:bool}

Syntax

$$l \in \mathcal{L}$$
 $e ::= \cdots \mid \{l_1 = e_1, \dots, l_n = e_n\} \mid e.l$
 $v ::= \cdots \mid \{l_1 = v_1, \dots, l_n = v_n\}$
 $\tau ::= \cdots \mid \{l_1 : \tau_1, \dots, l_n : \tau_n\}$

Dynamic Semantics

$$E ::= ...$$

$$| \{l_1 = v_1, ..., l_{i-1} = v_{i-1}, l_i = E, l_{i+1} = e_{i+1}, ..., l_n = e_n\}$$

$$| E.l |$$

$$\overline{\{l_1=v_1,\ldots,l_n=v_n\}.l_i\to v_i}$$

Static Semantics

$$\frac{\forall i \in 1..n. \quad \Gamma \vdash e_i : \tau_i}{\Gamma \vdash \{l_1 = e_1, \dots, l_n = e_n\} : \{l_1 : \tau_1, \dots, l_n : \tau_n\}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \{l_1 : \tau_1, \dots, l_n : \tau_n\}}{\Gamma \vdash e . l_i : \tau_i}$$

 $\mathsf{GETX} \triangleq \lambda p : \{ \mathsf{x} : \mathsf{int}, \mathsf{y} : \mathsf{int} \}. \, p.\mathsf{x}$

$$\mathsf{GETX} \triangleq \lambda p : \{ \mathsf{x} : \mathsf{int}, \mathsf{y} : \mathsf{int} \}. \, p.\mathsf{x}$$

$$GETX~\{x=4,y=2\}$$

$$\mathsf{GETX} \triangleq \lambda p : \{ \mathsf{x} : \mathsf{int}, \mathsf{y} : \mathsf{int} \}. \, p.\mathsf{x}$$

$$GETX \; \{x=4, y=2\}$$

$$GETX~\{x=4,y=2,z=42\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{GETX} &\triangleq \lambda p \colon \{x : \mathbf{int}, y : \mathbf{int}\}.\, p.x \\ \\ \mathsf{GETX} \; \{x = 4, y = 2\} \\ \\ \mathsf{GETX} \; \{x = 4, y = 2, z = 42\} \\ \\ \mathsf{GETX} \; \{y = 2, x = 4\} \end{aligned}$$

Subtyping

Definition (Subtype)

 τ_1 is a *subtype* of τ_2 , written $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, if a program can use a value of type τ_1 whenever it would use a value of type τ_2 .

If $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, we also say τ_2 is the supertype of τ_1 .

7

Subtyping

Definition (Subtype)

 τ_1 is a *subtype* of τ_2 , written $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, if a program can use a value of type τ_1 whenever it would use a value of type τ_2 .

If $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, we also say τ_2 is the supertype of τ_1 .

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e \colon \tau \quad \tau \leq \tau'}{\Gamma \vdash e \colon \tau'} \text{ Subsumption}$$

This typing rule says that if e has type τ and τ is a subtype of τ' , then e also has type τ' .

7

We'll define a new subtyping relation that works together with the subsumption rule.

$$\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$$

This program isn't well-typed (yet):

$$(\lambda p : \{x : int\}. p.x) \{x = 4, y = 2\}$$

This program isn't well-typed (yet):

$$(\lambda p: \{x: int\}. p.x) \{x = 4, y = 2\}$$

So let's add width subtyping:

$$\frac{k \geq 0}{\{l_1:\tau_1,\ldots,l_{n+k}:\tau_{n+k}\} \leq \{l_1:\tau_1,\ldots,l_n:\tau_n\}}$$

This program also doesn't get stuck:

$$(\lambda p : \{x : int, y : int\}. p.x + p.y) \{y = 37, x = 5\}$$

This program also doesn't get stuck:

$$(\lambda p: \{x: int, y: int\}. p.x + p.y) \{y = 37, x = 5\}$$

So we can make it well-typed by adding permutation subtyping:

 π is a permutation on 1..n

$$\overline{\{l_1:\tau_1,\ldots,l_n:\tau_n\}} \leq \{l_{\pi(1)}:\tau_{\pi(1)},\ldots,l_{\pi(n)}:\tau_{\pi(n)}\}$$

Does this program get stuck? Is it well-typed?

$$(\lambda p : \{x : \{y : int\}\}. p.x.y) \{x = \{y = 4, z = 2\}\}$$

Does this program get stuck? Is it well-typed?

$$(\lambda p : \{x : \{y : int\}\}, p.x.y) \{x = \{y = 4, z = 2\}\}$$

Let's add depth subtyping:

$$\frac{\forall i \in 1..n. \quad \tau_i \leq \tau_i'}{\{l_1 : \tau_1, \dots, l_n : \tau_n\} \leq \{l_1 : \tau_1', \dots, l_n : \tau_n'\}}$$

Putting all three forms of record subtyping together:

$$\frac{\forall i \in 1..n. \ \exists j \in 1..m. \quad l_i' = l_j \ \land \ \tau_j \leq \tau_i'}{\{l_1 \colon \tau_1, \dots, l_m \colon \tau_m\} \leq \{l_1' \colon \tau_1', \dots, l_n' \colon \tau_n'\}} \text{ S-Record}$$

Standard Subtyping Rules

We always make the subtyping relation both reflexive and transitive.

$$\frac{\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \quad \tau_2 \leq \tau_3}{\tau_1 \leq \tau_3} \text{ S-Trans}$$

Think of every type describing a set of values. Then $\tau_1 \le \tau_2$ when τ_1 's values are a subset of τ_2 's.

Top Type

It's sometimes useful to define a *maximal* type with respect to subtyping:

$$\tau ::= \cdots \mid \top$$

$$\frac{}{\tau \leq \top} \text{ S-Top}$$

Everything is a subtype of \top , as in Java's Object or Go's interface{}.

Subtype All the Things!

We can also write subtyping rules for sums and products:

$$\frac{\tau_1 \leq \tau_1' \quad \tau_2 \leq \tau_2'}{\tau_1 + \tau_2 \leq \tau_1' + \tau_2'} \text{ S-Sum}$$

Subtype All the Things!

We can also write subtyping rules for sums and products:

$$\begin{split} \frac{\tau_1 \leq \tau_1' \quad \tau_2 \leq \tau_2'}{\tau_1 + \tau_2 \leq \tau_1' + \tau_2'} \text{ S-Sum} \\ \frac{\tau_1 \leq \tau_1' \quad \tau_2 \leq \tau_2'}{\tau_1 \times \tau_2 \leq \tau_1' \times \tau_2'} \text{ S-PRODUCT} \end{split}$$

Function Types

How should we decide whether one function type is a subtype of another?

$$\frac{???}{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \leq \tau_1' \rightarrow \tau_2'} \text{ S-Function}$$

Desiderata

We'd like to have:

 $int \rightarrow \{x:int, y:int\} \leq int \rightarrow \{x:int\}$

Desiderata

We'd like to have:

int
$$\rightarrow \{x:int, y:int\} \leq int \rightarrow \{x:int\}$$

And:

 $\{x\!:\!\text{int}\}\rightarrow\text{int}\leq\{x\!:\!\text{int},y\!:\!\text{int}\}\rightarrow\text{int}$

Desiderata

We'd like to have:

int
$$\rightarrow \{x:int, y:int\} \leq int \rightarrow \{x:int\}$$

And:

$$\{x\!:\!\text{int}\}\to\text{int}\leq\{x\!:\!\text{int},y\!:\!\text{int}\}\to\text{int}$$

In general, to prove:

$$\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \leq \tau_1' \rightarrow \tau_2'$$

we'll require:

- Argument types are contravariant: $\tau_1' \leq \tau_1$
- Return types are covariant: $\tau_2 \le \tau_2'$

Function Subtyping

Putting these two pieces together, we get the subtyping rule for function types:

$$\frac{\tau_1' \leq \tau_1 \quad \tau_2 \leq \tau_2'}{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \leq \tau_1' \rightarrow \tau_2'} \text{ S-Function}$$

Reference Subtyping

What should the relationship be between τ and τ' in order to have τ ref $\leq \tau'$ ref?

If r' has type τ' **ref**, then !r' has type τ' .

Imagine we replace r' with r, where r has a type τ **ref** that we've somehow decided is a subtype of τ' **ref**.

If r' has type τ' **ref**, then !r' has type τ' .

Imagine we replace r' with r, where r has a type τ **ref** that we've somehow decided is a subtype of τ' **ref**.

Then !r should still produce something can be treated as a τ' . In other words, it should have a type that is a *subtype* of τ' .

So the referent type should be covariant:

$$\frac{\tau \leq \tau'}{\tau \ \mathsf{ref} \leq \tau' \ \mathsf{ref}}$$

If v has type τ' , then r' := v should be legal.

If we replace r' with r, then it must still be legal to assign r := v. So !r would then produce a value of type τ' .

If v has type τ' , then r' := v should be legal.

If we replace r' with r, then it must still be legal to assign r := v. So !r would then produce a value of type τ' .

So the referent type should be contravariant!

$$\frac{\tau' \le \tau}{\tau \operatorname{ref} \le \tau' \operatorname{ref}}$$

Reference Subtyping

In fact, subtyping for reference types must be *invariant*: a reference type τ **ref** is a subtype of τ' **ref** if and only if $\tau \leq \tau'$ and $\tau' \leq \tau$.

$$\frac{\tau \leq \tau' \quad \tau' \leq \tau}{\tau \operatorname{ref} \leq \tau' \operatorname{ref}} \operatorname{S-ReF}$$

Java Arrays

Tragically, Java's mutable arrays use covariant subtyping!

Java Arrays

Tragically, Java's mutable arrays use covariant subtyping!

Suppose that Cow is a subtype of Animal.

Code that only reads from arrays typechecks:

```
Animal[] arr = new Cow[] { new Cow("Alfonso") };
Animal a = arr[0];
```

Java Arrays

Tragically, Java's mutable arrays use covariant subtyping!

Suppose that Cow is a subtype of Animal.

Code that only reads from arrays typechecks:

```
Animal[] arr = new Cow[] { new Cow("Alfonso") };
Animal a = arr[0];
```

but writing to the array can get into trouble:

```
arr[0] = new Animal("Brunhilda");
```

Specifically, this generates an ArrayStoreException.