

# Static typing in object-oriented languages

Keunwoo Lee

CSE 341 -- Programming Languages

University of Washington

Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering

# Static types: review

- Need to statically eliminate "unsafe" operations
  - (undecidable in general case; use conservative approximation)
- **"Unsafe"**: relative to definition of language
- In OO languages: generally "unsafe" = sending message to object that has no method for it
  - **"message not understood"** exception
  - static type system guarantees no "message not understood" exceptions

# Typing OO programs

- Assign type to every expression
  - 1 For every message send: make sure type of receiver contains method for message send (name and argument types)
  - 2 For every method body, ensure it returns correct type (assuming types of args & receiver)
  - 3 Every class must implement types it declares
  - 4 Every class must be compatible extension of its superclass

# Terminology

- **class**: unit of **implementation**
  - instructs **compiler** how to generate code
  - mostly concerns **dynamic** semantics
- **type**: unit of **interface**
  - instructs **type checker and programmer** how an expression may be used
  - mostly concerns **static** semantics

# Object type syntax

- object types are like record types: a map from names to types
- Could use ML type syntax:

```
{ fieldName1:type1,  
  ...,  
  fieldNameN:typeN,  
  methodName1:argType1 -> returnType1,  
  ...  
  methodNameM:argTypeM -> returnTypeM }
```

# Object type syntax (2)

- Instead, we'll use more familiar Java-like syntax:

```
signature S {  
  type1 fieldName1;  
  ...  
  typeN fieldNameN;  
  returnType1 methodName1(argType, ..., argType);  
  ...  
  returnTypeM methodNameM(argType, ..., argType);  
}
```

# Object type example

```
signature Point {  
    Integer x;  
    Integer y;  
    Point move(Integer dx, Integer dy);  
}
```

- Ignore access protection for now --- all public
- Recall types describe only interface --- no bodies
- Will sometimes omit signature name (Point)
- Can permute members at will (order does not matter)

# Fields = methods

- Read-only field is equivalent to method:

**signature { Foo x; }**

is equivalent to

**signature { Foo x(); }**

- Read-write field is equivalent to two methods:

**signature { mutable Foo x; }**

is equivalent to

**signature { Foo x(); void setFoo(Foo x); }**

- Will mostly ignore fields in discussion that follows
- Rules for fields can be derived straightforwardly from rules for methods.



# Subtyping

- Subtyping is essence of OO types
- T1 subtypes T2 if instances of T1 can be substituted for instances of T2
  - i.e., T1 understands all messages of T2, and always returns type-compatible results
  - "Substitutability principle"
- Notation: "T1 subtypes T2" written  $T1 <: T2$

# Reflexive, transitive

- All types subtype themselves:

$T <: T$  (reflexivity)

- Subtyping is transitive:

$T1 <: T3$  and  $T3 <: T2$

implies

$T1 <: T2$

# Width subtyping

- If T1 has exactly the same members as T2, plus some extra ones, then  $T1 <: T2$

```
signature Point {
```

```
  Integer x();
```

```
  Integer y();
```

```
  Point move(Integer dx, Integer dy);
```

```
}
```

```
signature ColoredPoint {
```

```
  Integer x();
```

```
  Integer y();
```

```
  Color color();
```

```
  Point move(Integer dx, Integer dy);
```

```
}
```

- Can derive  $\text{ColoredPoint} <: \text{Point}$

# Depth subtyping

- If T1 is exactly like T2, except that one of T1's methods subtypes one of T2's methods, then  $T1 <: T2$ .

```
signature Rectangle {  
  Point topLeft();  
  Point bottomRight();  
}
```

```
signature ColoredRectangle {  
  ColoredPoint topLeft();  
  ColoredPoint bottomRight();  
}
```

- ColoredRectangle substitutable for Rectangle --- result of `topLeft()` always substitutable

# Method subtyping

- But hold on --- depth subtyping asks whether methods subtype each other
- Must define *method* subtyping relation...
- (trickier than it seems)

# Fruits, plants, flies

```
signature Fruit { String name(); }
```

```
signature Apple { String name(); Stem stem(); }
```

```
signature Banana {
```

```
    String name(); void slipOnPeel(); }
```

```
signature FruitPlant { Fruit produce(); }
```

```
signature ApplePlant { Apple produce(); }
```

```
signature FruitFly { void eat(Fruit f); }
```

```
signature AppleFly { void eat(Apple a); }
```

# Fruit subtyping

```
signature Fruit { String name(); }
```

```
signature Apple { String name(); Stem stem(); }
```

```
signature Banana {
```

```
    String name(); void slipOnPeel(); }
```

- **Seems clear that**

**Apple <: Fruit**

**Banana <: Fruit**

- Indeed, with subtyping gives us this result

# Return subtyping

```
signature FruitPlant { Fruit produce(); }
```

```
signature ApplePlant { Apple produce(); }
```

**Seems OK to conclude that**

**ApplePlant <: FruitPlant**

Result of produce() always substitutable:

```
ApplePlant ap = ...;
```

```
FruitPlant fp = ap;
```

```
Fruit f = fp.produce();
```

```
String s = f.name();
```

- **Return types are *covariant* (go with subtyping relationship of method as a whole)**



# Argument subtyping

signature FruitFly { void eat(Fruit f); }

signature AppleFly { void eat(Apple a); }

**Can we conclude that**

**AppleFly <: FruitFly ?**

Consider following code:

```
AppleFly af = ...; // 1
```

```
FruitFly ff = af; // 2
```

```
Fruit aFruit = ...; // 3
```

```
ff.eat(aFruit); // 4
```

**What if the AppleFly implementor calls stem()  
on its argument?**

# "Natural" subtyping

- Covariant *argument* subtyping is broken!
- Must use opposite rule --- called *contravariant* rule -  
--- for arguments.
- Summary:
  - For M1 to subtype M2, M1 must *return* a type *at least as specific as* M2.
  - For M1 to subtype M2, M1 must *accept argument types* that are *at least as general as* M2's.

# Other rules...

- **Java uses *invariant* argument and return:**
  - M1 subtypes M2 only if M1 and M2 have *same* argument and return types.
- **C++ uses *invariant* argument and *covariant* return:**
  - M1 subtypes M2 only if M1 and M2 have *same* argument types, and M1's return type is *at least as specific* as M2's
- **Eiffel uses *covariant* argument and return types**
  - M1 subtypes M2 only if M1's argument and return types are *at least as specific* as M2's.
  - Broken! (Fix using dynamic checks: raise runtime error)

# Implementations

```
class C1
  subclasses C2
  implements S1, S2, ... SN
{
  returnType1 methodName1(argType, ... argType)
    { body1 }
  ...
  returnTypeN methodNameM(argType, ... argType)
    { bodyM }
}
```

# Completeness

## Completeness of implementation rule:

- A class C must have a method --- either defined in C, or inherited from C's superclass(es) --- to handle every message in its types.

```
class MauvaisePomme
  subclasses Object
  implements Apple {
    String name() { return "BadApple"; }
  }
```

```
MauvaisePomme mp = ...; // 1
Apple a = mp;           // 2
Stem s = a.stem();     // 3
```

# Abstract classes

- Most languages allow **abstract methods**
- Classes that do not implement all methods in their types, or that do not override abstract methods with non-abstract ones, are **abstract classes**
- **Concrete instantiation restriction:**
  - Only non-abstract classes can be instantiated.
- Note this relaxes completeness of implementation rule -  
-- incomplete classes exist, but may not be instantiated

# Compatible extension

```
class BonFruit subclasses Object implements Fruit {  
    String name() { return "some kind of fruit"; } }
```

```
signature Bogus { Integer name(); }
```

```
class Papaya subclasses BonFruit implements Bogus {  
    Integer name() { return 456; } }
```

- Problem: most languages require that subclasses also be supertypes
- In such languages, methods must override only with a method that subtypes overridden method

# Miscellaneous issues

- Access protection
- Structural vs. nominal subtyping
- Principal typing of classes
- Overloading vs. overriding
- Subtyping of mutable objects



# Access protection

- To add access protection (public, private, protected):
  - Add visibility modifiers to fields and methods
  - Change typechecking of sends, classes, inheritance
- Won't discuss details in this class
- Recall that in ML we use module system to accomplish much the same thing --- arguably a more orthogonal design (does not conflate data type with module)

# By-name subtyping

- Our presentation has used *structural* subtyping
- Most real-world languages use *by-name* (nominal) subtyping:
  - T1 subtypes T2 if T1's structure subtypes T2,  
and  
T1 *declares* that it subtypes T2
  - e.g., following do not have subtype relation in Java:

```
interface I1 { void foo(); }  
interface I2 { void foo(); void bar(); }
```
  - Must add:

```
interface I2 extends I1 { void foo(); void bar(); }
```

# Principal class types

- In Java, type checker implicitly declares a type for every class:

```
class Point {  
    Integer x() { ... }  
    Integer y() { ... }  
}
```

```
Point p = new Point( ... );
```

- Each class has **principal type** ("best type for that class")

# Overloading

```
class Point extends Object {  
    Integer x() { ... }  
    Integer y() { ... }  
    Point move(Integer dx, Integer dy) { ... }  
    Point move(Float dx, Float dy) { ... }  
}
```

Point move(Integer, Integer) and

Point move(Float, Float)

do not *not* have an overriding relationship --- they are different functions with the same name

# Overloading ct'd

- Overloading resolves **statically**, based on **static type of arguments**, with surprising results:

```
class Shape extends Object {  
    boolean overlaps(Shape other) { ... }  
}  
class Rectangle extends Shape {  
    boolean overlaps(Shape other)    { ... }  
    boolean overlaps(Rectangle other) { ... }  
}  
Rectangle r = new Rectangle(...);  
Shape s = new Rectangle(...);  
boolean b = r.overlaps(s);
```

# Subtyping and mutation

```
signature FruitRef {  
  Fruit fruit();  
  void setFruit(Fruit f);  
}
```

```
signature AppleRef {  
  Apple fruit();  
  void setFruit(Apple a);  
}
```

Any subtype relation?

# Subtyping & mutation (2)

Same with mutable fields...

```
signature FruitRef {  
    mutable Fruit fruit;  
}
```

```
signature AppleRef {  
    mutable Apple fruit;  
}
```

# Subtyping & mutation (3)

```
class BananaImplementor
  extends Object
  implements Banana {
  String name() { ... }
  void slipOnPeel() { ... }
}
```

```
AppleRef ar = new AppleRefImplementor(); // 1
FruitRef fr = ar; // 2
fr.fruit = BananaImplementor(); // 3
Apple anApple = ar.fruit; // 4
Stem s = anApple.stem(); // 5
```