CIS 500

Software Foundations

Fall 2005

14 November

Subtyping

Motivation

With our usual typing rule for applications

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : T_{12}} \qquad \text{(T-APP)}$$

the term

$(\lambda r{:}\{x{:}Nat\}.\ r.x)\ \{x{=}0,y{=}1\}$

is not well typed.

Motivation

With our usual typing rule for applications

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \rightarrow T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : T_{12}} \qquad \text{(T-App)}$$

the term

```
(λr:{x:Nat}. r.x) {x=0,y=1}
```

is not well typed.

This is silly: all we're doing is passing the function a better argument than it needs.

Polymorphism

A polymorphic function may be applied to many different types of data.

Varieties of polymorphism:

- Parametric polymorphism (ML-style)
- Subtype polymorphism (OO-style)
- Ad-hoc polymorphism (overloading)

Polymorphism

A polymorphic function may be applied to many different types of data.

Varieties of polymorphism:

- Parametric polymorphism (ML-style)
- Subtype polymorphism (OO-style)
- Ad-hoc polymorphism (overloading)

In this class, we will consider subtype polymorphism, which is based on the idea of subsumption.

Subsumption

More generally: some types are better than others, in the sense that a value of one can always safely be used where a value of the other is expected.

We can formalize this intuition by introducing

1. a subtyping relation between types, written S <: T
2. a rule of subsumption stating that, if S <: T, then any value of type S can also be regarded as having type T

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t} : \mathtt{S} \qquad \mathtt{S} <: \mathtt{T}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t} : \mathtt{T}} \qquad \text{(T-Sub)}$$

Example

We will define subtyping between record types so that, for example,

```
{x:Nat, y:Nat} <: {x:Nat}
```

So, by subsumption,

```
⊢ {x=0,y=1} : {x:Nat}
```

and hence

```
(λr:{x:Nat}. r.x) {x=0,y=1}
```

is well typed.

The Subtype Relation: Records

"Width subtyping" (forgetting fields on the right):

$$\{l_i : T_i \;^{i \in 1..n+k}\} <: \{l_i : T_i \;^{i \in 1..n}\} \qquad \text{(S-RcdWidth)}$$

Intuition: {x:Nat} is the type of all records with at least a numeric x field.

Note that the record type with more fields is a subtype of the record type with fewer fields.

Reason: the type with more fields places a stronger constraint on values, so it describes fewer values.

The Subtype Relation: Records

Permutation of fields:

$$\frac{\{\mathtt{k_j}:\mathtt{S_j}\ ^{j\in 1..n}\} \text{ is a permutation of } \{\mathtt{l_i}:\mathtt{T_i}\ ^{i\in 1..n}\}}{\{\mathtt{k_j}:\mathtt{S_j}\ ^{j\in 1..n}\} <: \{\mathtt{l_i}:\mathtt{T_i}\ ^{i\in 1..n}\}} \quad \text{(S-RcdPerm)}$$

By using S-RcdPerm together with S-RcdWidth and S-Trans, we can drop arbitrary fields within records.

"Depth subtyping" within fields:

$$\frac{\text{for each } i \quad S_i <: T_i}{\{l_i{:}S_i\ ^{i\in 1..n}\} <: \{l_i{:}T_i\ ^{i\in 1..n}\}} \qquad \text{(S-RcdDepth)}$$

The types of individual fields may change.

Example

$$
\dfrac{
  \dfrac{}{\texttt{\{a:Nat,b:Nat\} <: \{a:Nat\}}}\ \textsc{S-RcdWidth}
  \qquad
  \dfrac{}{\texttt{\{m:Nat\} <: \{\}}}\ \textsc{S-RcdWidth}
}{
  \texttt{\{x:\{a:Nat,b:Nat\},y:\{m:Nat\}\} <: \{x:\{a:Nat\},y:\{\}\}}
}\ \textsc{S-RcdDepth}
$$

Variations

Real languages often choose not to adopt all of these record subtyping rules. For example, in Java,

- A subclass may not change the argument or result types of a method of its superclass (i.e., no depth subtyping)
- Each class has just one superclass ("single inheritance" of classes)

  $\longrightarrow$ each class member (field or method) can be assigned a single index, adding new indices "on the right" as more members are added in subclasses
  (i.e., no permutation for classes)
- A class may implement multiple interfaces ("multiple inheritance" of interfaces)

  I.e., permutation is allowed for interfaces.

The Subtype Relation: Arrow types

$$\frac{T_1 <: S_1 \qquad S_2 <: T_2}{S_1 \to S_2 <: T_1 \to T_2} \qquad \text{(S-Arrow)}$$

Note the order of T_1 and S_1 in the first premise. The subtype relation is contravariant in the left-hand sides of arrows and covariant in the right-hand sides.

Intuition: if we have a function f of type $S_1 \to S_2$, then we know that f accepts elements of type S_1; clearly, f will also accept elements of any subtype T_1 of S_1. The type of f also tells us that it returns elements of type S_2; we can also view these results belonging to any supertype T_2 of S_2. That is, any function f of type $S_1 \to S_2$ can also be viewed as having type $T_1 \to T_2$.

The Subtype Relation: Top

It is convenient to have a type that is a supertype of every type. We introduce a new type constant `Top`, plus a rule that makes `Top` a maximum element of the subtype relation.

`S <: Top` (S-Top)

Cf. `Object` in Java.

The Subtype Relation: General rules

$$\texttt{S <: S} \qquad \text{(S-Refl)}$$

$$\frac{\texttt{S <: U} \qquad \texttt{U <: T}}{\texttt{S <: T}} \qquad \text{(S-Trans)}$$

Subtype relation

$$\texttt{S} <: \texttt{S} \qquad \text{(S-Refl)}$$

$$\frac{\texttt{S} <: \texttt{U} \qquad \texttt{U} <: \texttt{T}}{\texttt{S} <: \texttt{T}} \qquad \text{(S-Trans)}$$

$$\{\texttt{l}_i\texttt{:T}_i\ ^{i\in 1..n+k}\} <: \{\texttt{l}_i\texttt{:T}_i\ ^{i\in 1..n}\} \qquad \text{(S-RcdWidth)}$$

$$\frac{\text{for each } i \quad \texttt{S}_i <: \texttt{T}_i}{\{\texttt{l}_i\texttt{:S}_i\ ^{i\in 1..n}\} <: \{\texttt{l}_i\texttt{:T}_i\ ^{i\in 1..n}\}} \qquad \text{(S-RcdDepth)}$$

$$\frac{\{\texttt{k}_j\texttt{:S}_j\ ^{j\in 1..n}\} \text{ is a permutation of } \{\texttt{l}_i\texttt{:T}_i\ ^{i\in 1..n}\}}{\{\texttt{k}_j\texttt{:S}_j\ ^{j\in 1..n}\} <: \{\texttt{l}_i\texttt{:T}_i\ ^{i\in 1..n}\}} \qquad \text{(S-RcdPerm)}$$

$$\frac{\mathtt{T}_1 \mathrel{\mathtt{<:}} \mathtt{S}_1 \qquad \mathtt{S}_2 \mathrel{\mathtt{<:}} \mathtt{T}_2}{\mathtt{S}_1 \to \mathtt{S}_2 \mathrel{\mathtt{<:}} \mathtt{T}_1 \to \mathtt{T}_2} \qquad \text{(S-Arrow)}$$

$$\mathtt{S} \mathrel{\mathtt{<:}} \mathtt{Top} \qquad \text{(S-Top)}$$

Properties of Subtyping

Safety

Statements of progress and preservation theorems are unchanged from $\lambda_{\rightarrow}$.

Proofs become a bit more involved, because the typing relation is no longer syntax directed.

Given a derivation, we don't always know what rule was used in the last step. The rule T-Sub could appear anywhere.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t} : \mathtt{S} \qquad \mathtt{S} <: \mathtt{T}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t} : \mathtt{T}} \qquad \text{(T-Sub)}$$

Preservation

Theorem: If $\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t} : \mathtt{T}$ and $\mathtt{t} \longrightarrow \mathtt{t'}$, then $\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t'} : \mathtt{T}$.

Proof: By induction on typing derivations.

(Which cases are hard?)

Subsumption case

Case T-Sub: `t : S` `S <: T`

Subsumption case

Case T-Sub: $\quad$ t : S $\quad$ S <: T

By the induction hypothesis, $\Gamma \vdash$ t′ : S. By T-Sub, $\Gamma \vdash$ t : T.

Subsumption case

Case T-Sub: $\quad$ `t : S` $\quad$ `S <: T`

By the induction hypothesis, $\Gamma \vdash t' : S$. By T-Sub, $\Gamma \vdash t : T$.

Not hard!

Application case

Case T-App:

$$\mathtt{t} = \mathtt{t}_1\ \mathtt{t}_2 \qquad \Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_1 : \mathtt{T}_{11} \to \mathtt{T}_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_2 : \mathtt{T}_{11} \qquad \mathtt{T} = \mathtt{T}_{12}$$

By the inversion lemma for evaluation, there are three rules by which $\mathtt{t} \longrightarrow \mathtt{t}'$ can be derived: E-App1, E-App2, and E-AppAbs. Proceed by cases.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_1 : \mathtt{T}_{11} \to \mathtt{T}_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_2 : \mathtt{T}_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_1\ \mathtt{t}_2 : \mathtt{T}_{12}} \quad \text{(T-App)}$$

Application case

Case T-App:

$\mathtt{t} = \mathtt{t}_1\ \mathtt{t}_2 \qquad \Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_1 : \mathtt{T}_{11} \to \mathtt{T}_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_2 : \mathtt{T}_{11} \qquad \mathtt{T} = \mathtt{T}_{12}$

By the inversion lemma for evaluation, there are three rules by which $\mathtt{t} \longrightarrow \mathtt{t}'$ can be derived: E-App1, E-App2, and E-AppAbs. Proceed by cases.

Subcase E-App1: $\mathtt{t}_1 \longrightarrow \mathtt{t}_1' \qquad \mathtt{t}' = \mathtt{t}_1'\ \mathtt{t}_2$

The result follows from the induction hypothesis and T-App.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_1 : \mathtt{T}_{11} \to \mathtt{T}_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_2 : \mathtt{T}_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_1\ \mathtt{t}_2 : \mathtt{T}_{12}} \qquad \text{(T-App)}$$

$$\frac{\mathtt{t}_1 \longrightarrow \mathtt{t}_1'}{\mathtt{t}_1\ \mathtt{t}_2 \longrightarrow \mathtt{t}_1'\ \mathtt{t}_2} \qquad \text{(E-App1)}$$

Case T-App (continued):

$t = t_1\ t_2 \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11} \qquad T = T_{12}$

Subcase E-App2: $t_1 = v_1 \qquad t_2 \longrightarrow t_2' \qquad t' = v_1\ t_2'$

Similar.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : T_{12}} \qquad \text{(T-App)}$$

$$\frac{t_2 \longrightarrow t_2'}{v_1\ t_2 \longrightarrow v_1\ t_2'} \qquad \text{(E-App2)}$$

Case T-App (continued):

$$t = t_1 \ t_2 \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \rightarrow T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11} \qquad T = T_{12}$$

Subcase E-AppAbs: $t_1 = \lambda x{:}S_{11}.\ t_{12} \qquad t_2 = v_2 \qquad t' = [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12}$

By the inversion lemma for the typing relation...

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \rightarrow T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 \ t_2 : T_{12}} \qquad \text{(T-App)}$$

$$(\lambda x{:}T_{11}.t_{12})\ v_2 \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12} \qquad \text{(E-AppAbs)}$$

Case T-App (continued):

$t = t_1\ t_2 \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11} \qquad T = T_{12}$

Subcase E-AppAbs: $\quad t_1 = \lambda x{:}S_{11}.\ t_{12} \qquad t_2 = v_2 \qquad t' = [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12}$

By the inversion lemma for the typing relation... $T_{11} <: S_{11}$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_{11} \vdash t_{12} : T_{12}$.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : T_{12}} \qquad \text{(T-App)}$$

$$(\lambda x{:}T_{11}.t_{12})\ v_2 \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12} \qquad \text{(E-AppAbs)}$$

Case T-App (continued):

$t = t_1\ t_2 \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11} \qquad T = T_{12}$

Subcase E-AppAbs: $\quad t_1 = \lambda x{:}S_{11}.\ t_{12} \qquad t_2 = v_2 \qquad t' = [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12}$

By the inversion lemma for the typing relation... T_{11} <: S_{11} and $\Gamma, x{:}S_{11} \vdash t_{12} : T_{12}$.

By T-Sub, $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : S_{11}$.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : T_{12}} \qquad \text{(T-App)}$$

$$(\lambda x{:}T_{11}.t_{12})\ v_2 \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12} \qquad \text{(E-AppAbs)}$$

Case T-APP (CONTINUED):

$t = t_1\ t_2 \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11} \qquad T = T_{12}$

Subcase E-APPABS: $t_1 = \lambda x{:}S_{11}.\ t_{12} \qquad t_2 = v_2 \qquad t' = [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12}$

By the inversion lemma for the typing relation... $T_{11} <: S_{11}$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_{11} \vdash t_{12} : T_{12}$.

By T-SUB, $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : S_{11}$.

By the substitution lemma, $\Gamma \vdash t' : T_{12}$, and we are done.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : T_{12}} \qquad \text{(T-APP)}$$

$$(\lambda x{:}T_{11}.t_{12})\ v_2 \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12} \qquad \text{(E-APPABS)}$$

Inversion Lemma for Typing

Lemma: If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : T_1 \to T_2$, then $T_1 <: S_1$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : T_2$.

Proof: Induction on typing derivations.

Inversion Lemma for Typing

Lemma: If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : T_1 \to T_2$, then $T_1 <: S_1$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : T_2$.

Proof: Induction on typing derivations.

Case T-Sub: $\lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : U \qquad U <: T_1 \to T_2$

We want to say “By the induction hypothesis...”, but the IH does not apply (we do not know that U is an arrow type).

Inversion Lemma for Typing

Lemma: If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : T_1 \to T_2$, then T_1 <: S_1 and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : T_2$.

Proof: Induction on typing derivations.

Case T-Sub: $\lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : U$ $\quad$ U <: $T_1 \to T_2$

We want to say "By the induction hypothesis...", but the IH does not apply (we do not know that U is an arrow type). Need another lemma...

> Lemma: If U <: $T_1 \to T_2$, then U has the form $U_1 \to U_2$, with T_1 <: U_1 and U_2 <: T_2. (Proof: by induction on subtyping derivations.)

Inversion Lemma for Typing

Lemma: If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : T_1 \to T_2$, then $T_1 <: S_1$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : T_2$.

Proof: Induction on typing derivations.

Case T-Sub: $\lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : U \qquad U <: T_1 \to T_2$

We want to say "By the induction hypothesis...", but the IH does not apply (we do not know that U is an arrow type). Need another lemma...

> Lemma: If $U <: T_1 \to T_2$, then U has the form $U_1 \to U_2$, with $T_1 <: U_1$ and $U_2 <: T_2$. (Proof: by induction on subtyping derivations.)

By this lemma, we know $U = U_1 \to U_2$, with $T_1 <: U_1$ and $U_2 <: T_2$.

Inversion Lemma for Typing

Lemma: If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : T_1 \to T_2$, then $T_1 <: S_1$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : T_2$.

Proof: Induction on typing derivations.

Case T-Sub: $\lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : U \qquad U <: T_1 \to T_2$

We want to say "By the induction hypothesis...", but the IH does not apply (we do not know that U is an arrow type). Need another lemma...

> Lemma: If $U <: T_1 \to T_2$, then U has the form $U_1 \to U_2$, with $T_1 <: U_1$ and $U_2 <: T_2$. (Proof: by induction on subtyping derivations.)

By this lemma, we know $U = U_1 \to U_2$, with $T_1 <: U_1$ and $U_2 <: T_2$.

The IH now applies, yielding $U_1 <: S_1$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : U_2$.

Inversion Lemma for Typing

Lemma: If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : T_1 \to T_2$, then $T_1 <: S_1$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : T_2$.

Proof: Induction on typing derivations.

Case T-Sub: $\lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : U \qquad U <: T_1 \to T_2$

We want to say "By the induction hypothesis...", but the IH does not apply (we do not know that U is an arrow type). Need another lemma...

> Lemma: If $U <: T_1 \to T_2$, then U has the form $U_1 \to U_2$, with $T_1 <: U_1$ and $U_2 <: T_2$. (Proof: by induction on subtyping derivations.)

By this lemma, we know $U = U_1 \to U_2$, with $T_1 <: U_1$ and $U_2 <: T_2$.

The IH now applies, yielding $U_1 <: S_1$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : U_2$.

From $U_1 <: S_1$ and $T_1 <: U_1$, rule S-Trans gives $T_1 <: S_1$.

Inversion Lemma for Typing

Lemma: If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : T_1 \to T_2$, then $T_1 <: S_1$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : T_2$.

Proof: Induction on typing derivations.

Case T-Sub: $\lambda x{:}S_1.s_2 : U \qquad U <: T_1 \to T_2$

We want to say "By the induction hypothesis...", but the IH does not apply (we do not know that U is an arrow type). Need another lemma...

> Lemma: If $U <: T_1 \to T_2$, then U has the form $U_1 \to U_2$, with $T_1 <: U_1$ and $U_2 <: T_2$. (Proof: by induction on subtyping derivations.)

By this lemma, we know $U = U_1 \to U_2$, with $T_1 <: U_1$ and $U_2 <: T_2$.

The IH now applies, yielding $U_1 <: S_1$ and $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : U_2$.

From $U_1 <: S_1$ and $T_1 <: U_1$, rule S-Trans gives $T_1 <: S_1$.

From $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : U_2$ and $U_2 <: T_2$, rule T-Sub gives $\Gamma, x{:}S_1 \vdash s_2 : T_2$, and we are done.

Subtyping with Other Features

Ascription and Casting

Ordinary ascription:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t_1} : \mathtt{T}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t_1}\ \mathtt{as}\ \mathtt{T} : \mathtt{T}} \qquad \text{(T-Ascribe)}$$

$$\mathtt{v_1}\ \mathtt{as}\ \mathtt{T} \longrightarrow \mathtt{v_1} \qquad \text{(E-Ascribe)}$$

Ascription and Casting

Ordinary ascription:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t_1} : \mathtt{T}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t_1}\ \mathtt{as}\ \mathtt{T} : \mathtt{T}} \qquad \text{(T-Ascribe)}$$

$$\mathtt{v_1}\ \mathtt{as}\ \mathtt{T} \longrightarrow \mathtt{v_1} \qquad \text{(E-Ascribe)}$$

Casting (cf. Java):

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t_1} : \mathtt{S}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t_1}\ \mathtt{as}\ \mathtt{T} : \mathtt{T}} \qquad \text{(T-Cast)}$$

$$\frac{\vdash \mathtt{v_1} : \mathtt{T}}{\mathtt{v_1}\ \mathtt{as}\ \mathtt{T} \longrightarrow \mathtt{v_1}} \qquad \text{(E-Cast)}$$

Subtyping and Variants

$$\texttt{<}l_i\texttt{:}T_i{}^{\,i\in 1..n}\texttt{>} \;\;<:\;\; \texttt{<}l_i\texttt{:}T_i{}^{\,i\in 1..n+k}\texttt{>} \qquad \text{(S-VariantWidth)}$$

$$\frac{\text{for each } i \quad S_i <: T_i}{\texttt{<}l_i\texttt{:}S_i{}^{\,i\in 1..n}\texttt{>} \;\;<:\;\; \texttt{<}l_i\texttt{:}T_i{}^{\,i\in 1..n}\texttt{>}} \qquad \text{(S-VariantDepth)}$$

$$\frac{\texttt{<}k_j\texttt{:}S_j{}^{\,j\in 1..n}\texttt{>} \text{ is a permutation of } \texttt{<}l_i\texttt{:}T_i{}^{\,i\in 1..n}\texttt{>}}{\texttt{<}k_j\texttt{:}S_j{}^{\,j\in 1..n}\texttt{>} \;\;<:\;\; \texttt{<}l_i\texttt{:}T_i{}^{\,i\in 1..n}\texttt{>}} \qquad \text{(S-VariantPerm)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash \texttt{<}l_1\texttt{=}t_1\texttt{>} : \texttt{<}l_1\texttt{:}T_1\texttt{>}} \qquad \text{(T-Variant)}$$

Subtyping and Lists

$$\frac{\texttt{S}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{T}_1}{\texttt{List } \texttt{S}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{List } \texttt{T}_1} \qquad \text{(S-List)}$$

I.e., `List` is a covariant type constructor.

Subtyping and References

$$\frac{\texttt{S}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{T}_1 \qquad \texttt{T}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{S}_1}{\texttt{Ref } \texttt{S}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{Ref } \texttt{T}_1} \quad \text{(S-Ref)}$$

I.e., `Ref` is not a covariant (nor a contravariant) type constructor.

Why?

Subtyping and References

$$\frac{S_1 <: T_1 \qquad T_1 <: S_1}{\texttt{Ref}\ S_1 <: \texttt{Ref}\ T_1} \quad \text{(S-Ref)}$$

I.e., `Ref` is not a covariant (nor a contravariant) type constructor.

Why?

- When a reference is read, the context expects a T_1, so if $S_1 <: T_1$ then an S_1 is ok.

Subtyping and References

$$\frac{S_1 <: T_1 \qquad T_1 <: S_1}{\texttt{Ref}\ S_1 <: \texttt{Ref}\ T_1} \quad \text{(S-Ref)}$$

I.e., Ref is not a covariant (nor a contravariant) type constructor.

Why?

- When a reference is read, the context expects a T_1, so if $S_1 <: T_1$ then an S_1 is ok.
- When a reference is written, the context provides a T_1 and if the actual type of the reference is Ref S_1, someone else may use the T_1 as an S_1. So we need $T_1 <: S_1$.

Subtyping and Arrays

Similarly...

$$\frac{\texttt{S}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{T}_1 \qquad \texttt{T}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{S}_1}{\texttt{Array } \texttt{S}_1 \texttt{ <: Array } \texttt{T}_1} \qquad \text{(S-Array)}$$

Subtyping and Arrays

Similarly...

$$\frac{\mathtt{S_1} <: \mathtt{T_1} \qquad \mathtt{T_1} <: \mathtt{S_1}}{\mathtt{Array}\ \mathtt{S_1} <: \mathtt{Array}\ \mathtt{T_1}} \qquad \text{(S-Array)}$$

$$\frac{\mathtt{S_1} <: \mathtt{T_1}}{\mathtt{Array}\ \mathtt{S_1} <: \mathtt{Array}\ \mathtt{T_1}} \qquad \text{(S-ArrayJava)}$$

This is regarded (even by the Java designers) as a mistake in the design.

References again

Observation: a value of type `Ref T` can be used in two different ways: as a source for values of type `T` and as a sink for values of type `T`.

References again

Observation: a value of type `Ref T` can be used in two different ways: as a source for values of type `T` and as a sink for values of type `T`.

Idea: Split `Ref T` into three parts:

- `Source T`: reference cell with “read cabability”
- `Sink T`: reference cell with “write cabability”
- `Ref T`: cell with both capabilities

Modified Typing Rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \texttt{t}_1 : \texttt{Source } \texttt{T}_{11}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \texttt{!t}_1 : \texttt{T}_{11}} \qquad \text{(T-Deref)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \texttt{t}_1 : \texttt{Sink } \texttt{T}_{11} \qquad \Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \texttt{t}_2 : \texttt{T}_{11}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \texttt{t}_1 \texttt{:=} \texttt{t}_2 : \texttt{Unit}} \qquad \text{(T-Assign)}$$

Subtyping rules

$$\frac{\texttt{S}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{T}_1}{\texttt{Source } \texttt{S}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{Source } \texttt{T}_1} \qquad \text{(S-Source)}$$

$$\frac{\texttt{T}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{S}_1}{\texttt{Sink } \texttt{S}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{Sink } \texttt{T}_1} \qquad \text{(S-Sink)}$$

$$\texttt{Ref } \texttt{T}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{Source } \texttt{T}_1 \qquad \text{(S-RefSource)}$$

$$\texttt{Ref } \texttt{T}_1 \texttt{ <: } \texttt{Sink } \texttt{T}_1 \qquad \text{(S-RefSink)}$$

Algorithmic Subtyping

Syntax-directed rules

In the simply typed lambda-calculus (without subtyping), each rule can be "read from bottom to top" in a straightforward way.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : T_{12}} \qquad \text{(T-App)}$$

If we are given some Γ and some t of the form $t_1\ t_2$, we can try to find a type for t by

1. finding (recursively) a type for t_1
2. checking that it has the form $T_{11} \to T_{12}$
3. finding (recursively) a type for t_2
4. checking that it is the same as T_{11}

Technically, the reason this works is that We can divide the "positions" of the typing relation into input positions (Γ and $\mathtt{t}$) and output positions ($\mathtt{T}$).

- For the input positions, all metavariables appearing in the premises also appear in the conclusion (so we can calculate inputs to the "subgoals" from the subexpressions of inputs to the main goal)
- For the output positions, all metavariables appearing in the conclusions also appear in the premises (so we can calculate outputs from the main goal from the outputs of the subgoals)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_1 : \mathtt{T}_{11} \to \mathtt{T}_{12} \qquad \Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_2 : \mathtt{T}_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t}_1\ \mathtt{t}_2 : \mathtt{T}_{12}} \quad \text{(T-App)}$$

Syntax-directed sets of rules

The second important point about the simply typed lambda-calculus is that the set of typing rules is syntax-directed, in the sense that, for every "input" Γ and `t`, there one rule that can be used to derive typing statements involving `t`.

E.g., if `t` is an application, then we must proceed by trying to use T-App. If we succeed, then we have found a type (indeed, the unique type) for `t`. If it fails, then we know that `t` is not typable.

$\longrightarrow$ no backtracking!

Non-syntax-directedness of typing

When we extend the system with subtyping, both aspects of syntax-directedness get broken.

1. The set of typing rules now includes two rules that can be used to give a type to terms of a given shape (the old one plus T-Sub)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t} : \mathtt{S} \qquad \mathtt{S} <: \mathtt{T}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{t} : \mathtt{T}} \qquad \text{(T-Sub)}$$

2. Worse yet, the new rule T-Sub itself is not syntax directed: the inputs to the left-hand subgoal are exactly the same as the inputs to the main goal!

   (Hence, if we translated the typing rules naively into a typechecking function, the case corresponding to T-Sub would cause divergence.)

Non-syntax-directedness of subtyping

Moreover, the subtyping relation is not syntax directed either.

1. There are lots of ways to derive a given subtyping statement.
2. The transitivity rule

$$\frac{\texttt{S <: U} \qquad \texttt{U <: T}}{\texttt{S <: T}} \qquad \text{(S-Trans)}$$

   is badly non-syntax-directed: the premises contain a metavariable (in an "input position") that does not appear at all in the conclusion.

   To implement this rule naively, we'd have to guess a value for `U`!

What to do?

What to do?

1. Observation: We don't need 1000 ways to prove a given typing or subtyping statement — one is enough.

   $\longrightarrow$ Think more carefully about the typing and subtyping systems to see where we can get rid of excess flexibility

2. Use the resulting intuitions to formulate new "algorithmic" (i.e., syntax-directed) typing and subtyping relations

3. Prove that the algorithmic relations are "the same as" the original ones in an appropriate sense.