
Type system

Overview

- Jinja types
- Auxiliary notions
- The typing rules: what is the type of an expression?

Jinja Types

A Ninja type (type *ty*) is one of the following:

- *Boolean*
- *Integer*
- *Class C*
- *NT* (“Null Type”)
- *Void*

The formal model

```
datatype ty = Boolean
             | Integer
             | Class cname
             | NT
             | Void
```

Reference types

A reference type is either NT or *Class C*:

$$\text{is-ref} T \equiv T = NT \vee (\exists C. T = \text{Class } C)$$

Valid types

Types should only refer to existing classes:

is-type P (Class C) = is-class P C

is-type P T = True

The type of a value

typeof :: *heap* \Rightarrow *val* \Rightarrow *ty option*

$\text{typeof}_h \text{ Unit} = \lfloor \text{Void} \rfloor$

$\text{typeof}_h \text{ Null} = \lfloor NT \rfloor$

$\text{typeof}_h (\text{Bool } b) = \lfloor \text{Boolean} \rfloor$

$\text{typeof}_h (\text{Intg } i) = \lfloor \text{Integer} \rfloor$

$\text{typeof}_h (\text{Addr } a) =$

$(\text{case } h \text{ } a \text{ of } \text{None} \Rightarrow \text{None} \mid \lfloor (C, fs) \rfloor \Rightarrow \lfloor \text{Class } C \rfloor)$

$\text{typeof } v \quad \equiv \quad \text{typeof}_{\text{empty}} \text{ } v$

From subclass to subtype

The subclass relation $P \vdash C \preceq^* C'$ induces a
subtype relation $P \vdash T \leq T'$
(Java: “ T widens to T' ”)

$$P \vdash C \preceq^* D \implies P \vdash \text{Class } C \leq \text{Class } D$$

$$P \vdash NT \leq \text{Class } C$$

$$P \vdash T \leq T$$

The pointwise extension of \leq to lists of types: $[\leq]$

Environments

An *environment* is a map from variable names to types:

$$E :: vname \rightarrow ty$$

Environments record the type of each local variable

Expression has type

$P, E \vdash e :: T$

Expression e has type T
(in the context of program P and environment E)

Typing rules

Val

typeof v = ⌊ T ⌋ \implies

$P, E \vdash \text{Val } v :: T$

No Addresses!

Var

$E \ V = \lfloor T \rfloor \implies$

$P, E \vdash \text{Var } V :: T$

Field access

$$\llbracket P, E \vdash e :: \text{Class } C; P \vdash C \text{ sees } F:T \text{ in } D \rrbracket \implies \\ P, E \vdash e.F\{D\} :: T$$

D must be the class declaring F

Can be viewed as test or computation of D

Binary operations

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket P, E \vdash e_1 :: T_1; P, E \vdash e_2 :: T_2; \\ & \text{case } bop \text{ of} \\ & = \Rightarrow (P \vdash T_1 \leq T_2 \vee P \vdash T_2 \leq T_1) \wedge T = \text{Boolean} \\ & | + \Rightarrow T_1 = \text{Integer} \wedge T_2 = \text{Integer} \wedge T = \text{Integer} \rrbracket \\ \implies & P, E \vdash e_1 \ll bop \gg e_2 :: T \end{aligned}$$

new

is-class P C \implies

$P, E \vdash \text{new } C :: \text{Class } C$

Cast

$\llbracket P, E \vdash e :: \text{Class } D; \text{is-class } P C; P \vdash C \preceq^* D \vee P \vdash D \preceq^* C \rrbracket$

$\implies P, E \vdash \text{Cast } C e :: \text{Class } C$

Variable assignment

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket E \ V = \lfloor T \rfloor ; P, E \vdash e :: T' ; P \vdash T' \leq T ; V \neq this \rrbracket \\ \implies & P, E \vdash V := e :: \text{Void} \end{aligned}$$

In Java: $P, E \vdash V := e :: T$

Field assignment

$\llbracket P, E \vdash e_1 :: \text{Class } C;$
 $P \vdash C \text{ sees } F:T \text{ in } D;$
 $P, E \vdash e_2 :: T';$
 $P \vdash T' \leq T \rrbracket$
 $\implies P, E \vdash e_1.F\{D\} := e_2 :: \text{Void}$

Method call

$\llbracket P, E \vdash e :: \text{Class } C;$

$P \vdash C \text{ sees } M: Ts \rightarrow T = (\text{pns}, \text{body}) \text{ in } D;$

$P, E \vdash es [::] Ts'; P \vdash Ts' [\leq] Ts \rrbracket$

$\implies P, E \vdash e.M(es) :: T$

Expression lists

$$P, E \vdash \text{es} [::] Ts$$
$$P, E \vdash [] [::] []$$
$$[P, E \vdash e :: T; P, E \vdash \text{es} [::] Ts]$$
$$\implies P, E \vdash e \cdot \text{es} [::] T \cdot Ts$$

Local variable

$$\llbracket \text{is-type } P\ T; P, E(V \mapsto T) \vdash e :: T' \rrbracket \implies \\ P, E \vdash \{V:T; e\} :: T'$$

Sequential composition

$$\llbracket P, E \vdash e_1 :: T_1; P, E \vdash e_2 :: T_2 \rrbracket \implies \\ P, E \vdash e_1 ; e_2 :: T_2$$

Conditional

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket P, E \vdash e :: \text{Boolean}; \\ & P, E \vdash e_1 :: T_1; \\ & P, E \vdash e_2 :: T_2; \\ & P \vdash T_1 \leq T_2 \vee P \vdash T_2 \leq T_1; \\ & P \vdash T_1 \leq T_2 \longrightarrow T = T_2; \\ & P \vdash T_2 \leq T_1 \longrightarrow T = T_1 \rrbracket \\ & \implies \\ & P, E \vdash \text{if } (e) \ e_1 \ \text{else } e_2 :: T \end{aligned}$$

While loop

$$\llbracket P, E \vdash e :: \text{Boolean}; P, E \vdash c :: T \rrbracket \implies \\ P, E \vdash \text{while } (e) c :: \text{Void}$$

throw

$P, E \vdash e :: \text{Class } C \implies$

$P, E \vdash \text{throw } e :: \text{Void}$

Alternative (e.g. in ML):

$P, E \vdash e :: \text{Class } C \implies$

$P, E \vdash \text{throw } e :: T$

Advantage:

Exceptions may be used *anywhere*

Complication:

Expression may have multiple unrelated types

try-catch

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket P, E \vdash e_1 :: T; P, E(V \mapsto \text{Class } C) \vdash e_2 :: T; \text{is-class } P C \rrbracket \\ & \implies P, E \vdash \text{try } e_1 \text{ catch } (C V) e_2 :: T \end{aligned}$$

Generalize?

Remarks (1)

The type of an expression
depends only on the type of its subexpressions.

⇒ The rules form a terminating (Prolog) program
for computing the type of an expression.

Remarks (2)

The rules are *syntax directed*:
exactly one rule per construct

⇒ Each rule can be turned into an equivalence:

$$(P, E \vdash \text{val } v :: T) = (\text{typeof } v = \lfloor T \rfloor)$$

$$(P, E \vdash V := e :: T) =$$

$$(T = \text{Void} \wedge V \neq \text{this} \wedge \\ (\exists T_1 T_2. E V = \lfloor T_1 \rfloor \wedge P, E \vdash e :: T_2 \wedge P \vdash T_2 \leq T_1))$$

:

Terminology

We say e is *well-typed* or *type correct* (in the context of P and E) iff there is a T such that $P, E \vdash e :: T$ follows from the typing rules.

Uniqueness

Thm Every well-typed expression has a unique type:

$$\llbracket P, E \vdash e :: T; P, E \vdash e :: T' \rrbracket \implies T = T'$$

Equivalent: Every expression has at most one type.

Annotating expressions with {D}

Adding {D}

$$P, E \vdash e \rightsquigarrow e'$$

where

- e is an expression *without* $\{D\}$ annotations, the input
- e' is an expression *with* $\{D\}$ annotations, the output

Some typical rules for $P, E \vdash e \rightsquigarrow e'$

$$P, E \vdash \text{Val } v \rightsquigarrow \text{Val } v$$

$$P, E(V \mapsto T) \vdash e \rightsquigarrow e' \implies$$

$$P, E \vdash \{V:T; e\} \rightsquigarrow \{V:T; e'\}$$

$$\llbracket P, E \vdash e_1 \rightsquigarrow e'_1; P, E \vdash e_2 \rightsquigarrow e'_2 \rrbracket$$

$$\implies P, E \vdash e_1; e_2 \rightsquigarrow e'_1; e'_2$$

Adding the annotation

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket P, E \vdash e \rightsquigarrow e'; P, E \vdash e' :: \text{Class } C; P \vdash C \text{ sees } F:T \text{ in } D \rrbracket \\ & \implies P, E \vdash e.F \rightsquigarrow e'.F\{D\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket P, E \vdash e_1 \rightsquigarrow e_1'; P, E \vdash e_2 \rightsquigarrow e_2'; \\ & P, E \vdash e_1' :: \text{Class } C; P \vdash C \text{ sees } F:T \text{ in } D \rrbracket \\ & \implies P, E \vdash e_1.F := e_2 \rightsquigarrow e_1'.F\{D\} := e_2' \end{aligned}$$

Is it a local variable or a field?

$\llbracket E \mathrel{V = \text{None}}; E \mathrel{\textit{this} = \lfloor \text{Class } C \rfloor}; P \vdash C \text{ sees } V:T \text{ in } D \rrbracket \implies$
 $P, E \vdash \text{Var } V \rightsquigarrow \text{Var } \textit{this}.V\{D\}$

$E \mathrel{V = \lfloor T \rfloor} \implies$
 $P, E \vdash \text{Var } V \rightsquigarrow \text{Var } V$

Summary

$$P, E \vdash e \rightsquigarrow e'$$

- Adds annotations to field access and update
- Turns variables into fields if necessary
- Can be viewed as a preprocessor
- Is normally part of the type checker in a compiler