

# Foo

## A Minimal Modern OO Calculus

Prodromos Gerakios    George Fourtounis  
Yannis Smaragdakis

Department of Informatics  
University of Athens

`{pgerakios,gfour,smaragd}@di.uoa.gr`

# What

A **core** OO calculus  
with *nominal* and (width) *structural subtyping*

# Overview

Motivation

Semantics

Formal properties

Future directions

# Why

- Well-known OO calculi (e.g., FJ) are non-minimal or only express one kind of subtyping
- We need a simple core calculus with flexibility
  - (painfully) minimal
  - study both nominal and structural subtyping
- FOO motivated by our own language modeling work
  - morphing [Huang and Smaragdakis, 2011, Gerakios et al., 2013]

# Fundamentals

- Basic idea: *hybrid types* unify nominal and structural subtyping
- Very compact, tiny syntax, 15 rules for everything, non-essential features removed
- Mimics (modulo minor syntactic conventions) a tiny subset of Scala
  - our examples are executable code

# Example: Extending a class

```
(new Employee  
  { def extra() = println("add-on") }  
).extra();
```

# Example: Inheritance

Overriding a method:

```
class EnhancedEmployee extends Employee
  { def extra() = println("more") }
```

## Example: Methods and formals

- Methods only accept one formal argument (plus the implicit `this`)
- But anonymous classes can see formals from their environment

```
class C
{ def f(x : Integer) =
  new Object
    { def g(y : Integer) = x + y }
}
```



## Example: Fields

- Fields are represented by dummy-argument methods that return the field value
- To set a field, we override its method

```
class C { def field(d : Object) = 1 }  
...  
new C { def field(d : Object) = 42 }
```

- Informally, we use `obj.field` instead of `obj.field(new Object { })`

# Example: Emulating multiple arguments

```
class Add
  { def apply(x : Integer,
              y : Integer) = x + y }
(new Add).apply(5, 10)
```

**becomes (Scala):**

```
class Add
  { def x(): Integer
    def apply(y : Integer) = x() + y
  }
(new Add { def x() = 5 }).apply(10)
```

# Example: Structural subtyping

```
def fun(e : { def extra() }) = e.extra
...
fun(new Object
    { def extra() = println("subtyping") }
)
```

# Syntax

<b>Member type</b>	$\Psi ::= m : N \longrightarrow N$
<b>Hybrid Type</b>	$N ::= C \ \& \ \bar{\Psi}$
<b>Member</b>	$M ::= m(x) \ e$
<b>Program Value</b>	$v ::= \text{new } N \ \{\bar{M}\} \mid x$
<b>Expression</b>	$e ::= v \mid v.m(e)$
<b>Top-level classes</b>	$P ::= \frac{}{\text{class } C = N \ \{\bar{M}\}}$

# Hybrid types

Purely structural type:

$$\frac{\vdash_H \bar{\Psi}}{\vdash_H \text{Object} \& \bar{\Psi}} \quad (W-O)$$

Class extended by (optional) structural part:

$$\frac{\vdash_H (C \& \bar{\Psi}) \Rightarrow \bar{\Psi}'; \dots}{\vdash_H C \& \bar{\Psi}} \quad (W-C)$$

Method signatures (elements of  $\bar{\Psi}$ ):

$$\frac{\vdash_H N, N'}{\vdash_H m : N \longrightarrow N'} \quad (W-M)$$

# Reduction

Formal argument can be reduced:

$$\frac{e \longrightarrow_P e'}{\text{new } N \{ \bar{M} \} . m(e) \longrightarrow_P \text{new } N \{ \bar{M} \} . m(e')} \quad (R-C)$$

Formal argument is in normal form, call method:

$$\frac{v' = \text{new } \dots \quad \text{mbody}(P, N \{ \bar{M} \}, m) = m(x) e}{\text{new } N \{ \bar{M} \} . m(v') \longrightarrow_P e[(\text{new } N \{ \bar{M} \})/\text{this}, v'/x]} \quad (R-I)$$

# Subtyping

Based on the hierarchy computation:

$$\frac{\overline{\Psi'} \subseteq \overline{\Psi} \quad \vdash_{\text{H}} N \Rightarrow \overline{\Psi}; \overline{N}, \overline{N'} \quad \vdash_{\text{H}} N' \Rightarrow \overline{\Psi}'; \overline{N'}}{\vdash_{\text{H}} N <: N'} \quad (\text{S-N})$$

Width subtyping ( $\subseteq$  relation)

# Formal properties of FOO

- Correctness proof, being formalized in Coq
- No subsumption axiom
- Substitution lemma is special



# Proof

## Subject reduction, with narrowing.

If  $e \longrightarrow_p e'$  and  $e : N$ , then  $\exists N', e' : N' \wedge N' <: N$

FOO does not admit the standard subject reduction theorem, like DOT [Amin et al., 2012]

## Progress.

If  $e : N$ , then  $\exists \bar{M}, e = \text{new } N \bar{M}$  or  $\exists e', e \longrightarrow_p e'$

# No subsumption

- Subsumption property:  
if  $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{H}} x : N$  and  $N <: N'$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{H}} x : N'$
- Usually added as an axiom in the type system
- In FOO, **expressions have a single type**
- Substitutivity-of-subtypes-for-supertypes still captured by rules:
  - T-I “you can use a subtype for formal arguments”
  - T-M “you can use a subtype for method bodies”

# Substitution lemma (I)

- Without subsumption, the familiar substitution lemma plays different role in the type safety proof
- Example, identity method, with  $N' <: N$ :
  - o  $= \text{new Object } \{ \text{id}(N \text{ o}) : N = \text{o} \}$
  - t  $= \text{new } N$
  - t'  $= \text{new } N'$
  - $\text{o.id}(t) \longrightarrow_p t : N$
  - $\text{o.id}(t') \longrightarrow_p t' : N'$
- We cannot say that  $t' : N$ , so the substitution lemma does not hold for formals!
- A lemma still holds for substitution of **this**

# Substitution lemma (II)

- Intuitively, lack of a substitution lemma for formals is not a problem
- Values are passed/returned by rules T-I/T-M, which accept subtypes
- Formally, our proof just uses the fact above directly, instead of going through a separate substitution lemma for formals

# Other core calculi






- DOT
  - combines nominal and structural subtypes
  - more features (path-dependent types), bigger calculus
- Unity [Malayeri and Aldrich, 2008]
  - structural subtyping with branding
  - similarity: internal vs. external methods
  - intersection types, depth subtyping, abstract
  - bigger calculus, e.g. 13 subtyping rules
- Tinygrace
  - almost as minimal as  $F_{OO}$ , extra feature (casts)
  - structural subtyping, supports nominal subtyping if further extended with branding [Jones et al. 2015]

# Future directions and applications

- We already have an extension of `FOO` with generics, to match `FJ`
- To be used in formalizing universal morphing (see our `jUCM` paper at `MASPEGHI`)
- Finish `Coq` proof (the usual culprit: binding representation)

# Thank You!

# References

-  N. Amin, A. Moors, and M. Odersky. Dependent Object Types: Towards a foundation for Scala's type system. *FOOL '12*.
-  P. Gerakios, A. Biboudis, and Y. Smaragdakis. Forsaking inheritance: Supercharged delegation in DelphJ. *OOPSLA '13*.
-  S. S. Huang and Y. Smaragdakis. Morphing: Structurally shaping a class by reflecting on others. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 33(2):1–44, 2011.
-  T. Jones, M. Homer, and J. Noble. Brand Objects for Nominal Typing. *ECOOP '15*.
-  D. Malayeri and J. Aldrich. Integrating Nominal and Structural Subtyping. *ECOOP '08*.



# Expression and method typing

Variables, new objects, method invocations:

$$\frac{x \mapsto N \in \Gamma \quad \vdash_H N}{\Gamma \vdash_H x : N} \quad (T-V)$$

$$\frac{N = C \ \& \ \bar{\Psi} \quad \vdash_H N \quad (\Gamma \setminus \text{this}), \text{this} \mapsto N \vdash_H \bar{\Psi} \ \bar{M}}{\Gamma \vdash_H \text{new } N \{\bar{M}\} : N} \quad (T-N)$$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \Gamma \vdash_H v_1 : N_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash_H e_2 : N_2 \quad \vdash_H N_2 <: N_3 \\ \vdash_H N_1 \Rightarrow \bar{\Psi}'; \dots \quad \bar{\Psi}'(m) = N_3 \longrightarrow N_4 \end{array}}{\Gamma \vdash_H v_1.m(e_2) : N_4} \quad (T-I)$$

Method definitions:

$$\frac{\Gamma, x \mapsto N \vdash_H e : N'' \quad \vdash_H N'' <: N'}{\Gamma \vdash_H m : N \longrightarrow N' \quad m(x) e} \quad (T-M)$$

# Hierarchy computation

- Given a hybrid type  $N$ , extracts the pair  $\bar{\Psi}; \bar{N}$ :
  - $\bar{\Psi}$ : signatures for all methods that can be called on  $N$
  - $\bar{N}$ : the “path” of parent classes towards `Object`
- Purely structural case:

$$\frac{\vdash_H \bar{\Psi}}{\vdash_H \text{Object} \& \bar{\Psi} \Rightarrow \bar{\Psi}; [\text{Object} \& \bar{\Psi}]} \quad (H-O)$$

- Involving classes:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} H(C) = N \quad \vdash_H N \Rightarrow \bar{\Psi}'; \bar{N} \quad \vdash_H \bar{\Psi} \\ \text{for all } m \in \text{dom}(\bar{\Psi}) \cap \text{dom}(\bar{\Psi}') \quad \bar{\Psi}(m) = \bar{\Psi}'(m) \end{array}}{\vdash_H C \& \bar{\Psi} \Rightarrow \bar{\Psi} \cup \bar{\Psi}'; C \& \bar{\Psi}, \bar{N}} \quad (H-C)$$

# Method lookup

Look up method in structural part of object:

$$\frac{m \in \text{dom}(\bar{M})}{\text{mbody}(P, N \{\bar{M}\}, m) = \bar{M}(m)} \quad (M-O)$$

Look up method in the parent class:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} \text{mbody}(P, (N \{\bar{M}'\}), m) = M \\ m \notin \text{dom}(\bar{M}) \quad P(C) = N \{\bar{M}'\} \end{array}}{\text{mbody}(P, (C \ \& \ \bar{\Psi}) \{\bar{M}\}, m) = M} \quad (M-C)$$

# Class definitions

$$\frac{[\text{this} \mapsto C \ \& \bullet] \vdash_H \bar{\Psi} \ \bar{M} \quad H(C) = N \quad N = C' \ \& \ \bar{\Psi} \quad \vdash_H C \ \& \ \bullet}{\vdash_H \text{class } C = N\{\bar{M}\}} \quad (T-C)$$