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History

Pascal was the first widely used language with a refined, strong, static type system.

Compare to:

- Fortran, Cobol, Algol 60: few types
- Lisp: dynamic
- BCPL, C: weak

Then as now, that choice is controversial!
Types

Everyone has an opinion on them

Industry:
  – Used to be the norm (C/C++, Java).
  – Today split about evenly with dynamic.

Academia:
  – Static types are more common in research.
  – But teaching languages are often dynamic (Scheme, Python).
Static: Points in Favor

- More efficient
- Better tooling
- Fewer tests needed
- Better documentation
- Safety net for maintenance
Dynamic: Points in Favor

- Simpler languages
- Fewer puzzling compiler errors
- No boilerplate
- Easier for exploration
- No type-imposed limits to expressiveness
What is Good Design?

- Clear
- Correct
- Minimal
- The opposite of “random”

Great designs are often discovered, not invented.
Elements Of Great Designs:

Patterns & Constraints
Example: Bach Fugues
What Is A Good Language for Design?

One that helps discovering great designs.
What Is A Good Language for Design?

One that helps discovering great designs.

Patterns \rightarrow Abstractions
Constraints \rightarrow Specifications
Contracts
Types
Example

Functional Collections

```scala
val (minors, adults) = people partition (_.age < 18)
```

Powerful patterns made safe by types.
But...

Type systems are hairy. Otherwise there would not be so many different ones.

I'm not against types, but I don't know of any type systems that aren't a complete pain, so I still like dynamic typing [Alan Kay]
Type Systems Landscape

- **C**
- **Java**
- **C#**
- **TypeScript**
- **Dart**
- **OCaml**
- **Haskell**
- **Scala**
- **Assembly**
- **JS**
- **Ruby**
- **Python, Clojure**

**Static** vs **Dynamic**

**Weak** vs **Strong**
Static Type Systems

- precise
  - "Post-modernism"
- coarse
  - weak
    - C
    - Eiffel
    - TypeScript
    - Dart
  - strong
    - Haskell
    - OCaml
    - Scala
    - C#
    - F#
    - Go
    - Java 4
    - Java 5+
    - Pascal
    - Modula-2
    - Oberon

- "Type it to the max"
- "Set menu"
(1) Set Menu

- Precise:
  - Eiffel
  - Typescript
  - Dart
  - Scala
  - Haskell
  - OCaml
  - F#
  - C#
  - Java 5+

- Coarse:
  - C
  - Go
  - Pascal
  - Modula-2
  - Oberon

- Weak:
  - Java 4

- Strong:
Set Menu

Simple type systems
No generics
Not that extensible by users

→ Simpler tooling
→ Highly normative
(2) Type it to the Max

- Haskell
- OCaml
- Scala
- Java 5+
- C#
Type it to the Max

Rich* language to write types
Type combination forms, including generics.
Type systems often inspired by logic.

* Often, turing complete
Type it to the Max

Where dynamic languages had the upper hand:

– No type-imposed limits to expressiveness
  ➔ Rich type system + escape hatches such as casts

– No boilerplate
  ➔ Type Inference

– Easier for exploration
  ➔ Bottom type Nothing, ???
Making Good Use of Nothing

def f(x: Int) = ???
Making Good Use of Nothing

def f(x: Int): Nothing = ???

if (x < 0) ??? else f(x)
Other Strengths of Dynamic

• Simpler languages
  – Rich types add complexity

• Fewer puzzling compiler errors
5862.scala:36: error: type mismatch;
  found   : scala.collection.mutable.Iterable[_ >: (MapReduceJob.this.DataSource,
scala.collection.mutable.Set[test.TaggedMapper[_, _, _]]) with test.TaggedMapper[_$1, _$2, _$3] forSome
{ type _$1; type _$2; type _$3 } <= Object] with
scala.collection.mutable.Builder[(MapReduceJob.this.DataSource,
scala.collection.mutable.Set[test.TaggedMapper[_, _, _]]) with test.TaggedMapper[_$1, _$2, _$3] forSome
{ type _$1; type _$2; type _$3 }, scala.collection.mutable.Builder[_ >: (MapReduceJob.this.DataSource,
scala.collection.mutable.Set[test.TaggedMapper[_, _, _]]) with test.TaggedMapper[_$1, _$2, _$3] forSome
{ type _$1; type _$2; type _$3 } <= Object] with
scala.collection.mutable.Builder[(MapReduceJob.this.DataSource,
scala.collection.mutable.Set[test.TaggedMapper[_, _, _]]) with test.TaggedMapper[_$1, _$2, _$3] forSome
{ type _$1; type _$2; type _$3 }, scala.collection.mutable.Builder[_ >: (MapReduceJob.this.DataSource,
scala.collection.mutable.Set[test.TaggedMapper[_, _, _]]) with test.TaggedMapper[_$1, _$2, _$3] forSome
{ type _$1; type _$2; type _$3 } <= Object] with
scala.collection.mutable.Builder[(MapReduceJob.this.DataSource,
scala.collection.mutable.Set[test.TaggedMapper[_, _, _]]) with test.TaggedMapper[_$1, _$2, _$3] forSome
{ type _$1; type _$2; type _$3 }, scala.collection.mutable.Builder[_ >: (MapReduceJob.this.DataSource,
scala.collection.mutable.Set[test.TaggedMapper[_, _, _]]) with test.TaggedMapper[_$1, _$2, _$3] forSome
{ type _$1; type _$2; type _$3 } <= Object] with
scala.collection.mutable.Builder[(MapReduceJob.this.DataSource,
scala.collection.mutable.Set[test.TaggedMapper[_, _, _]]) with test.TaggedMapper[_$1, _$2, _$3] forSome
{ type _$1; type _$2; type _$3 } <= Object] with
scala.collection.mutable.Builder[(MapReduceJob.this.DataSource,
scala.collection.mutable.Set[test.TaggedMapper[_, _, _]]) with test.TaggedMapper[_$1, _$2, _$3] forSome
{ type _$1; type _$2; type _$3 } <= Object] with

and so on for another 200 lines
(3) Post-Modernism

- Detailed:
  - Eiffel
  - Typescript
  - Dart
  - Scala
  - Haskell
  - OCaml
- Coarse:
  - C
- Weak:
  - C#
  - Java 5+
- Strong:
  - Go
  - Pascal
  - Modula-2
  - Oberon

- Java 4
Post-Modernism

• Appeal to user’s intuitions. E.g, covariant generics:
  – Employee are Persons
  – So arrays of employees should be arrays of persons (right?)
  – What about functions from Employees to Employers?

• Easy for users, but unsound
  → Can produce type errors at run-time.

• Unsoundness can be mitigated by run-time checks, but design problems can arise when the level of abstraction is raised.
Precision

Soundness

Simplicity

Take Any Two?
Abstractions

Two fundamental forms

– Parameters (positional, functional)

– Abstract Members (name-based, object-oriented)
Abstractions

Two fundamental forms

– Parameters (positional, functional)

– Abstract Members (name-based, modular)
Types in Scala

- scala.collection.BitSet
- Channel with Logged
- Channel { def close(): Unit }
- List[String]
- List[T] forSome { type T }
- List

- Named Type
- Compound Type
- Refined Type
- Parameterized
- Existential Type
- Higher-Kinded
Orthogonal Design

T \{ ... \} with U

Named

T with U

Modular

Functional

Exists T
Non-Orthogonal Design

More Features
Fewer combinations

Named, T {...}, T with U, T[U]

Modular

Functional

T[U]', T[...], Exists T, Named'}
Too Many Combinations?

- Named
- T {...}
- T with U

Functional

Modular
Projections Reduce Dimensionality

Modular

Named  T{...}  T with U

Exists T

T[_]  T[U]

Functional
Projections Help Remove Features

Modular

Named \quad T\{\ldots\}\quad T\text{ with }U

\exists T

T[I\_] 

T[U]

Functional
Dot and Dotty

DOT: Calculus for Dependent Object Types

Dotty: A Scala-Like Language with DOT as its core
Dependent Object Types
Towards a foundation for Scala’s type system
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Abstract
We propose a new type-theoretic foundation of Scala and languages like it in the Dependent Object Types (DOT) calculus. DOT models Scala’s path-dependent types, abstract type members and its mixture of nominal and structural typing through the use of refinement types. The core formalism makes no attempt to model inheritance and mixin composition. DOT normalizes Scala’s type system by unifying the constructs for type members and by providing classical intersection and union types which simplify greatest lower bound and least upper bound compositions.

In this paper, we present the DOT calculus, both formally and informally. We also discuss our work-in-progress to prove type-safety of the calculus.

Categories and Subject Descriptors D.3.3 [Language Constructs and Features]: Abstract data types, Classes and objects, polymorphism; D.3.1 [Formal Definitions and Theory]: Syntax, Semantics; F.3.1 [Specification and Verification]: Reasoning about Programs; F.3.3 [Studies of Program Constructs]: Object-oriented constructs, type structure; F.2.2 [Semantics or Programming Languages]: Operational semantics

General Terms Languages, Theory, Verification

Keywords calculi, objects, dependent types

1. Introduction
A scalable programming language is one in which the same concepts can be used within a large system. Towards this goal, Scala unifies concepts from object and module systems. An essential ingredient of this unification is objects with type members. Given a stable path to an object, its type members can be accessed as types, called path-dependent types.

This paper presents Dependent Object Types (DOT), a small object calculus with path-dependent types. In addition to path-dependent types, types in DOT are built from refinements, intersections and unions. A refinement extends a type by (re)-declaring members, which can be types, values or methods.

We propose DOT as a new type-theoretic foundation of Scala and languages like it. The properties we are interested in modeling are Scala’s path-dependent types and abstract type members, as well as its mixture of nominal and structural typing through the use of refinement types. Compared to previous approaches [5, 14], we make no attempt to model inheritance or mixin composition.

Indeed, we will argue that such concepts are better modeled in a different setting.

The DOT calculus does not precisely describe what’s currently in Scala. It is more normative than descriptive. The main point of deviation concerns the difference between Scala’s compound type formation using with and classical type intersection, as it is modeled in the calculus. Scala, and the previous calculi attempting to model it, conflates the concepts of compound types (which inherit the members of several parent types) and mixin composition (which builds classes from other classes and traits). At first glance, this offers an economy of concepts. However, it is problematic because mixin composition and intersection types have quite different properties. In the case of several inherited members with the same name, mixin composition has to pick one which overrides the others. It uses for that the notion of linearization of a trait hierarchy. Typically, given two independent traits $T_1$ and $T_2$ with a common method $m$, the mixin composition $T_1 \bowtie T_2$ would pick the $m$ in $T_1$, whereas the member in $T_2$ would be available via a super-call. All this makes sense from an implementation standpoint. From a typing standpoint it is much worse, because it breaks commutativity and with it several monotonicity properties.

In the present calculus, we replace Scala’s compound types by classical intersection types, which are commutative. We also complement this by classical union types. Intersections and unions form a lattice wrt subtyping. This addresses another problematic feature of Scala: In Scala’s current type system, least upper bounds and greatest lower bounds do not always exist. Here is an example: given two traits $A$ and $B$, where each declares an abstract upper-bounded type member $T$,

trait $A$ { type $T \subseteq A$ }

trait $B$ { type $T \subseteq B$ }

the greatest lower bound of $A$ and $B$ is approximated by the infinite sequence

$A$ with $B$ { type $T \subseteq A$ with $B$ { type $T \times \cdots$ } }

The limit of this sequence does not exist as a type in Scala.

This is problematic because greatest lower bounds and least upper bounds play a central role in Scala’s type inference. For example, in order to infer the type of an if expression such as

if (cond) (if (A) => C) else (if (B) => D; D)

type inference tries to compute the greatest lower bound of $A$ and $B$ and the least upper bound of $C$ and $D$. The absence of universal greatest lower bounds and least upper bounds makes type inference more brittle and more unpredictable.
Syntax

- Variables: $x, y, z$
- Value label: $l$
- Method label: $m$
- Value: $v := x$
- Term: $t := v$
- New instance: `val x = new c; t`
- Field selection: $t.m(t)$
- Path: $p := x$
- Selection: $p.i$
- Constructor: $c := T_c \{d\}$
- Initializer: $d := l$
- Field initialization: $m(x) = t$
- Store: $s := x \rightarrow c$
- Type label: $L$
- Class label: $L_c$
- Abstract type label: $L_a$
- Type: $S, T, U, V, W$
- Type selection: $p.l$
- Refinement: $T \Rightarrow D$
- Intersection type: $T \land T$
- Union type: $T \lor T$
- Top type: $\top$
- Bottom type: $\bot$
- Concrete type: $p.L_c | T_c \{x \Rightarrow D\} | T_c \land T_c | T$
- Declaration: $D$:
  - Type declaration: $L : S, U$
  - Value declaration: $l : T$
  - Method declaration: $m : S \rightarrow U$
  - Environment: $\Gamma := x : T$

Reduction

- $y \Rightarrow T_c \{l = v \ m(x) = t\} \in s$
- `val x = new c; t | s → t | s, x → c` (NEW)

Type Assignment

- $x : T \in \Gamma$
- $\Gamma \vdash t : T$
- $\Gamma \vdash t . l : T'$
- $\Gamma \vdash t . m(t') : T$

Declaration Assignment

- $\Gamma \vdash v : V', V' <: V$
- $\Gamma \vdash (l = v) : (l : V)$
- $\Gamma \vdash S$ wfe
- $\Gamma, x : S \vdash t : T', T' <: S$
- $\Gamma \vdash (m(x) = t) : (m : S \rightarrow T)$
- $\Gamma \vdash d : D$
Types in Dotty

scala.collection.BitSet
Named Type

Channel & Logged
Intersection Type

Channel { def close(): Unit }
Refined Type

( List[String]
Parameterized )

List[T] forSome { tpe T }  
Existential Type

List  
Higher-Kinded
Modelling Generics

class Set[T] { ... } → class Set { type $T$ }
Set[String] → Set { type $T = String$ }

class List[+T] { ... } → class List { type $T$ }
List[String] → List { type $T <: String$ }

Parameters → Abstract members
Arguments → Refinements
Making Parameters Public

```scala
class Set[Elem] {...}  class Set { type Elem ...}
Set[String]           Set { type Elem = String }

class List[Elem] {...} class List { type Elem ...}
List[String]          List { type Elem <: String }

Analogous to "val" parameters:

class C(val fld: Int)  class C { val fld: Int }
```
Expressing Existentials

What is the type of Lists with arbitrary element type?

Previously: \( \text{List}[_] \)
\( \text{List}[T] \ \text{forSome} \ \{ \ \text{type} \ T \} \)

Now: \( \text{List} \)

(Types can have abstract members)
Expressing Higher-Kinded

• What is the type of List constructors?
• Previously: List
• Now: List

• Can always instantiate later:
  
  type X = List
  
  X { type T = String }
  
  X[String]
In a Nutshell

In this system,

Existential = Higher-kindred

In fact, both are just types with abstract members. We do not distinguish between types and type constructors.
Native Meets and Joins

• The horrible type error message came from a computed join of two types.
• Problem: In Scala, the least upper bound of two types can be infinitely large.
• Adding native & and | types fixes that.
Will this Be Scala?

• Hopefully. Depends on how compatible we can make it.

• Note: SIP 18 already forces you to flag usages of existentials and higher-kindled types in Scala.

• This should give you a some indication how much effort would be needed to convert.
The Essence of Scala

Harness the power of naming

A simple language struggling to get out
Types Are Trouble

– Tooling
– Error messages
– Conceptual complexity
– Scope for misuse

But I believe they are worth it, because they can lead to great designs.
Supplementary Slides
expr.member

Type = path.TypeName
   | Type { Defs }
   | ...

Def = val x: Type = Expr
   | def f(y: Type): Type = Expr
   | type T <: Type
   | >:
   | =
   | extends
Subtyping

Fundamental relation:

\[ T_1 \leq T_2 \]

\( T_1 \) is a subtype of \( T_2 \).

Comes in many guises:

- Implementation matches Interface
- Type class extension
- Signature ascription