CSE 341: Programming Languages

Spring 2007

Lecture 5 — Type synonyms, more pattern-matching, accumulators

Goals

- Contrast type synonyms with new types
- See pattern-matching for built-in "one of" types (important for ML programming) and "each of" types
- Investigate why accumulator-style recursion can be more efficient

Type synonyms

You can bind a *type name* to a type. Example:

```
type intpair = int * int
type point   = int * int
type complex = int * int
```

(We call something else a *type variable*.)

In ML, this creates a *synonym*, also known as a *transparent* type definition. Recursion not allowed.

So a type name is *equivalent* to its definition.

To contrast, the type a datatype binding introduces is not equivalent to any other type (until possibly a later type binding).

Review: datatypes and pattern-matching

Evaluation rules for `datatype` bindings and `case` expressions:

```
datatype t = C1 of t1 | C2 of t2 | ... | Cn of tn
```

Adds constructors `Ci` where `Ci v` is a value (and `Ci` has type `ti->t`).

```
case e of p1 => e1 | p2 => e2 | ... | pn => en
```

- Evaluate `e` to `v`
- If `pi` is the first pattern to *match* `v`, then result is evaluation of `ei` in environment extended by the match.
- If `C` is a constructor of type `t1 * ... * tn -> t`, then `C(x1,...,xn)` is a pattern that matches `C(v1,...,vn)` and the match extends the environment with `x1` bound to `v1` ... `xn` to `vn`.
- Coming soon: many more pattern forms.

Why patterns?

Even without more pattern forms, this design has advantages over functions for “testing and deconstructing” (e.g., `null`, `hd`, and `tl`):

- easier to check for missing and redundant cases
- more concise syntax by combining “test, deconstruct, and bind”
- you can easily define testing and deconstructing in terms of pattern-matching

In fact, case expressions are the preferred way to test variants and extract values from all ML’s “one-of” types, including predefined ones (`[]` and `::` just funny syntax).

So: Do *not* use functions `hd`, `tl`, `null`, `isSome`, `valOf`

Teaser: These functions are useful for *passing as values*

Tuple/record patterns

You can also use patterns to extract fields from tuples and records: pattern `{f1=x1, ..., fn=xn}` (or `(x1,...,xn)`) matches `{f1=v1, ..., fn=vn}` (or `(v1,...,vn)`).

For record-patterns, field-order does not matter.

This is better style than `#1` and `#foo`, and it means you do not (ever) need to write function-argument types.

Instead of a case with one pattern, better style is a pattern directly in a `val` binding.

Next time: “deep” (i.e., nested) patterns.

Recursion

You should now have the hang of recursion:

- It’s no harder than using a loop (whatever that is)
- It’s much easier when you have multiple recursive calls (e.g., with functions over ropes or trees)

But there are idioms you should learn for *elegance*, *efficiency*, and *understandability*.

Today: using an *accumulator*.

Accumulator lessons

- Accumulators can avoid data-structure copying
- Accumulators can reduce the depth of recursive calls that are not *tail calls*
- Key idioms:
  - Non-accumulator: compute recursive results and combine
  - Accumulator: use recursive result as new accumulator
  - The base case becomes the initial accumulator

You will use recursion in non-functional languages—this lesson still applies.

Let’s investigate the evaluation of `to_list_1` and `to_list_2`.