CSE 341: Programming Languages

Hal Perkins

Spring 2011

Lecture 10— Higher-Order Functions Wrapup; Type inference; Namespace Management

One Last Closure Example

Closures are essential to elegant functional programming.

See our 35[a] ways of counting zeros in a list to see how currying and higher-order functions give us lots of flexibility.

- And some interesting reuse vs. straightforwardness vs. efficiency trade-offs

[a] Well, only about 10 or so...

Now inference

- We have learned an interesting subset of ML expressions
- But we have been really informal about some aspects of the type system:
  - Type inference (what types do bindings implicitly have)
  - Type variables (what do `'a` and `'b` really mean)
  - Type constructors (why is `int list` a type but not `list`)
- Type inference and parametric polymorphism are separate concepts that end up intertwined in ML
  - A different language could have one or the other
  - *Focus* on inference today; type variables on Friday

Type Inference

Some languages are untyped or dynamically typed.

ML is *statically typed*; every binding has one type, determined during type-checking (compile-time).

ML is *implicitly typed*; programmers rarely need to write bindings' types (e.g., if using features like #1)

The type-inference question: Given a program without explicit types, produce types for all bindings such that the program type-checks; reject if and only if it is impossible.

Whether type inference is easy, hard, or impossible depends on details of the type system: Making it more or less powerful (i.e., more programs typecheck) may make inference easier or harder.

ML Type Inference

- Determine types of bindings in order (earlier first) (except for mutual recursion)
- For each `val` or `fun` binding, analyze the binding to determine necessary facts about its type.
- Afterward, use *type variables* (e.g., `'a`) for any unconstrained types in function arguments or results.
- (One extra restriction to be discussed in lecture 12.)

Amazing fact: For the ML type system, “going in order” this way never causes unnecessary rejection.

[Let’s walk through a few examples, doing type inference by hand.]

Comments on ML type inference

- If we had subtyping, the "equality constraints" we generated would be unnecessarily restrictive.
- If we did not have type variables, we would not be able to give a type to `compose` until we saw how it was used.
  - But type variables are useful regardless of inference.
  - (Other languages could just make programmer write them.)

Structure basics

Large programs benefit from more structure than a list of bindings.

Syntax: `structure Name = struct` *bindings* `end`

If `x` is a variable, exception, type, constructor, etc. defined in `Name`, the rest of the program refers to it via `Name.x`

(You can also do `open Name`, which is often bad style, but convenient when testing.)

So far, this is just *namespace management*, which is important for large programs, but not very interesting.

Signature basics

(For those interested in learning more, we're doing only *opaque signatures* on structure definitions.)

A signature `signature BLAH = sig ... end` is like a type for a structure.

- Describes what types a structure provides.
- Describes what values a structure provides (and their types).

That way, a module *client* can be type-checked without consulting the module *implementation* (just the signature).

Now the interesting part: A signature can *promise less*, i.e., *hide things* about the implementation.

- This is the essence of abstraction, one of the (possibly the) most important concepts in computer science.