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Slide from Monday’s lecture

If we ignore types, then ML let-bindings can be syntactic sugar for calling an anonymous function:

- These both evaluate $e_1$ to $v_1$, then evaluate $e_2$ in an environment extended to map $x$ to $v_1$
- So exactly the same evaluation of expressions and result

But in ML, there is a type-system difference:
- $x$ on the left can have a polymorphic type, but not on the right
- Can always go from right to left
- If $x$ need not be polymorphic, can go from left to right
Course Motivation
(Did you think I forgot? 😊)

• Why learn the fundamental concepts that appear in all (most?) languages?
• Why use languages quite different from C, C++, Java, Python?
• Why focus on functional programming?
• Why use ML, Racket, and Ruby in particular?
• Not: Language X is better than Language Y

[You won’t be tested on this stuff]
Summary

• No such thing as a “best” PL

• Fundamental concepts easier to teach in some (multiple) PLs

• A good PL is a relevant, elegant interface for writing software
  – There is no substitute for precise understanding of PL semantics

• Functional languages have been on the leading edge for decades
  – Ideas have been absorbed by the mainstream, but very slowly
  – First-class functions and avoiding mutation increasingly essential
  – Meanwhile, use the ideas to be a better C/Java/PHP hacker

• Many great alternatives to ML, Racket, and Ruby, but each was chosen for a reason and for how they complement each other
What is the best kind of car?

What is the best kind of shoes?
Cars / Shoes

Cars are used for rather different things:
- Winning a Formula 1 race
- Taking kids to soccer practice
- Off-roading
- Hauling a mattress
- Getting the wind in your hair
- Staying dry in the rain

Shoes:
- Playing basketball
- Going to a formal
- Going to the beach
More on cars

• A good mechanic might have a specialty, but also understands how “cars” (not a particular make/model) work
  – The upholstery color isn’t essential (syntax)

• A good mechanical engineer really knows how cars work, how to get the most out of them, and how to design better ones
  – I don’t have a favorite kind of car or a favorite PL

• To learn how car pieces interact, it may make sense to start with a classic design rather than the latest model
  – A popular car may not be best
  – May especially not be best for learning how cars work
Why semantics and idioms

This course focuses as much as it can on semantics and idioms

- Correct reasoning about programs, interfaces, and compilers requires a precise knowledge of semantics
  - Not “I feel that conditional expressions might work like this”
  - Not “I like curly braces more than parentheses”
  - Much of software development is designing precise interfaces; what a PL means is a really good example

- Idioms make you a better programmer
  - Best to see in multiple settings, including where they shine
  - See Java in a clearer light even if I never show you Java
Hamlet

The play *Hamlet*:
- Is a beautiful work of art
- Teaches deep, eternal truths
- Is the source of some well-known sayings
- Makes you a better person

Continues to be studied centuries later even though:
- The syntax is really annoying to many
- There are more popular movies with some of the same lessons
- Reading Hamlet will not get you a summer internship
All cars are the same

• To make it easier to rent cars, it is great that they all have steering wheels, brakes, windows, headlights, etc.
  – Yet it is still uncomfortable to learn a new one
  – Can you be a great driver if you only ever drive one car?

• And maybe PLs are more like cars, trucks, boats, and bikes

• So are all PLs really the same…
Are all languages the same?

Yes:
- Any input-output behavior implementable in language X is implementable in language Y [Church-Turing thesis]
- Java, ML, and a language with one loop and three infinitely-large integers are “the same”

Yes:
- Same fundamentals reappear: variables, abstraction, one-of types, recursive definitions, …

No:
- The human condition vs. different cultures (travel to learn more about home)
- The primitive/default in one language is awkward in another
- Beware “the Turing tarpit”
**Functional Programming**

Why spend 60-80% of course using *functional languages*:
- Mutation is discouraged
- Higher-order functions are very convenient
- One-of types via constructs like datatypes

Because:
1. These features are invaluable for correct, elegant, efficient software (great way to think about computation)
2. Functional languages have always been ahead of their time
3. Functional languages well-suited to where computing is going

Most of course is on (1), so a few minutes on (2) and (3) …
Ahead of their time

All these were dismissed as “beautiful, worthless, slow things PL professors make you learn”

- Garbage collection (Java didn’t exist in 1995, PL courses did)
- Generics (\texttt{List\:<T>} in Java, C#), much more like SML than C++
- XML for universal data representation (like Racket/Scheme/LISP/…)
- Higher-order functions (Ruby, Javascript, C#, now Java, …)
- Type inference (C#, Scala, …)
- Recursion (a big fight in 1960 about this – I’m told 😊)
- …

The future may resemble the past

Somehow nobody notices we are right… 20 years later

• “To conquer” versus “to assimilate”

• Societal progress takes time and muddles “taking credit”

• Maybe pattern-matching, currying, hygienic macros, etc. will be next
Recent-ish Surge, Part 1

Other popular functional PLs (alphabetized, pardon omissions)
- Clojure http://clojure.org
- Erlang http://www.erlang.org
- F# http://tryfsharp.org
- Haskell http://www.haskell.org
- OCaml http://ocaml.org
- Scala http://www.scala-lang.org

Some “industry users” lists (surely more exist):
- http://www.haskell.org/haskellwiki/Haskell_in_industry
- http://ocaml.org/companies.html
- In general, see http://cufp.org
Recent-ish Surge, Part 2

Popular adoption of concepts:
- C#, LINQ, C++ (closures, type inference, …)
- Java 8 (closures)
- MapReduce / Hadoop
  - Avoiding side-effects essential for fault-tolerance here
- Scala libraries (e.g., Akka, …)
- …
Why a surge?

My best guesses:

• Concise, elegant, productive programming

• JavaScript, Python, Ruby helped break the Java/C/C++ hegemony

• Avoiding mutation is the easiest way to make concurrent and parallel programming easier
  – In general, to handle sharing in complex systems

• Sure, functional programming is still a small niche, but there is so much software in the world today even niches have room
The languages together

SML, Racket, and Ruby are a useful combination for us

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dynamically typed</th>
<th>statically typed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>functional</td>
<td>Racket</td>
<td>SML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object-oriented</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>Java</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ML: polymorphic types, pattern-matching, abstract types & modules
Racket: dynamic typing, “good” macros, minimalist syntax, eval
Ruby: classes but not types, very OOP, mixins
   [and much more]

Really wish we had more time:
Haskell: laziness, purity, type classes, monads
Prolog: unification and backtracking
   [and much more]
But why not…

Instead of SML, could use similar languages easy to learn after:

- OCaml: yes indeed but would have to port all my materials 😊
  - And a few small things (e.g., second-class constructors)
- F#: yes and very cool, but needs a .Net platform
  - And a few more small things (e.g., second-class constructors, less elegant signature-matching)
- Haskell: more popular, cooler types, but lazy semantics and type classes from day 1
- Coq: truly immutable, even crazier types, and even proofs!

Admittedly, SML and its implementations are showing their age (e.g., andalso and less tool support), but it still makes for a fine foundation in statically typed, eager functional programming
But why not…

Instead of Racket, could use similar languages easy to learn after:

– Scheme, Lisp, Clojure, Python…

Racket has a combination of:

– A modern feel and active evolution
– “Better” macros, modules, structs, contracts, …
– A large user base and community (not just for education)
– An IDE tailored to education

Could easily define our own language in the Racket system

– Would rather use a good and vetted design
But why not…

Instead of Ruby, could use another language:

- Python, Perl, JavaScript are also dynamically typed, but are not as “fully” OOP, which is what I want to focus on
  - Python also does not have (full) closures
  - JavaScript also does not have classes but is OOP

- Smalltalk serves my OOP needs
  - But implementations merge language/environment
  - Less modern syntax, user base, etc.
Is this real programming?

• The way we use ML/Racket/Ruby can make them seem almost “silly” precisely because lecture and homework focus on interesting language constructs

• “Real” programming needs file I/O, string operations, floating-point, graphics, project managers, testing frameworks, threads, build systems, …
  – Many elegant languages have all that and more
    • Including Racket and Ruby
  – If we used Java the same way, Java would seem “silly” too
A note on reality

Reasonable questions when deciding to use/learn a language:
- What libraries are available for reuse?
- What tools are available?
- What can get me a job?
- What does my boss tell me to do?
- What is the de facto industry standard?
- What do I already know?

Our course by design does not deal with these questions
  - You have the rest of your life for that
  - And technology leaders affect the answers