An extended example: binary trees

- Stores elements in sorted order
- enables faster membership testing, printing out in sorted order
 - datatype 'a BTree =
 EmptyBTree
 BTNode of 'a * 'a BTree * 'a BTree

Some functions on binary trees









Another common pattern: filter

 Pattern: take a list and produce a new list of all the elements of the first list that pass some test (a **predicate**)

- filter captures this pattern
 filter: ('a -> bool) * 'a list -> 'a list
 [not quite the type of ML's predefined filter; stay tuned]
- Example:
 - have a list of day temps
 want a list of nice days

- fun is_nice_day(temp) = temp >= 70.0; val is_nice_day = fn : real -> bool - val nice_days = filter(is_nice_day, f_temps); val nice_days = (72.2,78.4) : real list Another common pattern: find
 Pattern: take a list and return the first element that passes some test, raising an exception if no element passes the test
 find captures this pattem
 find: ('a -> bool) * 'a list -> 'a
 exception NotFound
 [not quite the type of ML's predefined find; stay tuned]

 Example: find first nice day

- val a_nice_day = find(is_nice_day, f_temps);
a_nice_day = 72.2 : real

















Closures

- To support lexically nested procedures which can be returned out of their enclosing scope, must represent as a **closure**: a pair of code address and an environment
 - environment records bindings of free variables
 - closure no longer dependent on enclosing scope
 - pair and environment must be heap-allocated
 - e.g. ML, Scheme, Haskell, Smalltalk, Cecil
- Restricted versions If only allow to pass nested procedures down, not return them, then can implement more cheaply environment can be stack-allocated, not heap-allocated e.g. Pascal, Modula-3 If allow nested procedures but not first-class procedures, then cheaper still · do not need pair, just extra implicit environment argument e.g. Ada If allow first-class procedures but no nesting, then can implement with just a code address • e.g. C, C++

20

A general pattern: fold The general pattern over lists simply abstracts the standard pattern of . Recursion pattern: $\begin{array}{c} | t(-,x;;z_{*},-)-x-t(-,x_{*},-)-(* \mbox{ inductive case }^{*}) \\ \mbox{Parameters of this pattern, for a list argument of type 'a list:} \\ \mbox{ what to return as the base case result ('b)} \\ \mbox{ how to compute the inductive result from the head and the recursive call ('a * 'b - > 'b) \\ \mbox{ ('a * 'b - > 'b)} \end{array}$

- fold captures this pattern
- 'b -> 'b) -> 'b -> 'a list -> 'b
- fold1, foldr: ('a * 'b -> 'b) -> 'b -> 'a list 3 curried arguments iterate over elements left-to-right: fold1 iterate over elements right-to-left: folda for associative combining operators, order doesn't matter [which is the recursive pattern above?]

21







Example #2

fun map f nil = nil

```
| map f (x::xs) =
```

f x ::

map f xs



Polymorphic vs. monomorphic
recursion• When analyzing the body of a polymorphic function, what do we
do when we encounter a recursive call?f(m f(m) = i f(m(m)) f(m(m)) f(m(m)) f(m(m))If allow polymorphic recursion, then f is considered
polymorphic in body, and each recursive call uses a fresh
instantiation (like any call to a polymorphic function)

- If only monomorphic recursion, then force recursive call to pass same argument types as formals (don't make a fresh instantiation)
- Type inference under polymorphic recursion is undecidable
 but only in obscure cases
- ML uses monomorphic recursion

















Signature "subtyping"

- Signature specifies a particular interface
- Any structure that satisfies that interface can be used where that interface is expected
 - e.g. in functor application
- Structure can have
 - more operations
 - more polymorphic operations
- more details of implementation of types
- than required by signature

37

Some limitations of ML modules

- Structures are not first-class values must be named or be argument to functor application
 must be declared at top-level or nested inside another structure or signature
- Cannot instantiate functors at run-time to create "objects" ⇒ cannot simulate classes and object-oriented programming
- No type inference for functor arguments
- These constraints are to enable type inference of core and static typechecking (at all) of structures that contain types •

38

Modules vs. classes

- Classes (abstract data types) implicitly define a single type, with associated constructors, observers, and mutators
- Modules can define 0, 1, or many types in same module, with associated operations over several types no new types if adding operations to existing type(s) e.g. a litrary of integer or array functions hard to din C++ multiple types can share private data & operations require 1 rismal detained in C++ one new type requires a name for the type (e.g. :t) dats name is dato type anew in C++, conveniently

- Functors similar to parameterized classes
- C++'s ${\tt public}/{\tt private}$ is simpler than ML's separate signatures, but C++ doesn't have a simple way of describing just an interface
- See Moby: modules + classes, cleanly