

# CSE341: Programming Languages Winter 2013

## Unit 3 Summary

*Standard Description: This summary covers roughly the same material as class and recitation section. It can help to read about the material in a narrative style and to have the material for an entire unit of the course in a single document, especially when reviewing the material later. Please report errors in these notes, even typos. This summary is not a sufficient substitute for attending class, reading the associated code, etc.*

### Contents

Introduction and Some Terms . . . . .	1
Taking Functions as Arguments . . . . .	2
Polymorphic Types and Functions as Arguments . . . . .	3
Anonymous functions . . . . .	3
Unnecessary Function Wrapping . . . . .	4
Maps and filters . . . . .	5
Returning functions . . . . .	5
Not just for numbers and lists . . . . .	6
Lexical Scope . . . . .	6
Environments and Closures . . . . .	7
(Silly) Examples Including Higher-Order Functions . . . . .	7
Why Lexical Scope . . . . .	8
Passing Closures to Iterators Like Filter . . . . .	9
Fold and More Closure Examples . . . . .	9
Another Closure Idiom: Combining Functions . . . . .	10
Another Closure Idiom: Currying and Partial Application . . . . .	11
The Value Restriction . . . . .	13
Mutation via ML References . . . . .	14
Another Closure Idiom: Callbacks . . . . .	14
Optional: Another Closure Idiom: Abstract Data Types . . . . .	16
Optional: Closures in Other Languages . . . . .	17
Optional: Closures in Java using Objects and Interfaces . . . . .	18
Optional: Closures in C Using Explicit Environments . . . . .	20
Standard-Library Documentation . . . . .	22

### Introduction and Some Terms

This unit focuses on *first-class functions* and *function closures*. By “first-class” we mean that functions can be computed, passed, stored, etc. *wherever* other values can be computed, passed, stored, etc. As examples, we can pass them to functions, return them from functions, put them in pairs, have them be part of the data a datatype constructor carries, etc. “Function closures” refers to functions that use variables defined outside of them, which makes first-class functions much more powerful, as we will see after starting with simpler first-class functions that do not use this ability. The term *higher-order function* just refers to a function that takes or returns other functions.

Terms like first-class functions, function closures, and higher-order functions are often confused with each

other or considered synonyms. Because so much of the world is not careful with these terms, we will not be too worried about them either. But the idea of first-class functions and the idea of function closures really are distinct *concepts* that we often use together to write elegant, reusable code. For that reason, we will delay the idea of closures, so we can introduce it as a separate concept.

There is an even more general term, *functional programming*. This term also is often used imprecisely to refer to several distinct concepts. The two most important and most common are:

- Not using mutable data in most or all cases: We have avoided mutation throughout the course so far and will mostly continue to do so.
- Using functions as values, which is what this unit is all about

There are other things that are also considered related to functional programming:

- A programming style that encourages recursion and recursive data structures
- Programming with a syntax or style that is closer to traditional mathematical definitions of functions
- Anything that is not object-oriented programming (this one is really incorrect)
- Using certain programming idioms related to *laziness*, a technical term for a certain kind of programming construct/idiom we will study, briefly, later in the course

An obvious related question is “what makes a programming language a functional language?” Your instructor has come to the conclusion this is not a question for which there is a precise answer and barely makes sense as a question. But one could say that a functional language is one where writing in a functional style (as described above) is more convenient, more natural, and more common than programming in other styles. At a minimum, you need good support for immutable data, first-class functions, and function closures. More and more we are seeing new languages that provide such support but also provide good support for other styles, like object-oriented programming, which we will study some toward the end of the course.

## Taking Functions as Arguments

The most common use of first-class functions is passing them as arguments to other functions, so we motivate this use first.

Here is a first example of a function that takes another function:

```
fun n_times (f,n,x) =
  if n=0
  then x
  else f (n_times(f,n-1,x))
```

We can tell the argument `f` is a function because the last line calls `f` with an argument. What `n_times` does is compute `f(f(...(f(x))))` where the number of calls to `f` is `n`. That is a genuinely useful helper function to have around. For example, here are 3 different uses of it:

```
fun double x = x+x
val x1 = n_times(double,4,7) (* answer: 112 *)

fun increment x = x+1
val x2 = n_times(increment,4,7) (* answer: 11 *)

val x3 = n_times(tl,2,[4,8,12,16]) (* answer: [12,16] *)
```

Like any helper function, `n_times` lets us *abstract* the common parts of multiple computations so we can *reuse* some code in different ways by passing in different arguments. The main novelty is making one of those arguments a function, which is a powerful and flexible programming idiom. It also makes perfect sense — we are not introducing any new language constructs here, just using ones we already know in ways you may not have thought of.

Once we define such abstractions, we can find additional uses for them. For example, even if our program today does not need to triple any values  $n$  times, maybe tomorrow it will, in which case we can just define the function `triple_n_times` using `n_times`:

```
fun triple x = 3*x

fun triple_n_times (n,x) = n_times(triple,n,x)
```

## Polymorphic Types and Functions as Arguments

Let us now consider the type of `n_times`, which is `('a -> 'a) * int * 'a -> 'a`. It might be simpler at first to consider the type `(int -> int) * int * int -> int`, which is how `n_times` is used for `x1` and `x2` above: It takes 3 arguments, the first of which is itself a function that takes and returns an `int`. Similarly, for `x3` we use `n_times` as though it has type `(int list -> int list) * int * int list -> int list`. But choosing either one of these types for `n_times` would make it less useful because only some of our example uses would type-check. The type `('a -> 'a) * int * 'a -> 'a` says the third argument and result can be any type, but they have to be the *same* type, as does the argument and return type for the first argument. When types can be any type and do not have to be the same as other types, we use different letters (`'b`, `'c`, etc.)

This is called *parametric polymorphism*, or perhaps more commonly *generic types*. It lets functions take arguments of any type. It is a separate issue from first-class functions:

- There are functions that take functions and do not have polymorphic types
- There are functions with polymorphic types that do not take functions.

However, many of our examples with first-class functions will have polymorphic types. That is a good thing because it makes our code more reusable.

Without parametric polymorphism, we would have to redefine lists for every type of element that a list might have. Instead, we can have functions that work for any kind of list, like `length`, which has type `'a list -> int` even though it does not use any function arguments. Conversely, here is a higher-order function that is not polymorphic: it has type `(int->int) * int -> int`:<sup>1</sup>

```
fun times_until_zero (f,x) =
  if x = 0 then 0 else 1 + times_until_zero(f, f x)
```

## Anonymous functions

There is no reason that a function like `triple` that is passed to another function like `n_times` needs to be defined at top-level. As usual, it is better style to define such functions locally if they are needed only locally. So we could write:

---

<sup>1</sup>It would be better to make this function tail-recursive using an accumulator.

```
fun triple_n_times (n,x) =
  let fun triple x = 3*x in n_times(triple,n,x) end
```

In fact, we could give the `triple` function an even smaller scope: we need it only as the first argument to `n_times`, so we could have a `let`-expression there that evaluates to the `triple` function:

```
fun triple_n_times (n,x) = n_times((let fun triple y = 3*y in triple end), n, x)
```

Notice that in this example, which is actually poor style, we need to have the `let`-expression “return” `triple` since, as always, a `let`-expression produces the result of the expression between `in` and `end`. In this case, we simply look up `triple` in the environment, and the resulting function is the value that we then pass as the first argument to `n_times`.

ML has a much more concise way to define functions right where you use them, as in this final, best version:

```
fun triple_n_times (n,x) = n_times((fn y => 3*y), n, x)
```

This code defines an *anonymous function* `fn y => 3*y`. It is a function that takes an argument `y` and has body `3*y`. The `fn` is a keyword and `=>` (not `=`) is also part of the syntax. We never gave the function a name (it is *anonymous*, see?), which is convenient because we did not need one. We just wanted to pass a function to `n_times`, and in the body of `n_times`, this function is bound to `f`.

It is common to use anonymous functions as arguments to other functions. Moreover, you can put an anonymous function anywhere you can put an expression — it simply is a value, the function itself. The only thing you cannot do with an anonymous function is recursion, exactly because you have no name to use for the recursive call. In such cases, you need to use a `fun` binding as before, and `fun` bindings must be in `let`-expressions or at top-level.

For non-recursive functions, you could use anonymous functions with `val` bindings instead of a `fun` binding. For example, these two bindings are exactly the same thing:

```
fun increment x = x + 1
val increment = fn x => x+1
```

They both bind `increment` to a value that is a function that returns its argument plus 1. So function-bindings are *almost* syntactic sugar, but they support recursion, which is essential.

## Unnecessary Function Wrapping

While anonymous functions are incredibly convenient, there is one poor idiom where they get used for no good reason. Consider:

```
fun nth_tail_poor (n,x) = n_times((fn y => tl y), n, x)
```

What is `fn y => tl y`? It is a function that returns the list-tail of its argument. But there is already a variable bound to a function that does the exact same thing: `tl!` In general, there is no reason to write `fn x => f x` when we can just use `f`. This is analogous to the beginner’s habit of writing `if x then true else false` instead of `x`. Just do this:

```
fun nth_tail (n,x) = n_times(tl, n, x)
```

## Maps and filters

We now consider a very useful higher-order function over lists:

```
fun map (f,xs) =
  case xs of
    [] => []
  | x::xs' => (f x)::(map(f,xs'))
```

The `map` function takes a list and a function `f` and produces a new list by applying `f` to each element of the list. Here are two example uses:

```
val x1 = map (increment, [4,8,12,16]) (* answer: [5,9,13,17] *)
val x2 = map (hd, [[1,2],[3,4],[5,6,7]]) (* answer: [1,3,5] *)
```

The type of `map` is illuminating: `('a -> 'b) * 'a list -> 'b list`. You can pass `map` any kind of list you want, but the argument type of `f` must be the element type of the list (they are both `'a`). But the return type of `f` can be a different type `'b`. The resulting list is a `'b list`. For `x1`, both `'a` and `'b` are *instantiated* with `int`. For `x2`, `'a` is `int list` and `'b` is `int`.

The ML standard library provides a very similar function `List.map`, but it is defined in a curried form, a topic we will discuss later in this unit.

The definition and use of `map` is an incredibly important idiom even though our particular example is simple. We could have easily written a recursive function over lists of integers that incremented all the elements, but instead we divided the work into two parts: The `map implementer` knew how to traverse a recursive data structure, in this case a list. The `map client` knew what to do with the data there, in this case increment each number. You could imagine either of these tasks — traversing a complicated piece of data or doing some calculation for each of the pieces — being vastly more complicated and best done by different developers without making assumptions about the other task. That is exactly what writing `map` as a helper function that takes a function lets us do.

Here is a second very useful higher-order function for lists. It takes a function of type `'a -> bool` and an `'a list` and returns the `'a list` containing only the elements of the input list for which the function returns true:

```
fun filter (f,xs) =
  case xs of
    [] => []
  | x::xs' => if f x
               then x::(filter (f,xs'))
               else filter (f,xs')
```

Here is an example use that assumes the list elements are pairs with second component of type `int`; it returns the list elements where the second component is even:

```
fun get_all_even_snd xs = filter((fn (_,v) => v mod 2 = 0), xs)
```

(Notice how we are using a pattern for the argument to our anonymous function.)

## Returning functions

Functions can also return functions. Here is an example:

```

fun double_or_triple f =
  if f 7
  then fn x => 2*x
  else fn x => 3*x

```

The type of `double_or_triple` is `(int -> bool) -> (int -> int)`: The if-test makes the type of `f` clear and as usual the two branches of the if must have the same type, in this case `int->int`. However, ML will print the type as `(int -> bool) -> int -> int`, which is the same thing. The parentheses are unnecessary because the `->` “associates to the right”, i.e., `t1 -> t2 -> t3 -> t4` is `t1 -> (t2 -> (t3 -> t4))`.

## Not just for numbers and lists

Because ML programs tend to use lists a lot, you might forget that higher-order functions are useful for more than lists. Some of our first examples just used integers. But higher-order functions also are great for our own data structures. Here we use an `is_even` function to see if all the constants in an arithmetic expression are even. We could easily reuse `true_of_all_constants` for any other property we wanted to check.

```

datatype exp = Constant of int | Negate of exp | Add of exp * exp | Multiply of exp * exp

fun is_even v =
  (v mod 2 = 0)

fun true_of_all_constants(f,e) =
  case e of
    Constant i      => f i
  | Negate e1        => true_of_all_constants(f,e1)
  | Add(e1,e2)       => true_of_all_constants(f,e1) andalso true_of_all_constants(f,e2)
  | Multiply(e1,e2)  => true_of_all_constants(f,e1) andalso true_of_all_constants(f,e2)

fun all_even e = true_of_all_constants(is_even,e)

```

## Lexical Scope

So far, the functions we have passed to or returned from other functions have been *closed*: the function bodies used only the function’s argument(s) and any locally defined variables. But we know that functions can do more than that: they can use any bindings that are in scope. Doing so in combination with higher-order functions is very powerful, so it is crucial to learn effective idioms using this technique. But first it is even more crucial to get the semantics right. This is probably the most subtle and important concept in the entire course, so go slowly and read carefully.

*The body of a function is evaluated in the environment where the function is **defined**, not the environment where the function is **called**.* Here is a very simple example to demonstrate the difference:

```

val x = 1
fun f y = x + y
val x = 2
val y = 3
val z = f (x+y)

```

In this example, `f` is bound to a function that takes an argument `y`. Its body also looks up `x` in the environment where `f` was defined. Hence this function *always* increments its argument since the environment

at the definition maps  $x$  to 1. Later we have a different environment where  $f$  maps to this function,  $x$  maps to 2,  $y$  maps to 3, and we make the call  $f\ x$ . Here is how evaluation proceeds:

- Look up  $f$  to get the previously described function.
- Evaluate the argument  $x+y$  in the *current* environment by looking up  $x$  and  $y$ , producing 5.
- Call the function with the argument 5, which means evaluating the body  $x+y$  in the “old” environment where  $x$  maps to 1 extended with  $y$  mapping to 5. So the result is 6.

Notice the argument was evaluated in the current environment (producing 5), but the function body was evaluated in the “old” environment. We discuss below why this semantics is desirable, but first we define this semantics more precisely and understand the semantics with additional silly examples that use higher-order functions.

This semantics is called *lexical scope*. The alternate, inferior semantics where you use the current environment (which would produce 7 in the above example) is called *dynamic scope*.

## Environments and Closures

We have said that functions are values, but we have not been precise about what that value exactly is. We now explain that a function value has *two parts*, the *code* for the function (obviously) and the *environment that was current when we created the function*. These two parts really do form a “pair” but we put “pair” in quotation marks because it is not an ML pair, just something with two parts. You *cannot* access the parts of the “pair” separately; all you can do is call the function. This call uses both parts because it evaluates the code part using the environment part.

This “pair” is called a *function closure* or just *closure*. The reason is that while the code itself can have *free variables* (variables that are not *bound* inside the code so they need to be bound by some outer environment), the closure carries with it an environment that provides all these bindings. So the closure overall is “closed” — it has everything it needs to produce a function result given a function argument.

In the example above, the binding `fun f y = x + y` bound  $f$  to a closure. The code part is the function `fn y => x + y` and the environment part maps  $x$  to 1. Therefore, any call to this closure will return  $y+1$ .

## (Silly) Examples Including Higher-Order Functions

Lexical scope and closures get more interesting when we have higher-order functions, but the semantics already described will lead us to the right answers.

Example 1:

```
val x = 1
fun f y =
  let
    val x = y+1
  in
    fn z => x + y + z
  end
val x = 3
val g = f 4
val y = 5
val z = g 6
```

Here, `f` is bound to a closure where the environment part maps `x` to 1. So when we later evaluate `f 4`, we evaluate `let val x = y + 1 in fn z => x + y + z end` in an environment where `x` maps to 1 extended to map `y` to 4. But then due to the `let`-binding we shadow `x` so we evaluate `fn z => x + y + z` in an environment where `x` maps to 5 and `y` maps to 4. How do we evaluate a function like `fn z => x + y + z`? We create a closure with the current environment. So `f 4` returns a closure that, when called, will always add 9 to its argument, no matter what the environment is at any call-site. Hence, in the last line of the example, `z` will be bound to 15.

Example 2:

```
fun f g =
  let
    val x = 3
  in
    g 2
  end
val x = 4
fun h y = x + y
val z = f h
```

In this example, `f` is bound to a closure that takes another function `g` as an argument and returns the result of `g 2`. The closure bound to `h` *always* adds 4 to its argument because the argument is `y`, the body is `x+y`, and the function is defined in an environment where `x` maps to 4. So in the last line, `z` will be bound to 6. The binding `val x = 3` is totally irrelevant: the call `g 2` is evaluated by looking up `g` to get the closure that was passed in and then using that closure with *its environment* (in which `x` maps to 4) with 2 for an argument.

## Why Lexical Scope

While lexical scope and higher-order functions take some getting used to, decades of experience make clear that this semantics is what we want. Much of the rest of this section will describe various widespread idioms that are powerful and that rely on lexical scope.

But first we can also motivate lexical scope by showing how dynamic scope (where you just have one current environment and use it to evaluate function bodies) leads to some fundamental problems.

First, suppose in Example 1 above the body of `f` was changed to `let val q = y+1 in fn z => q + y + z`. Under lexical scope this is fine: we can always change the name of a local variable and its uses without it affecting anything. Under dynamic scope, now the call to `g 6` will make no sense: we will try to look up `q`, but there is no `q` in the environment at the call-site.

Second, consider again the original version of Example 1 but now change the line `val x = 3` to `val x = "hi"`. Under lexical scope, this is again fine: that binding is never actually used. Under dynamic scope, the call to `g 6` will look-up `x`, get a string, and try to add it, which should not happen in a program that type-checks.

Similar issues arise with Example 2: The body of `f` in this example is awful: we have a local binding we never use. Under lexical scope we can remove it, changing the body to `g 2` and know that this has no effect on the rest of the program. Under dynamic scope it would have an effect. Also, under lexical scope we *know* that any use of the closure bound to `h` will add 4 to its argument regardless of how other functions like `g` are implemented and what variable names they use. This is a key separation-of-concerns that only lexical scope provides.

For “regular” variables in programs, lexical scope is the way to go. There are some compelling uses for dynamic scoping for certain idioms, but few languages have special support for these (Racket does) and very



few if any modern languages have dynamic scoping as the default. But you have seen one feature that is more like dynamic scope than lexical scope: exception handling. When an exception is raised, evaluation has to “look up” which handle expression should be evaluated. This “look up” is done using the dynamic call stack, with no regard for the lexical structure of the program.

## Passing Closures to Iterators Like Filter

The examples above are silly, so we need to show useful programs that rely on lexical scope. The first idiom we will show is passing functions to iterators like *map* and *filter*. The functions we previously passed did not use their environment (only their arguments and maybe local variables), but being able to pass in closures makes the higher-order functions much more widely useful. Consider:

```
fun filter (f,xs) =
  case xs of
    [] => []
  | x::xs' => if f x then x::(filter(f,xs')) else filter(f,xs')

fun allGreaterThanSeven xs = filter (fn x => x > 7, xs)

fun allGreaterThan (xs,n) = filter (fn x => x > n, xs)
```

Here, `allGreaterThanSeven` is “old news” — we pass in a function that removes from the result any numbers 7 or less in a list. But it is much more likely that you want a function like `allGreaterthan` that takes the “limit” as a parameter `n` and uses the function `fn x => x > n`. Notice this requires a closure and lexical scope! When the implementation of `filter` calls this function, we need to look up `n` in the environment where `fn x => x > n` was defined.

Here are two additional examples:

```
fun allShorterThan1 (xs,s) = filter (fn x => String.size x < String.size s, xs)

fun allShorterThan2 (xs,s) =
  let
    val i = String.size s
  in
    filter(fn x => String.size x < i, xs)
  end
```

Both these functions take a list of strings `xs` and a string `s` and return a list containing only the strings in `xs` that are shorter than `s`. And they both use closures, to look up `s` or `i` when the anonymous functions get called. The second one is more complicated but a bit more efficient: The first one recomputes `String.size s` once per element in `xs` (because `filter` calls its function argument this many times and the body evaluates `String.size s` each time). The second one “precomputes” `String.size s` and binds it to a variable `i` available to the function `fn x => String.size x < i`.

## Fold and More Closure Examples

Beyond `map` and `filter`, a third incredibly useful higher-order function is *fold*, which can have several slightly different definitions and is also known by names such as *reduce* and *inject*. Here is one common definition:

```

fun fold (f,acc,xs) =
  case xs of
    []      => acc
  | x::xs' => fold (f, f(acc,x), xs')

```

`fold` takes an “initial answer” `acc` and uses `f` to “combine” `acc` and the first element of the list, using this as the new “initial answer” for “folding” over the rest of the list. We can use `fold` to take care of iterating over a list while we provide some function that expresses how to combine elements. For example, to sum the elements in a list `foo`, we can do:

```
fold ((fn (x,y) => x+y), 0, foo)
```

As with `map` and `filter`, much of `fold`’s power comes from clients passing closures that can have “private fields” (in the form of variables bindings) for keeping data they want to consult. Here are two examples. The first counts how many elements are in some integer range. The second checks if all elements are strings shorter than some other string’s length.

```

fun numberInRange (xs,lo,hi) =
  fold ((fn (x,y) =>
          x + (if y >= lo andalso y <= hi then 1 else 0)),
        0, xs)

fun areAllShorter (xs,s) =
  let
    val i = String.size s
  in
    fold((fn (x,y) => x andalso String.size y < i), true, xs)
  end

```

This pattern of splitting the recursive traversal (`fold` or `map`) from the data-processing done on the elements (the closures passed in) is fundamental. In our examples, both parts are so easy we could just do the whole thing together in a few simple lines. More generally, we may have a very complicated set of data structures to traverse or we may have very involved data processing to do. It is good to *separate these concerns* so that the programming problems can be solved separately.

## Another Closure Idiom: Combining Functions

### *Function composition*

When we program with lots of functions, it is useful to create new functions that are just combinations of other functions. You have probably done similar things in mathematics, such as when you compose two functions. For example, here is a function that does exactly function composition:

```
fun compose (f,g) = fn x => f (g x)
```

It takes two functions `f` and `g` and returns a function that applies its argument to `g` and makes that the argument to `f`. Crucially, the code `fn x => f (g x)` uses the `f` and `g` in the environment where it was defined. Notice the type of `compose` is inferred to be  $(\text{'a} \rightarrow \text{'b}) * (\text{'c} \rightarrow \text{'a}) \rightarrow \text{'c} \rightarrow \text{'b}$ , which is equivalent to what you might write:  $(\text{'b} \rightarrow \text{'c}) * (\text{'a} \rightarrow \text{'b}) \rightarrow (\text{'a} \rightarrow \text{'c})$  since the two types simply use different type-variable names consistently.

As a cute and convenient library function, the ML library defines the infix operator `o` as function composition, just like in math. So instead of writing:

```
fun sqrt_of_abs i = Math.sqrt(Real.fromInt (abs i))
```

you could write:

```
fun sqrt_of_abs i = (Math.sqrt o Real.fromInt o abs) i
```

But this second version makes clearer that we can just use function-composition to create a function that we bind to a variable with a val-binding, as in this third version:

```
val sqrt_of_abs = Math.sqrt o Real.fromInt o abs
```

While all three versions are fairly readable, the first one does not immediately indicate to the reader that `sqrt_of_abs` is just the composition of other functions.

### *The Pipeline Operator*

In functional programming, it is very common to compose other functions to create larger ones, so it makes sense to define convenient syntax for it. While the third version above is concise, it, like function composition in mathematics, has the strange-to-many-programmers property that the computation proceeds from right-to-left: “Take the absolute value, convert it to a real, and compute the square root” may be easier to understand than, “Take the square root of the conversion to real of the absolute value.”

We can define convenient syntax for left-to-right as well. Let’s first define our own infix operator that lets us put the function to the right of the argument we are calling it with:

```
infix |> (* tells the parser |> is a function that appears between its two arguments *)
fun x |> f = f x
```

Now we can write:

```
fun sqrt_of_abs i = i |> abs |> Real.fromInt |> Math.sqrt
```

This operator, commonly called the *pipeline operator*, is very popular in F# programming. (F# is a dialect of ML that runs on .Net and interacts well with libraries written in other .Net languages.) As we have seen, there is nothing complicated about the semantics of the pipeline operator.

## Another Closure Idiom: Currying and Partial Application

The next idiom we consider is very convenient in general, and is often used when defining and using higher-order functions like `map`, `filter`, and `fold`. We have already seen that in ML every function takes exactly one argument, so you have to use an idiom to get the effect of multiple arguments. Our previous approach passed a tuple as the one argument, so each part of the tuple is conceptually one of the multiple arguments. Another more clever and often more convenient way is to have a function take the first conceptual argument and return another function that takes the second conceptual argument and so on. Lexical scope is essential to this technique working correctly.

This technique is called *currying* after a logician named Haskell Curry who studied related ideas (so if you do not know that, then the term currying does not make much sense).

### *Defining and Using a Curried Function*

Here is an example of a “three argument” function that uses currying:

```
val sorted3 = fn x => fn y => fn z => z >= y andalso y >= x
```

If we call `sorted3 4` we will get a closure that has `x` in its environment. If we then call this closure with `5`, we will get a closure that has `x` and `y` in its environment. If we then call this closure with `6`, we will get `true` because `6` is greater than `5` and `5` is greater than `4`. That is just how closures work.

So `((sorted3 4) 5) 6` computes exactly what we want and feels pretty close to calling `sorted3` with 3 arguments. Even better, the parentheses are optional, so we can write exactly the same thing as `sorted3 4 5 6`, which is actually fewer characters than our old tuple approach where we would have:

```
fun sorted3_tupled (x,y,z) = z >= y andalso y >= x
val someClient = sorted3_tupled(4,5,6)
```

In general, the syntax `e1 e2 e3 e4` is implicitly the nested function calls `((e1 e2) e3) e4` and this choice was made because it makes using a curried function so pleasant.

### *Partial Application*

Even though we might expect most clients of our curried `sorted3` to provide all 3 conceptual arguments, they might provide fewer and use the resulting closure later. This is called “partial application” because we are providing a subset (more precisely, a prefix) of the conceptual arguments. As a silly example, `sorted3 0 0` returns a function that returns `true` if its argument is nonnegative.

### *Partial Application and Higher-Order Functions*

Currying is particularly convenient for creating similar functions with iterators. For example, here is a curried version of a fold function for lists:

```
fun fold f = fn acc => fn xs =>
  case xs of
    [] => acc
  | x::xs' => fold f (f(acc,x)) xs'
```

Now we could use this fold to define a function that sums a list elements like this:

```
fun sum1 xs = fold (fn (x,y) => x+y) 0 xs
```

But that is unnecessarily complicated compared to just using partial application:

```
val sum2 = fold (fn (x,y) => x+y) 0
```

The convenience of partial application is why many iterators in ML’s standard library use currying with the function they take as the first argument. For example, the types of all these functions use currying:

```
val List.map = fn : ('a -> 'b) -> 'a list -> 'b list
val List.filter = fn : ('a -> bool) -> 'a list -> 'a list
val List.foldl = fn : ('a * 'b -> 'b) -> 'b -> 'a list -> 'b
```

As an example, `List.foldl((fun (x,y) => x+y), 0, [3,4,5])` does not type-check because `List.foldl` expects a `'a * 'b -> 'b` function, not a triple. The correct call is `List.foldl (fn (x,y) => x+y) 0 [3,4,5]`, which calls `List.foldl` with a function, which returns a closure and so on.

There is syntactic sugar for defining curried functions; you can just separate the conceptual arguments by spaces rather than using anonymous functions. So the better style for our fold function would be:

```
fun fold f acc xs =
  case xs of
    [] => acc
  | x::xs' => fold f (f(acc,x)) xs'
```

Another useful curried function is `List.exists`, which we use in the callback example below. These library functions are easy to implement ourselves, so we should understand they are not fancy:

```
fun exists predicate xs =
  case xs of
    [] => false
  | x::xs' => predicate x orelse exists predicate xs
```

### *Currying in General*

While currying and partial application are great for higher-order functions, they are great in general too. They work for any multi-argument function and partial application can also be surprisingly convenient. In this example, both `zip` and `range` are defined with currying and `countup` partially applies `range`. The `add_numbers` function turns the list `[v1,v2,...,vn]` into `[(1,v1),(2,v2),..., (n,vn)]`.

```
fun zip xs ys =
  case (xs,ys) of
    ([,[]) => []
  | (x::xs',y::ys') => (x,y) :: (zip xs' ys')
  | _ => raise Empty

fun range i j = if i > j then [] else i :: range (i+1) j

val countup = range 1

fun add_numbers xs = zip (countup (length xs)) xs
```

### *Combining Functions to Curry and Uncurry Other Functions*

Sometimes functions are curried but the arguments are not in the order you want for a partial application. Or sometimes a function is curried when you want it to use tuples or vice-versa. Fortunately our earlier idiom of combining functions can take functions using one approach and produce functions using another:

```
fun other_curry1 f = fn x => fn y => f y x
fun other_curry2 f x y = f y x
fun curry f x y = f (x,y)
fun uncurry f (x,y) = f x y
```

Looking at the types of these functions can help you understand what they do. As an aside, the types are also fascinating because if you pronounce `->` as “implies” and `*` as “and”, the types of all these functions are logical tautologies.

### *Efficiency*

Finally, you might wonder which is faster, currying or tupling. It almost never matters; they both do work proportional to the number of conceptual arguments, which is typically quite small. For the performance-critical functions in your software, it *might* matter to pick the faster way. In the version of the ML compiler we are using, tupling happens to be faster. In widely used implementations of OCaml, Haskell, and F#, curried functions are faster so they are the standard way to define multi-argument functions in those languages.

## The Value Restriction

Once you have learned currying and partial application, you might try to use it to create a polymorphic function. Unfortunately, certain uses, such as these, do not work in ML:

```

val mapSome = List.map SOME (*turn [v1,v2,...,vn] into [SOME v1, SOME v2, ..., SOME vn]*)
val pairIt = List.map (fn x => (x,x)) (*turn [v1,v2,...,vn] into [(v1,v1),(v2,v2),...,(vn,vn)]*)

```

Given what we have learned so far, there is no reason why this should not work, especially since all these functions do work:

```

fun mapSome xs = List.map SOME xs
val mapSome = fn xs => List.map SOME xs
val pairIt : int list -> (int * int) list = List.map (fn x => (x,x))
val incrementIt = List.map (fn x => x+1)

```

The reason is called the *value restriction* and it is sometimes annoying. It is in the language for good reason: without it, the type-checker might allow some code to break the type system. This can happen only with code that is using mutation and the code above is not, but the type-checker does not know that.

The simplest approach is to ignore this issue until you get a warning/error about the value restriction. When you do, turn the val-binding back into a fun-binding like in the first example above of what works.

When we study type inference in the next unit, we will discuss the value restriction in a little more detail.

## Mutation via ML References

We now finally introduce ML's support for mutation. Mutation is okay in some settings. A key approach in functional programming is to use it only when “updating the state of something so all users of that state can see a change has occurred” is the natural way to model your computation. Moreover, we want to keep features for mutation separate so that we know when mutation is not being used.

In ML, most things really cannot be mutated. Instead you must create a *reference*, which is a container whose contents can be changed. You create a new reference with the expression `ref e` (the initial contents are the result of evaluating `e`). You get a reference `r`'s current contents with `!r` (not to be confused with negation in Java or C), and you change `r`'s contents with `r := e`. The type of a reference that contains values of type `t` is written `t ref`.

One good way to think about a reference is as a record with one field where that field can be updated with the `:=` operator.

Here is a short example:

```

val x = ref 0
val x2 = x (* x and x2 both refer to the same reference *)
val x3 = ref 0
(* val y = x + 1*) (* wrong: x is not an int *)
val y = (!x) + 1 (* y is 1 *)
val _ = x := (!x) + 7 (* the contents of the reference x refers to is now 7 *)
val z1 = !x (* z1 is 7 *)
val z2 = !x2 (* z2 is also 7 -- with mutation, aliasing matters*)
val z3 = !x3 (* z3 is 0 *)

```

## Another Closure Idiom: Callbacks

The next common idiom we consider is implementing a library that detects when “events” occur and informs clients that have previously “registered” their interest in hearing about events. Clients can register their

interest by providing a “callback” — a function that gets called when the event occurs. Examples of events for which you might want this sort of library include things like users moving the mouse or pressing a key. Data arriving from a network interface is another example. Computer players in a game where the events are “it is your turn” is yet another.

The purpose of these libraries is to allow multiple clients to register callbacks. The library implementer has no idea what clients need to compute when an event occurs, and the clients may need “extra data” to do the computation. So the library implementor should not restrict what “extra data” each client uses. A closure is ideal for this because a function’s type `t1 -> t2` does not specify the types of any other variables a closure uses, so we can put the “extra data” in the closure’s environment.

If you have used “event listeners” in Java’s Swing library, then you have used this idiom in an object-oriented setting. In Java, you get “extra data” by defining a subclass with additional fields. This can take an awful lot of keystrokes for a simple listener, which is a (the?) main reason the Java language added anonymous inner classes (which you do not need to know about for this course, but we will show an example later), which are closer to the convenience of closures.

In ML, we will use mutation to show the callback idiom. This is reasonable because we really do want registering a callback to “change the state of the world” — when an event occurs, there are now more callbacks to invoke.

Our example uses the idea that callbacks should be called when a key on the keyboard is pressed. We will pass the callbacks an `int` that encodes which key it was. Our interface just needs a way to register callbacks. (In a real library, you might also want a way to unregister them.)

```
val onKeyEvent : (int -> unit) -> unit
```

Clients will pass a function of type `int -> unit` that, when called later with an `int`, will do whatever they want. To implement this function, we just use a reference that holds a list of the callbacks. Then when an event actually occurs, we assume the function `on_event` is called and it calls each callback in the list:

```
val cbs : (int -> unit) list ref = ref []
fun onKeyEvent f = cbs := f::(!cbs) (* The only "public" binding *)
fun onEvent i =
  let fun loop fs =
        case fs of
          [] => ()
        | f::fs' => (f i; loop fs')
      in loop (!cbs) end
```

Most importantly, the type of `onKeyEvent` places no restriction on what extra data a callback can access when it is called. Here are different clients (calls to `onKeyEvent`) that use different bindings of different types in their environment. (The `val _ = e` idiom is common for executing an expression just for its side-effect, in this case registering a callback.)

```
val timesPressed = ref 0
val _ = onKeyEvent (fn _ => timesPressed := (!timesPressed) + 1)

fun printIfPressed i =
  onKeyEvent (fn j => if i=j
                      then print ("you pressed " ^ Int.toString i ^ "\n")
                      else ())

val _ = printIfPressed 4
val _ = printIfPressed 11
val _ = printIfPressed 23
```

## Optional: Another Closure Idiom: Abstract Data Types

This last closure idiom we will consider is the fanciest and most subtle. It is not the sort of thing programmers typically do — there is usually a simpler way to do it in a modern programming language. It is included as an advanced example to demonstrate that a record of closures that have the same environment is a lot like an object in object-oriented programming: the functions are methods and the bindings in the environment are private fields and methods. There are no new language features here, just lexical scope. It suggests (correctly) that functional programming and object-oriented programming are more similar than they might first appear (a topic we will revisit later in the course; there are also important differences).

The key to an abstract data type (ADT) is requiring clients to use it via a collection of functions rather than directly accessing its private implementation. Thanks to this abstraction, we can later change how the data type is implemented without changing how it behaves for clients. In an object-oriented language, you might implement an ADT by defining a class with all private fields (inaccessible to clients) and some public methods (the interface with clients). We can do the same thing in ML with a record of closures; the variables that the closures use from the environment correspond to the private fields.

As an example, consider an implementation of a set of integers that supports creating a new bigger set and seeing if an integer is in a set. Our sets are mutation-free in the sense that adding an integer to a set produces a new, different set. (We could just as easily define a mutable version using ML's references.) In ML, we could define a type that describes our interface:

```
datatype set = S of { insert : int -> set, member : int -> bool, size : unit -> int }
```

Roughly speaking, a set is a record with three fields, each of which holds a function. It would be simpler to write:

```
type set = { insert : int -> set, member : int -> bool, size : unit -> int }
```

but this does not work in ML because `type` bindings cannot be recursive. So we have to deal with the mild inconvenience of having a constructor `S` around our record of functions defining a set even though sets are each-of types, not one-of types. Notice we are not using any new types or features; we simply have a type describing a record with fields named `insert`, `member`, and `size`, each of which holds a function.

Once we have an empty set, we can use its `insert` field to create a one-element set, and then use that set's `insert` field to create a two-element set, and so on. So the only other thing our interface needs is a binding like this:

```
val empty_set = ... : set
```

Before implementing this interface, let's see how a client might use it (many of the parentheses are optional but may help understand the code):

```
fun use_sets () =  
  let val S s1 = empty_set  
      val S s2 = (#insert s1) 34  
      val S s3 = (#insert s2) 34  
      val S s4 = #insert s3 19  
  in  
    if (#member s4) 42  
    then 99  
    else if (#member s4) 19  
    then 17 + (#size s3) ()  
    else 0  
  end
```



Again we are using no new features. `#insert s1` is reading a record field, which in this case produces a function that we can then call with 34. If we were in Java, we might write `s1.insert(34)` to do something similar. The `val` bindings use pattern-matching to “strip off” the `S` constructors on values of type `set`.

There are many ways we could define `empty_set`; they will all use the technique of using a closure to “remember” what elements a set has. Here is one way:

```
val empty_set =
  let
    fun make_set xs = (* xs is a "private field" in result *)
      let (* contains a "private method" in result *)
          fun contains i = List.exists (fn j => i=j) xs
        in
          S { insert = fn i => if contains i
                               then make_set xs
                               else make_set (i::xs),
              member = contains,
              size   = fn () => length xs
            }
        end
      in
        make_set []
      end
  end
```

All the fanciness is in `make_set`, and `empty_set` is just the record returned by `make_set []`. What `make_set` returns is a value of type `set`. It is essentially a record with three closures. The closures can use `xs`, the helper function `contains`, and `make_set`. Like all function bodies, they are not executed until they are called.

## Optional: Closures in Other Languages

To conclude our study of function closures, we digress from ML to show similar programming patterns in Java (using generics and interfaces) and C (using function pointers taking explicit environment arguments). We will not test you on this material, and you are welcome to skip it. However, it may help you understand closures by seeing similar ideas in other settings, and it should help you see how central ideas in one language can influence how you might approach problems in other languages. That is, it could make you a better programmer in Java or C.

For both Java and C, we will “port” this ML code, which defines our own polymorphic linked-list type constructor and three polymorphic functions (two higher-order) over that type. We will investigate a couple ways we could write similar code in Java or C, which will help us better understand similarities between closures and objects (for Java) and how environments can be made explicit (for C). In ML, there is no reason to define our own type constructor since `'a list` is already written, but doing so will help us compare to the Java and C versions.

```
datatype 'a mylist = Cons of 'a * ('a mylist) | Empty

fun map f xs =
  case xs of
    Empty => Empty
  | Cons(x,xs) => Cons(f x, map f xs)
```

```

fun filter f xs =
  case xs of
    Empty => Empty
  | Cons(x,xs) => if f x then Cons(x,filter f xs) else filter f xs

fun length xs =
  case xs of
    Empty => 0
  | Cons(_,xs) => 1 + length xs

```

Using this library, here are two client functions. (The latter is not particularly efficient, but shows a simple use of `length` and `filter`.)

```

val doubleAll = map (fn x => x * 2)
fun countNs (xs, n : int) = length (filter (fn x => x=n) xs)

```

## Optional: Closures in Java using Objects and Interfaces

Java 8 is scheduled to include convenient support for closures much like most other mainstream object-oriented languages now do (C#, Scala, Ruby, ...), but it is worth considering how we might write similar code in Java without this support, as has been necessary for almost two decades. While we do not have first-class functions, currying, or type inference, we do have generics (Java did not use to) and we can define interfaces with one method, which we can use like function types. Without further ado, here is a Java analogue of the code, followed by a brief discussion of features you may not have seen before and other ways we could have written the code:

```

interface Func<B,A> {
  B m(A x);
}
interface Pred<A> {
  boolean m(A x);
}
class List<T> {
  T head;
  List<T> tail;
  List(T x, List<T> xs) {
    head = x;
    tail = xs;
  }
  static <A,B> List<B> map(Func<B,A> f, List<A> xs) {
    if(xs==null)
      return null;
    return new List<B>(f.m(xs.head), map(f,xs.tail));
  }
  static <A> List<A> filter(Pred<A> f, List<A> xs) {
    if(xs==null)
      return null;
    if(f.m(xs.head))
      return new List<A>(xs.head, filter(f,xs.tail));
    return filter(f,xs.tail);
  }
}

```

```

static <A> int length(List<A> xs) {
    int ans = 0;
    while(xs != null) {
        ++ans;
        xs = xs.tail;
    }
    return ans;
}

class ExampleClients {
    static List<Integer> doubleAll(List<Integer> xs) {
        return List.map((new Func<Integer,Integer>() {
            public Integer m(Integer x) { return x * 2; }
        }),
            xs);
    }
    static int countNs(List<Integer> xs, final int n) {
        return List.length(List.filter((new Pred<Integer>() {
            public boolean m(Integer x) { return x==n; }
        }),
            xs));
    }
}

```

This code uses several interesting techniques and features:

- In place of the (inferred) function types 'a -> 'b for `map` and 'a -> bool for `filter`, we have generic interfaces with one method. A class implementing one of these interfaces can have fields of any types it needs, which will serve the role of a closure's environment.
- The generic class `List` serves the role of the datatype binding. The constructor initializes the `head` and `tail` fields as expected, using the standard Java convention of `null` for the empty list.
- Static methods in Java can be generic provided the type variables are explicitly mentioned to the left of the return type. Other than that and syntax, the `map` and `filter` implementations are similar to their ML counterparts, using the one method in the `Func` or `Pred` interface as the function passed as an argument. For `length`, we could use recursion, but choose instead to follow Java's preference for loops.
- If you have never seen anonymous inner classes, then the methods `doubleAll` and `countNs` will look quite odd. Somewhat like anonymous functions, this language feature lets us crate an object that implements an interface without giving a name to that object's class. Instead, we use `new` with the interface being implemented (instantiating the type variables appropriately) and then provide definitions for the methods. As an inner class, this definition can use fields of the enclosing object or *final* local variables and parameters of the enclosing method, gaining much of the convenience of a closure's environment with more cumbersome syntax. (Anonymous inner classes were added to Java to support callbacks and similar idioms.)

There are many different ways we could have written the Java code. Of particular interest:

- Tail recursion is not as efficient as loops in implementations of Java, so it is reasonable to prefer loop-based implementations of `map` and `filter`. Doing so without reversing an intermediate list is more intricate than you might think (you need to keep a pointer to the previous element, with special code

for the first element), which is why this sort of program is often asked at programming interviews. The recursive version is easy to understand, but would be unwise for very long lists.

- A more object-oriented approach would be to make `map`, `filter`, and `length` instance methods instead of static methods. The method signatures would change to:

```
<B> List<B> map(Func<B,T> f) {...}
List<T> filter(Pred<T> f) {...}
int length() {...}
```

The disadvantage of this approach is that we have to add special cases in any *use* of these methods if the client may have an empty list. The reason is empty lists are represented as `null` and using `null` as the receiver of a call raises a `NullPointerException`. So methods `doubleAll` and `countNs` would have to check their arguments for `null` to avoid such exceptions.

- Another more object-oriented approach would be to not use `null` for empty lists. Instead we would have an abstract list class with two subclasses, one for empty lists and one for nonempty lists. This approach is a much more faithful object-oriented approach to datatypes with multiple constructors, and using it makes the previous suggestion of instance methods work out without special cases. It does seem more complicated and longer to programmers accustomed to using `null`.
- Anonymous inner classes are just a convenience. We could instead define “normal” classes that implement `Func<Integer,Integer>` and `Pred<Integer>` and create instances to pass to `map` and `filter`. For the `countNs` example, our class would have an `int` field for holding *n* and we would pass the value for this field to the constructor of the class, which would initialize the field.

## Optional: Closures in C Using Explicit Environments

C does have functions, but they are not closures. If you pass a pointer to a function, it is only a code pointer. As we have studied, if a function argument can use only its arguments, higher-order functions are much less useful. So what can we do in a language like C? We can change the higher-order functions as follows:

- Take the environment explicitly as another argument.
- Have the function-argument also take an environment.
- When calling the function-argument, pass it the environment.

So instead of a higher-order function looking something like this:

```
int f(int (*g)(int), list_t xs) { ... g(xs->head) ... }
```

we would have it look like this:

```
int f(int (*g)(void*,int), void* env, list_t xs) { ... g(env,xs->head) ... }
```

We use `void*` because we want `f` to work with functions that use environments of different types, so there is no good choice. Clients will have to cast to and from `void*` from other compatible types. We do not discuss those details here.

While the C code has a lot of other details, this use of explicit environments in the definitions and uses of `map` and `filter` is the key difference from the versions in other languages:

```

#include <stdlib.h>
#include <stdint.h>
#include <stdbool.h>

typedef struct List list_t;
struct List {
    void * head;
    list_t * tail;
};
list_t * makelist (void * x, list_t * xs) {
    list_t * ans = (list_t *)malloc(sizeof(list_t));
    ans->head = x;
    ans->tail = xs;
    return ans;
}
list_t * map(void* (*f)(void*,void*), void* env, list_t * xs) {
    if(xs==NULL)
        return NULL;
    return makelist(f(env,xs->head), map(f,env,xs->tail));
}
list_t * filter(bool (*f)(void*,void*), void* env, list_t * xs) {
    if(xs==NULL)
        return NULL;
    if(f(env,xs->head))
        return makelist(xs->head, filter(f,env,xs->tail));
    return filter(f,env,xs->tail);
}
int length(list_t* xs) {
    int ans = 0;
    while(xs != NULL) {
        ++ans;
        xs = xs->tail;
    }
    return ans;
}
void* doubleInt(void* ignore, void* i) { // type casts to match what map expects
    return (void*)((intptr_t)i)*2;
}
list_t * doubleAll(list_t * xs) { // assumes list holds intptr_t fields
    return map(doubleInt, NULL, xs);
}
bool isN(void* n, void* i) { // type casts to match what filter expects
    return ((intptr_t)n)==((intptr_t)i);
}
int countNs(list_t * xs, intptr_t n) { // assumes list hold intptr_t fields
    return length(filter(isN, (void*)n, xs));
}

```

As in Java, using recursion instead of loops is much simpler but likely less efficient. Another alternative would be to define structs that put the code and environment together in one value, but our approach of using an extra `void*` argument to every higher-order function is more common in C code.

## Standard-Library Documentation

This topic is not closely related to the rest of the unit, but we need it a little for Homework 3, it is useful for any programming language, and it shows some of the useful functions (higher-order or not) predefined in ML.

ML, like many languages, has a *standard library*. This is code that programs in the language can assume is always available. There are two common and distinct reasons for code to be in a standard library:

- We need a standard-library to interface with the “outside world” to provide features that would otherwise be impossible to implement. Examples include opening a file or setting a timer.
- A standard-library can provide functions so common and useful that it is appropriate to define them once so that all programs can use the same function name, order of arguments, etc. Examples include functions to concatenate two strings, map over a list, etc.

Standard libraries are usually so large that it makes no sense to expect to be taught them. You need to get comfortable seeking out documentation and developing a rough intuition on “what is likely provided” and “where it is likely to be.” So on Homework 3, we are leaving it to you to find out more about a few simple functions in ML’s Standard Library.

The online documentation is very primitive compared to most modern languages, but it is entirely sufficient for our needs. Just go to:

<http://www.standardml.org/Basis/manpages.html>

The functions are organized using ML’s *module system*, which we will study the basics of in the next unit. For example, useful functions over characters are in the structure `Char`. To use a function `foo` in structure `Bar`, you write `Bar.foo`, which is exactly how we have been using functions like `List.map`. One wrinkle is that functions for the `String` structure are documented under the signature `STRING`. Signatures are basically types for structures, as we will study later. Certain library functions are considered so useful they are not in a structure, like `hd`. These bindings are described at <http://www.standardml.org/Basis/top-level-chapter.html>.

There is no substitute for precise and complete documentation of code libraries, but sometimes it can be inconvenient to look up the full documentation when you are in the middle of programming and just need a quick reminder. For example, it is easy to forget the order of arguments or whether a function is curried or tupled. Often you can use the REPL to get the information you need quickly. After all, if you enter a function like `List.map`, it evaluates this expression and returns its type. You can even guess the name of a function if you do not remember what it is called. If you are wrong, you will just get an undefined-variable message. Finally, using features just beyond what we will study, you can get the REPL to print out all the bindings provided by a structure. Just do this for example:

```
structure X = List; (* List is the structure we want to know about *)
structure X : LIST (* This is what the REPL gives back *)
signature X = LIST; (* Write LIST because that is what follows the : on the previous line *)
```

Because looking things up in the REPL is so convenient, some REPLs for other languages have gone further and provided special commands for printing the documentation associated with functions or libraries.