

Chapter 9

Conclusion

(Version of 4 January 2005)

1. *Functional programming in SML* 9.2
2. *Beyond functional programming* 9.4

9.1. Functional programming in SML

Covered and fundamental elements

- Evaluation by reduction of expressions
- Recursion
- Functions as basic objects
- Higher-order functions
- Polymorphism via type variables
- Strong typing
- Type inference
- Pattern matching
- Definition of new types
- Type and value constructors
- Abstract datatypes
- Modules
- Exceptions and error recovery

Non-covered elements

- Imperative programming aspects, such as variables and references, control structures, ...
- Input/output
- Inference techniques

Interest of functional programming in SML

- Fast program development
- Easy representation of new types
- Easy realisation of abstract datatypes
- Power of the functional paradigm
- Power of the SML language itself
- Conciseness of the developed programs

Warning

The apparent ease of program development in SML does *not* imply that one need not think nor be creative!

9.2. Beyond functional programming

Functional programming

The evaluation of $f(a)$ gives *at most one* result, and always gives the *same* result

Multifunctional programming

The evaluation of $f(a)$ gives *several* (0, 1, or more) results, either all-at-once or one-by-one

Example:

multifunction split L

TYPE: α list \rightarrow (α list * α list)

PRE: (none)

POST: (xs,ys) such that xs @ ys = L

```
fun split [ ] = ([ ],[ ])
  | split (x::xs) = ([ ],x::xs)
                  || let val (L1,L2) = split xs
                   in (x::L1,L2) end
```

```
- split [4,5,2] ;
  val it = ( [ ] , [4,5,2] ) ;
  val it = ( [4] , [5,2] ) ;
  val it = ( [4,5] , [2] ) ;
  val it = ( [4,5,2] , [ ] ) ;
  no other solutions
```

- This feature does *not* exist in SML
- There are very few multifunctional languages

Relational programming (aka logic programming)

Example:

relation append (X,Y,Z)

TYPE: int list * int list * int list

PRE: (none)

POST: Z is the concatenation of X and Y

For which triples does the **append** relation hold?

append ([], [], [])

append ([3], [1,2], [3,1,2])

append ([4,8], [], [4,8])

append ([5,0,2,1], [2,3,0], [5,0,2,1,2,3,0])

...

- *No* differentiation between arguments and results!
- *Several* possible usages of the *same* program for **append**:
 - append ([1,2], [0,3], [1,2,0,3]).
Yes
 - append ([1,2], [0,3], [1,5,3]).
No
 - append ([1,2], [0,3], L).
 $L = [1, 2, 0, 3]$;
No

- `append (L1, L2, [1,5,3]).`
`L1=[], L2=[1, 5, 3] ;`
`L1=[1], L2=[5, 3] ;`
`L1=[1, 5], L2=[3] ;`
`L1=[1, 5, 3], L2=[] ;`
No
- `append (L1, [5,3], [1,5,3]).`
`L1=[1] ;`
No
- `append ([1,5], L2, L3).`
`L3=[1, 5 | L2] ;`
No
- `append (L1, L2, L3).`
`L1=[], L3=L2 ;`
`L1=[X], L3=[X | L2] ;`
`L1=[X, Y], L3=[X, Y | L2] ;`
`...`
- `append ([1,X,4], [Y|Ys], [1,2,4,3]).`
`X=2, Y=3, Ys=[] ;`
No
- `append ([1,2], [0,3], L), append (L, [4,2], R).`
`L=[1, 2, 0, 3] , R=[1, 2, 0, 3, 4, 2] ;`
No
- `append (L1, L2, [1,5,3]), L2=[X,Y].`
`L1=[1], L2=[5, 3], X=5, Y=3 ;`
No

- *Backtracking* mechanism to enumerate all the possibilities

How to “program” the **append** relation?

With relational programming languages: Prolog, Mercury, ...

Example:

```
append ([ ], Ys, Ys) ←  
append ([X|Xs], Ys, [X|Zs]) ← append (Xs, Ys, Zs)
```

- Two clauses
- *Unification* mechanism,
as a generalisation of pattern matching

Interest of relational programming

- Power of the logic paradigm
- Power of the relational framework