

CSE341: Programming Languages

Lecture 16
Datatype-Style Programming
With Lists or Structs

Brett Wortzman Summer 2019

Slides originally created by Dan Grossman

The Goal

In ML, we often define datatypes and write recursive functions over them – how do we do analogous things in Racket?

- First way: With lists
- Second way: With structs [a new construct]
 - · Contrast helps explain advantages of structs

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

Life without datatypes

Racket has nothing like a datatype binding for one-of types

No need in a dynamically typed language:

- Can just mix values of different types and use primitives like number?, string?, pair?, etc. to "see what you have"
- Can use cons cells to build up any kind of data

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

Mixed collections

In ML, cannot have a list of "ints or strings," so use a datatype:

```
datatype int_or_string = I of int | S of string
fun funny_sum xs = (* int_or_string list -> int *)
    case xs of
    [] => 0
    | (I i)::xs' => i + funny_sum xs'
    | (S s)::xs' => String.size s + funny_sum xs'
```

In Racket, dynamic typing makes this natural without explicit tags

- Instead, every value has a tag with primitives to check it
- So just check car of list with number? or string?

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

Recursive structures

More interesting datatype-programming we know:

```
datatype exp = Const of int

| Negate of exp

| Add of exp * exp

| Multiply of exp * exp
```

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

Change how we do this

Previous version of eval_exp has type exp -> int

kinds of results (ints, pairs, functions, ...)

- From now on will write such functions with type exp -> exp
- Why? Because will be interpreting languages with multiple
 - Even though much more complicated for example so far
- How? See the ML code file:
 - Base case returns entire expression, e.g., (Const 17)
 - Recursive cases:
 - Check variant (e.g., make sure a Const)
 - Extract data (e.g., the number under the Const)
 - Also return an exp (e.g., create a new Const)

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

New way in Racket

See the Racket code file for coding up the same new kind of "exp -> exp" interpreter

- Using lists where car of list encodes "what kind of exp"

Key points

- · Define our own constructor, test-variant, extract-data functions
- Just better style than hard-to-read uses of car, cdr
- Same recursive structure without pattern-matching
- With no type system, no notion of "what is an exp" except in documentation
 - But if we use the helper functions correctly, then okay
 - Could add more explicit error-checking if desired

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

Symbols

Will not focus on Racket symbols like 'foo, but in brief:

- Syntactically start with quote character
- Like strings, can be almost any character sequence
- Unlike strings, compare two symbols with eq? which is fast

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

New feature

```
(struct foo (bar baz quux) #:transparent)
```

Defines a new kind of thing and introduces several new functions:

- (foo e1 e2 e3) returns "a foo" with bar, baz, quux fields holding results of evaluating e1, e2, and e3
- (foo? e) evaluates e and returns #t if and only if the result is something that was made with the foo function
- (foo-bar e) evaluates e. If result was made with the foo function, return the contents of the bar field, else an error
- (foo-baz e) evaluates e. If result was made with the foo function, return the contents of the baz field, else an error
- (foo-quux e) evaluates e. If result was made with the foo function, return the contents of the quux field, else an error

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

An idiom

```
(struct const (int) #:transparent)
(struct negate (e) #:transparent)
(struct add (e1 e2) #:transparent)
(struct multiply (e1 e2) #:transparent)
```

For "datatypes" like exp, create one struct for each "kind of exp"

- structs are like ML constructors!
- But provide constructor, tester, and extractor functions
 - · Instead of patterns
 - E.g., const, const?, const-int
- Dynamic typing means "these are the kinds of exp" is "in comments" rather than a type system
- Dynamic typing means "types" of fields are also "in comments"

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

10

12

All we need

These structs are all we need to:

· Build trees representing expressions, e.g.,

• Build our eval-exp function (see code):

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

Attributes

- #:transparent is an optional attribute on struct definitions
 - For us, prints struct values in the REPL rather than hiding them, which is convenient for debugging homework
- #:mutable is another optional attribute on struct definitions
 - Provides more functions, for example:

```
(struct card (suit rank) #:transparent #:mutable)
; also defines set-card-suit!, set-card-rank!
```

- Can decide if each struct supports mutation, with usual advantages and disadvantages
- · As expected, we will avoid this attribute
- ${\scriptstyle -}$ ${\tt mcons}$ is just a predefined mutable struct

Summer 2019

11

CSE341: Programming Languages

Contrasting Approaches

```
(struct add (e1 e2) #:transparent)
```

Versus

```
(define (add e1 e2) (list 'add e1 e2))
(define (add? e) (eq? (car e) 'add))
(define (add-e1 e) (car (cdr e)))
(define (add-e2 e) (car (cdr (cdr e))))
```

This is not a case of syntactic sugar

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

13

15

The key difference

(struct add (e1 e2) #:transparent)

- The result of calling (add x y) is not a list
 - And there is no list for which add? returns #t
- struct makes a new kind of thing: extending Racket with a new kind of data
- So calling car, cdr, or mult-e1 on "an add" is a run-time error

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

List approach is error-prone

```
(define (add e1 e2) (list 'add e1 e2))
(define (add? e) (eq? (car e) 'add))
(define (add-e1 e) (car (cdr e)))
(define (add-e2 e) (car (cdr (cdr e))))
```

- Can break abstraction by using car, cdr, and list-library functions directly on "add expressions"
 - Silent likely error:
 (define xs (list (add (const 1) (const 4)) ...))
 (car (car xs))
- Can make data that add? wrongly answers #t to (cons 'add "I am not an add")

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

Summary of advantages

Struct approach:

- Is better style and more concise for defining data types
- Is about equally convenient for using data types
- But much better at timely errors when *misusing* data types
 - Cannot use accessor functions on wrong kind of data
 - Cannot confuse tester functions

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

16

More with abstraction

Struct approach is even better combined with other Racket features not discussed here:

- The module system lets us hide the constructor function to enforce invariants
 - List-approach cannot hide cons from clients
 - Dynamically-typed languages can have abstract types by letting modules define new types!
- The contract system lets us check invariants even if constructor is exposed.
 - For example, fields of "an add" must also be "expressions"

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages

Struct is special

Often we end up learning that some convenient feature could be coded up with other features

Not so with struct definitions:

- · A function cannot introduce multiple bindings
- Neither functions nor macros can create a new kind of data
 - Result of constructor function returns #f for every other tester function: number?, pair?, other structs' tester functions, etc.

Summer 2019

CSE341: Programming Languages