

# CSE 341: Programming Languages

Dan Grossman  
Fall 2004

Lecture 3— Let bindings, options, and benefits of no mutation

# Let bindings

---

Motivation: Functions without local variables can be poor style and/or really inefficient.

Syntax: `let b1 b2 ... bn in e end` where each  $b_i$  is a *binding*.

Typing rules: Type-check each  $b_i$  and  $e$  in context including previous bindings. Type of whole expression is type of  $e$ .

Evaluation rules: Evaluate each  $b_i$  and  $e$  in environment including previous bindings. Value of whole expression is result of evaluating  $e$ .

Elegant design worth repeating:

- Let-expressions can appear anywhere an expression can.
- Let-expressions can have any kind of binding.
  - Local functions can refer to any bindings *in scope*.

## More than style

---

Exercise: hand-evaluate `bad_max` and `good_max` for lists `[1,2]`, `[1,2,3]`, and `[3,2,1]`.

# Summary and general pattern

---

Major progress: recursive functions, pairs, lists, let-expressions

Each has a syntax, typing rules, evaluation rules.

Functions, pairs, and lists are very different, but we can describe them in the same way:

- How do you create values? (function definition, pair expressions, empty-list and ::)
- How do you use values? (function application, #1 and #2, null, hd, and tl)

This (and conditionals) is enough for your homework though:

- andalso and orelse help
- You need *options* (next slide)
- Soon: much better ways to use pairs and lists (pattern-matching)

# Options

---

“Options are like lists that can have at most one element.”

- Create a `t option` with `NONE` or `SOME e` where `e` has type `t`.
- Use a `t option` with `isSome` and `valOf`

Why not just use (more general) lists? An interesting style trade-off:

- Options better express purpose, enforce invariants on callers, maybe faster.
- But cannot use functions for lists already written.

## You want to *change* something?

---

There is no way to *mutate* (assign to) a binding, pair component, or list element.

How could the *lack* of a feature make programming easier?

In this case:

- Amount of sharing is indistinguishable
  - Aliasing irrelevant to correctness!
- Bindings are invariant across function application
  - Mutation breaks compositional reasoning, a (the?) intellectual tool of engineering