



CS 3110

Lists

Prof. Clarkson

Fall 2017

Today's music: "Blank Space" by Taylor Swift

I could show you incredible things // Magic, madness, heaven, sin

So it's gonna be forever // Or it's gonna go down in flames //

You can tell me when it's over // If the high was worth the pain

Attendance

- Practiced with i>clickers (Thur) and one-minute-memo (Mon)
- Starting today counts toward grade
- **Important thing:** you are present and participating most of the time
- **Unimportant things:** you are here all the time, you have a reason to be elsewhere on a given day
 - Generous, unspecified number of absences will be ignored at the end of the semester

Review

Previously in 3110:

- **Functions:** definition, application, anonymous, partial application

Today:

- **Lists:** a built-in datatype
- **Pattern matching:** an incredible feature not found in most imperative languages

Lists

```
let lst = [1;2;3]
```

```
let empty = []
```

```
let longer = 5::lst
```

```
let another = 5::1::2::3::[]
```

```
let rec sum xs =
```

```
  match xs with
```

```
  | [] -> 0
```

```
  | h::t -> h + sum t
```

```
let six = sum lst
```

```
let zero = sum empty
```

Building lists

Syntax:

- `[]` is the empty list
- `e1::e2` prepends element `e1` to list `e2`
- `[e1; e2; ...; en]` is *syntactic sugar* for `e1::e2::...::en::[]`

`[]` is pronounced "nil"

`::` is pronounced "cons" (both from Lisp)

Syntactic sugar: redundant kind of syntax that makes program "sweeter" or easier to write

Alan J. Perlis



“Syntactic sugar causes cancer of the semi-colon.”

First recipient of the Turing Award
for his “influence in the area of advanced programming techniques and compiler construction”

1922-1990

Building lists

Evaluation:

- $[]$ is a value
- To evaluate $e1 :: e2$, evaluate $e1$ to a value $v1$, evaluate $e2$ to a (list) value $v2$, and return $v1 :: v2$

Consequence of the above rules:

- To evaluate $[e1; \dots; en]$, evaluate $e1$ to a value $v1$, ..., evaluate en to a value vn , and return $[v1; \dots; vn]$

List types

For any type t , the type t **list** describes lists where all elements have type t

- `[1;2;3] : int list`
- `[true] : bool list`
- `[[1+1;2-3];[3*7]] : int list list`

List types

Nil:

`[] : 'a list`

i.e., empty list has type `t list` for any type `t`

Cons:

If `e1 : t` and `e2 : t list` then `e1::e2 : t list`

With parens for clarity:

If `e1 : t` and `e2 : (t list)` then `(e1::e2) : (t list)`

Question

What is the type of `31 :: [10]`?

- A. `int`
- B. `int list`
- C. `int int list`
- D. `int list list`
- E. Not well-typed

Question

What is the type of `31 :: [10]`?

A. `int`

B. `int list`

C. `int int list`

D. `int list list`

E. Not well-typed

Accessing parts of lists

A list can only be:

- nil, or
- the cons of an element onto another list

Use **pattern matching** to access list in one of those ways:

```
let empty lst =  
  match lst with  
  | []      -> true  
  | h::t    -> false
```

Example list functions

```
let rec sum xs =  
  match xs with  
  | [] -> 0  
  | h::t -> h + sum t
```

```
let rec length xs =  
  match xs with  
  | [] -> 0  
  | h::t -> 1 + length t
```

```
let rec append lst1 lst2 =  
  match lst1 with  
  | [] -> lst2  
  | h::t -> h::(append t lst2)
```

(* append is available as operator @ *)

Recursion is your new bff

Functions over lists are usually recursive: only way to “get to” all the elements

- What should the answer be for the empty list?
- What should the answer be for a non-empty list?
 - Typically in terms of the answer for the tail of the list

Sometimes *tail recursion* becomes important (see notes)



Lists are immutable

- No way to *mutate* an element of a list
- Instead, build up new lists out of old
e.g., `::` and `@`

Lists are linked

- i.e., *singly-linked lists*
- Data structures (like languages and pole arms) are tools: none is perfect
- Singly-linked lists are good for sequential access of short-to-medium length lists

Match expressions

Syntax:

```
match e with
```

```
| p1 -> e1
```

```
| p2 -> e2
```

```
| ...
```

```
| pn -> en
```

Match expressions

the first vertical bar is optional

line breaks are optional

e.g.,

```
let empty lst =
```

```
  match lst with [] -> true | h::t -> false
```

```
(* though lst=[] would be better *)
```

Patterns

Patterns have their own **syntax**

For now, a pattern can be any of these:

- a variable name (e.g., **x**)
- **[]**
- **p1 :: p2**
- an underscore **_**

As we learn more data structures, we'll learn more patterns

Patterns

Patterns **match** values

Intuition of matching is that pattern "looks like" the value, if variables in the pattern are replaced by pieces of the value

- `[]` matches `[]` and nothing else
- `h::t` matches `[2]` as well as `[1;3]` and `[9;8;7]` ...
- `x` matches all the above
- `_` matches everything
— (that's the underscore character, called *wildcard*)
(it's like a blank space)

Match expressions

```
match e with
| p1 -> e1
| p2 -> e2
| ...
| pn -> en
```

Evaluation:

- Evaluate **e** to a value **v**
- If **p1** matches **v**, then evaluate **e1** to a value **v1** and return **v1**
- Else, if **p2** matches **v**, then evaluate **e2** to a value **v2** and return **v2**
- ...
- Else, if **pn** matches **v**, then evaluate **en** to a value **vn** and return **vn**
- Else, if no patterns match, raise an exception

When evaluating branch expression **ei**, any pattern variables that matched are in scope

Match expressions

```
match e with  
| p1 -> e1  
| p2 -> e2  
| ...  
| pn -> en
```

Type-checking:

If e and $p1 \dots pn$ have type ta

and $e1 \dots en$ have type tb

then entire match expression has type tb

Question

```
match ["taylor"; "swift"] with  
| []      -> "1989"  
| h::t   -> h
```

To what value does the above expression evaluate?

- A. "taylor"
- B. "swift"
- C. "1989"
- D. []
- E. h

Question

```
match ["taylor"; "swift"] with  
| []      -> "1989"  
| h::t   -> h
```

To what value does the above expression evaluate?

- A. "taylor"
- B. "swift"
- C. "1989"
- D. []
- E. h

Deep pattern matching

- Pattern **$a :: []$** matches all lists with exactly one element
- Pattern **$a :: b$** matches all lists with at least one element
- Pattern **$a :: b :: []$** matches all lists with exactly two elements
- Pattern **$a :: b :: c :: d$** matches all lists with at least three elements
- ...

Accessing lists, with poor style

- Two library functions that return head and tail
List.hd, List.tl
- **Not idiomatic** to apply directly to a list
 - Because they raise exceptions; **you can easily write buggy code**
 - Whereas pattern matching guarantees no exceptions when accessing list; **it's hard to write buggy code!**
 - Gray area: when invariant or precondition guarantees list is non-empty

Why pattern matching is INCREDIBLE

1. You can't forget a case
(inexhaustive pattern-match warning)
2. You can't duplicate a case
(unused match case warning)
3. You can't get an exception
(e.g., `hd []`)
4. Pattern matching leads to elegant, concise, beautiful code

Functions that immediately match

Instead of

```
let f x =  
  match x with  
  | p1 -> e1  
  | ...  
  | pn -> en
```

can use another piece of syntactic sugar

```
let f = function  
| p1 -> e1  
| ...  
| pn -> en
```

Lists (recap)

- **Syntax:** `[] :: [a; b; c]`
- **Semantics:** building with `nil` and `cons`, accessing with pattern matching
- **Idioms:** recursive functions with pattern for `nil` and for `cons`, **function** syntactic sugar
- **Library:** awesome higher-order functions in OCaml standard library (next week)

Upcoming events

- None for today

This is incredible.

THIS IS 3110