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## Homework 1

- Please submit your homework via the SVN / turnin system, in a folder named hw_1
- The specific files to submit are defined in the description for each assignments
- For each section, please turn in only your final program resulting from completion of the section
- Think about overflow!


# Please Restrict Your Homework Submission to Features Covered in Class 

## Current Core Scala Features

- object
- case class
- val
- if /else
- match / case
- require, ensuring
- Int, Double, String
- Array, Tuples
- Arithmetic operators
- (In)equality operators
- Logical and / or
- assertEquals etc.
- $\lambda$-expressions (ensuring)
- Plus the stuff from today!


## Please Restrict Your Homework Submission to Features Covered in Class

These should be the only import statements you need:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { import junit.framework.TestCase } \\
& \text { import junit.framework.Assert._ }
\end{aligned}
$$

(or equivalent imports auto-generated by your IDE for your JUnit test class)

## Type Checking

## Type Checking

- So far, we have been rigorous about computation of programs, but we have relied on intuition for static type checking
- We can provide a static semantics for Core Scala along with our dynamic semantics


## The Substitution Model of Type Checking

- To type check a value $\mathbf{v}$, replace $\mathbf{v}$ with its value type

$$
1.003 \Rightarrow \text { Double }
$$

- To type check a constant $\mathbf{c}$, reduce the defining expression of $\mathbf{c}$ to a static type $\mathbf{T}$, then replace all occurrences of $\mathbf{c}$ with $\mathbf{T}$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { pi }=3.14 \Rightarrow \\
\text { pi }: \text { Double } \\
\text { pi } * \text { radius } * \text { radius } \Rightarrow \\
\text { Double } * \text { radius } * \text { radius }
\end{gathered}
$$

## The Substitution Model of Type Checking

- To type check a function definition:
- Type check the body of the definition, replacing all occurrences of each parameter with the corresponding parameter type
- To type check the occurrence of a function name:
- Replace the name with an arrow type, where the parameter types of the function are to the left of the arrow and the return type is to the right

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { square }(x: \text { Double): Double }=x * x \\
\text { square(3.14) } \Rightarrow \\
(\text { Double } \rightarrow \text { Double) }(3.14)
\end{gathered}
$$

## The Substitution Model of Type Checking

- To type check the application of a function to arguments:
- Reduce the function to an arrow type
- Reduce the arguments, left to right, to static types
- If the argument types match the corresponding parameter types, reduce the application to the return type


# The Substitution Model of Type Checking 

square(3.14) $\Rightarrow$
(Double $\rightarrow$ Double)(3.14) $\Rightarrow$
(Double $\rightarrow$ Double)(Double) $\Rightarrow$
Double

Methods and Operators

## Syntactic Sugar For Binary Methods

- We refer to methods that take one parameter (in addition to the receiver) as binary methods
case class Coordinate(x: Int, y: Int) \{ def magnitude() = $x * x+y^{*} y$
def add(that: Coordinate) $=$ Coordinate(x + that. $x, y+t h a t . y)$ \}


## Syntactic Sugar For Binary Methods

Coordinate(1,2).add(Coordinate(3,4))

Coordinate(4,6)

## Syntactic Sugar For Binary Methods

- We can elide the dot in method calls on binary methods
- We can also elide the enclosing parentheses around the sole argument


# Syntactic Sugar For Binary Methods 

Coordinate(1,2) add Coordinate(3,4)
$\stackrel{\ominus}{\text { Coordinate }(4,6)}$

## Operator Symbols

- Scala allows the use of operator symbols in method names
- In fact, operators are simply methods in Scala

$$
\begin{gathered}
1+2 \rightarrow 3 \\
1 .+(2) \rightarrow 3
\end{gathered}
$$

## Coordinate Custom +

case class Coordinate(x: Int, y: Int) \{ def magnitude() $=x^{*} x+y^{*} y$
def +(that: Coordinate) = Coordinate(x + that. $x, y+$ that. $y)$ \}

## Coordinate Custom +

Coordinate(1,2) + Coordinate(3,4) $\mapsto$
Coordinate (4, 6)

# Requires Clauses on Class Constructors 

case class Name(field1: Type1, ..., fieldN: TypeN) \{ require (boolean-expression)

- Checked on every constructor call
- Because case class instances are immutable, this ensures the property holds for the lifetime of an instance


## Equals on Case Classes

- The equals method on a case class instance checks for structural equality with its argument:

$$
\text { Rational (4, 6).equals(Rational(4,6)) } \rightarrow
$$

true

## Equals on Case Classes

- Note that equals is a binary method, and so we can also write this expression as:

Rational(4,6) equals Rational(4,6) $\mapsto$

true

## Equals on Case Classes

- Of course, the built in equals method does not check for mathematical equality:

Rational(4,6) equals Rational $(2,3) \leftrightarrow$
false

## Equals on Case Classes

- Why is this definition of equality acceptable on case classes?
- What other definition is available to us?

Rational(4,6) equals Rational(2,3) $\mapsto$

false

## Short-Circuiting And and Or Operators

- Just as we have defined a short-circuiting if-then-else operator, we can define short-circuiting and/or operators:

$$
\& \& \quad|\mid
$$

- How do we define the static and dynamic semantics of these operators?
- When are they useful?


# Calling and Defining Parameterless Methods Without Parentheses 

$$
\text { def toString() = \{ ... \} }
$$

vs.

$$
\text { def toString }=\{\text {... }\}
$$

# Calling and Defining Parameterless Methods Without Parentheses 

Rational(4,6).toString()

VS.
Rational(4,6).toString

## The Uniform Access Principle

- Client code should not be affected by whether an attribute is defined as a field or a method
- Only applies to pure (side-effect free) methods
- Can be strange even for some pure methods (what are some examples?)


## Abstract Datatypes

## Abstract Datatypes

- Often, we wish to abstract over a collection of compound datatypes that share common properties
- For example, we might wish to define an abstract datatype for shapes, with separate case classes for each of several shapes
- For this purpose, we define an abstract class and use subclassing


## Abstract Datatypes

abstract class Shape
case class Circle(radius: Double) extends Shape
case class Square(side: Double) extends Shape
case class Rectangle(height: Double, width: Double) extends Shape

## Recall Our Design Recipe

- Analysis: What are the objects in the problem domain? What data types we will use to represent them?
- Contract: What is name of our functions and their parameters? What are the requirements of the data they consume and produce? What is the meaning of what our program computes?
- Repeat until we are confident in our program's correctness
- Write some tests
- Sketch a function template
- Define the function


## Recall Our Design Recipe

- Analysis: This is the stage where we would discover we wish to model our problem domain with functions over an abstract datatype
- Contract: What contract holds for each function? Do additional constraints and assurances hold for specific subclasses?
- Repeat until we are confident in our program's correctness
- Write some tests: Same as before
- Sketch a function template: This needs re-examination
- Define the function


## The Design Recipe for Abstract Datatypes

- Our Function Template for computing with abstract datatypes depends on answering the following questions:
- Do I expect to eventually add more subclasses?
- Do I expect to eventually add more functions?


## Case 1

We Expect Few New Functions But Many New Variants

## Case 1: We Expect Few New Functions But Many New Variants

- This is a case that object-oriented programming handles well
- Classic example domains: GUI Programming, Productivity Apps, Graphics, Games
- Declare an abstract method in our superclass and provide a concrete definition for each sub-class
a.k.a.,

The Union Pattern (for the datatype definitions)
The Template Method Pattern (for the function definitions)

# Abstract Datatypes 

abstract class Shape \{ def area: Double
\}

## Abstract Datatypes

case class Circle(radius: Double) extends Shape \{ val pi = 3.14
def area $=$ pi $*$ radius $*$ radius
\}

## Abstract Datatypes

case class Square(side: Double) extends Shape \{ def area = side * side
\}

## Abstract Datatypes

case class Rectangle(length: Double, width: Double) extends Shape \{
def area $=$ length * width
\}

## How Do Abstract Classes Affect Our Type Checking Rules?

- When type checking a class definition, ensure that all abstract methods declared in the superclass are actually defined, with compatible method types
- When type checking a collection of class definitions, ensure that there are no cycles in the class hierarchy!


## How Do Abstract Classes Affect Our Type Checking Rules?

- If a method is called on a receiver whose static type is an abstract class, extract an arrow type from the declaration (just as with a definition in a concrete class)

$$
\text { expr.area } \mapsto
$$

Shape.area $\mapsto$
() $\rightarrow$ Double

## Type Checking Arguments to a Method Call

- The static types of an argument might no longer be an exact match:

```
abstract class Shape {
    def area: Double
    def makeLikeMe(that: Shape): Shape
}
```

(Let us set aside the concrete definitions of makeLikeMe for awhile)

# Now Consider a Call to Matcher With Concrete Types 

Circle(1).makeLikeMe(Circle(2)) $\Rightarrow$
Circle.makeLikeMe(Circle) $\Rightarrow$
(Shape $\rightarrow$ Shape)(Circle)

And now we are stuck...

## Recall The Substitution Model of Type Checking

- To type check the application of a function to arguments:
- Reduce the function to an arrow type
- Reduce the arguments, left to right, to static types
- If the argument types match the corresponding parameter types, reduce the application to the return type


## Subtyping

- We need to widen our definition of matching a type to include subtyping
- A class is a subtype of the class it extends
- Subtyping is Reflexive:

$$
A<: A
$$

- Subtyping is Transitive:

If $A<: B$ and $B<: C$ then $A<: C$

## Subtyping

- All types are a subtype of type Any
- Type Nothing is a subtype of all types
- There is no value with value type Nothing


## Recall The Substitution Model of Type Checking

- To type check the application of a function to arguments:
- Reduce the function to an arrow type
- Reduce the arguments, left to right, to static types
- If the argument types are subtypes of the corresponding parameter types, reduce the application to the return type


## Applying a Class Method Revisited

- To reduce the application of a method:
C(v1, ..., vk).m(arg1, ..., argN)
- Reduce the receiver and arguments, left to right
- Reduce the body of $m$, replacing constructor parameters with constructor arguments and method parameters with method arguments


## Applying a Class Method Revisited

- To reduce the application of a method:
C(v1, ..., vk).m(arg1, ..., argN)
- Reduce the receiver and arguments, left to right
- Find the body of $m$ in $\mathbf{C}$ and reduce to that, replacing constructor parameters with constructor arguments and method parameters with method arguments


## The Body of $m$

- To find the body of method $m$ in type $C$ :
- Find the definition of $m$ in the body of $C$, if it exists
- Otherwise, find the body of m in the immediate superclass of C

