SML Modules and Abstract Data Types (ADTs)

These slides are lightly edited versions of Ben Wood's Fall '15 slides, some of which are based on Dan Grossman's material from the University of Washington.



CS251 Programming Languages Spring 2016, Lyn Turbak

Department of Computer Science Wellesley College

Hiding with functions

procedural abstraction

Hiding implementation details is the most important strategy for writing correct, robust, reusable software.

Can you tell the difference?

- double 4; val it : int = 8

"Private" top-level functions would also be nice...

• share a "private" helper function

Overview of Modules and ADTs

Hiding implementation details is the most important strategy for writing correct, robust, reusable software.

Topics:

- · ML structures and signatures.
- · Abstraction for robust library and client+library code.
- · Abstraction for easy change.
- ADTs and functions as data.

structure Name =
struct bindings end

structure (module)

namespace management and code organization

```
structure MyMathLib =
struct
fun fact 0 = 1
    | fact x = x * fact (x-1)

val half_pi = Math.pi / 2
fun doubler x = x * 2
end
```

outside:

```
val facts = List.map MyMathLib.fact [1,3,5,7,9]
```

adapted from slides by Dan Grossman

```
signature NAME =
sig binding-types end
```

signature

type for a structure (module)

List of bindings and their types:

variables (incl. functions), type synonyms, datatypes, exceptions

Separate from specific structure.

```
signature MATHLIB =
sig
  val fact : int -> int
  val half_pi : real
  val doubler : int -> int
end
```

Hiding with signatures

MyMathLib.doubler unbound (not in environment) outside module.

```
structure Name :> NAME =
struct bindings end
```

ascription

(opaque – will ignore other kinds)

Ascribing a signature to a structure

• Structure must have all bindings with types as declared in signature.

```
signature MATHLIB =
sig
  val fact : int -> int
  val half_pi : real
  val doubler : int -> int
end

structure MyMathLib :> MATHLIB =
struct
  fun fact 0 = 1
    | fact x = x * fact (x-1)
  val half_pi = Math.pi / 2
  fun doubler x = x * 2
end
Real power:
Abstraction and Hiding
```

Abstract Data Type

type of data and operations on it

Example: rational numbers supporting add and toString

Library spec and invariants

External properties [externally visible quarantees, up to library writer]

- Disallow denominators of 0
- Return strings in reduced form ("4" not "4/1", "3/2" not "9/6")
- · No infinite loops or exceptions

Implementation invariants [not in external specification]

- All denominators > 0
- All rational values returned from functions are reduced

Signatures help *enforce* internal invariants.

More on invariants

Our code maintains (and relies) on invariants.

Maintain:

- make_frac disallows 0 denominator, removes negative denominator, and reduces result
- add assumes invariants on inputs, calls reduce if needed

Rely:

- gcd assumes its arguments are non-negative
- add uses math properties to avoid calling reduce
- toString assumes its argument is in reduced form

10

A first signature

With what we know so far, this signature makes sense:

• Helper functions gcd and reduce not visible outside the module.

Problem: clients can violate invariants

Create values of type Rational.rational directly.

```
Rational.Frac(1,0)
Rational.Frac(3,~2)
Rational.Frac(40,32)
```

Solution: hide more!

ADT must hide concrete type definition so clients cannot create invariant-violating values of type directly.

This attempt goes too far: type rational is not known to exist

```
signature RATIONAL_WRONG = Attempt #2

sig
  exception BadFrac
  val make_frac : int * int -> rational
  val add : rational * rational -> rational
  val toString : rational -> string
end

structure Rational :> RATIONAL_WRONG = ...
```

13

Abstract Data Type

Abstract type of data + operations on it

Outside of implementation:

- Values of type <u>rational</u> can be created and manipulated only through ADT operations.
- Concrete representation of values of type rational is absolutely hidden.

```
signature RATIONAL =
sig
  type rational
  exception BadFrac
  val make_frac : int * int -> rational
  val add : rational * rational -> rational
  val toString : rational -> string
end
structure Rational :> RATIONAL = ...
```

Abstract the type! (Really Big Deal!)

```
Client can pass them around, but can
Type rational exists,
                                manipulate them only through module.
but representation absolutely hidden.
               signature RATIONAL =
                                                     Success! (#3)
               sig
                 type rational
                                    Only way to make 1st rational.
                 exception BadFrac
                 val make frac : int * int -> rational
Only operations
                val add : rational * rational -> rational
on rational.
                 val toString : rational -> string
               end
               structure Rational :> RATIONAL = ...
             Module controls all operations with rational,
             so client cannot violate invariants.
```

Abstract Data Types: two key tools

Powerful ways to use signatures for hiding:

- Deny bindings exist.
 Especially val bindings, fun bindings, constructors.
- 2. Make types abstract.

 Clients cannot create or inspect values of the type directly.

A cute twist

In our example, exposing the **Whole** constructor is no problem

In SML we can expose it as a function since the datatype binding in the module does create such a function

- · Still hiding the rest of the datatype
- Still does not allow using Whole as a pattern

```
signature RATIONAL_WHOLE =
sig

type rational
exception BadFrac
val Whole : int -> rational
val make_frac : int * int -> rational
val add : rational * rational -> rational
val toString : rational -> string
end
```

Allow different implementations to be equivalent

A key purpose of abstraction:

- No client can tell which you are using
- Can improve/replace/choose implementations later
- Easier with more abstract signatures (reveal only what you must)

UnreducedRational in adts.sml.

- · Same concrete datatype.
- Different invariant: reduce fractions only in toString.
- Equivalent under RATIONAL and RATIONAL_WHOLE, but not under RATIONAL_OPEN.

PairRational in adts.sml.

- · Different concrete datatype.
- Equivalent under RATIONAL and RATIONAL_WHOLE, but cannot ascribe RATIONAL OPEN.

Signature matching rules

structure Struct :> SIG type-checks if and only if:

- Every non-abstract type in SIG is provided in Struct, as specified
- Every abstract type in SIG is provided in Struct in some way
 Can be a datatype or a type synonym
- Every val-binding in SIG is provided in Struct, possibly with a more general and/or less abstract internal type
 - 'a list -> int more general than string list -> int
 - example soon
- Every exception in SIG is provided in Struct.

Of course Struct can have more bindings (implicit in above rules)

18

PairRational (alternate concrete type)

```
structure PairRational =
struct
  type rational = int * int
  exception BadFrac
  fun make_frac (x,y) = ...
  fun Whole i = (i,1) (* for RATIONAL_WHOLE *)
  fun add ((a,b)(c,d)) = (a*d + b*c, b*d)
  fun toString r = ... (* reduce at last minute *)
end
```

Some interesting details

- Internally make frac has type int * int -> int * int, externally int * int -> rational
 - · Client cannot tell if we return argument unchanged
- Internally Whole has type 'a -> 'a * int externally int -> rational
 - specialize 'a to int
 - abstract int * int to rational
 - Type-checker just figures it out
- Whole cannot have types 'a -> int * int
 or 'a -> rational (must specialize all 'a uses)

Cannot mix and match module bindings

Modules with the same signatures still define different types

These do not type-check:

- Rational.toString(UnreducedRational.make frac(9,6))
- PairRational.toString(UnreducedRational.make frac(9,6))

Crucial for type system and module properties:

- Different modules have different internal invariants!
- ... and different type definitions:
 - UnreducedRational.rational looks like Rational.rational, but clients and the type-checker do not know that
 - PairRational.rational is int*int not a datatype!

Will return and contrast with Object-Oriented techniques.

22

Set ADT (set.sml)

Double ticks mean a Is an equality type (can compare elts with =)

```
signature SET =
                            Common idiom: if module provides
                            one externally visible type, name it t.
                            Then outside references are Set.t.
 val empty
 val singleton : ''a -> ''a t
 val isEmptv : ''a t -> bool
                : ''a t -> int
 val size
 val member
              : ''a -> ''a t -> bool
 val insert : ''a -> ''a t -> ''a t
 val delete
                : ''a -> ''a t -> ''a t
                : ''a t -> ''a t -> ''a t
 val intersection : ''a t -> ''a t -> ''a t
 val difference : ''a t -> ''a t -> ''a t
 val fromList : ''a list -> ''a t
 val toList : ''a t -> 'a list
 val fromPred : (''a -> bool) -> ''a t
 val toPred : ''a t -> ''a -> bool
 val toString : (''a -> string) -> ''a t -> string
end
```

Implementing the SET signature

ListSet structure

Represent sets as unordered list.

- Invariant: no duplicates
- What about ordering? Can't use it, since not part of signature!

FunSet structure (PS6)

Represent sets as predicate functions

OperationTreeSet structure (PS6)

Represent sets as trees of set operations

ListSet (in class)

```
structure ListSet :> SET =
struct
  type ''a t = ''a list
  val empty = []
  fun singleton x = [x]
... flesh out the rest in class ...
end
```

25

Opening Modules

```
- ListSet.isEmpty (ListSet.empty);
val it = true : bool
- ListSet.size (ListSet.singleton 17);
val it = 1 : int
- open ListSet;
opening ListSet
 type 'a t
  val empty : ''a t
  ... lots of bindings omitted ...
  val toString: (''a -> string) -> ''a t -> string
- isEmpty (empty);
val it = true : bool
- size (singleton 17);
val it = 1 : int
- List.size (singleton 17);
val it = 1 : int
```

Testing ListSet

```
- val s1 = fromList [1,2,1,2,3,2,3,1,4];
val s1 = - : int t
- toList s1;
val it = [4,3,2,1] : int list
- toString Int.toString s1;
val it = "{4,3,2,1}" : string
- val s2 = fromList [3,4,5,6];
val s2 = - : int t
- toList (union s1 s2);
val it = [1,2,6,5,4,3] : int list
- toList (intersection s1 s2);
val it = [4,3] : int list-
- toList (difference s1 s2);
val it = [2,1] : int list
- toList (difference s2 s1);
val it = [6,5] : int list
```

FunSet (PS6)

Specifying sets with predicates is fun!

```
Math: { x \mid x \mod 3 = 0 }

SML: fn x => x \mod 3 = 0
```

```
structure FunSet :> SET =
struct
  type ''a t = ''a -> bool
  val empty = fn _ => false
  fun singleton x = fn y => x=y
  fun member x pred = pred x
  fun fromPred pred = pred
   ... Flesh out the rest in PS6 ...
end
```

- Which set operations are unimplementable in FunSet?
- Is fromPred implementable in ListSet?

OperationTreeSet (PS6)

```
(delete 4 (difference (union (union (insert 1 empty) (insert 4 empty))

(union (insert 7 empty) (insert 4 empty)))

(intersection (insert 1 empty) (union (insert 1 empty) (union (insert 6 empty)))))

Delete

Difference

Union
Union
Union
Insert
In
```