

README

This is not a language advocacy talk:

- Every language has (dis)advantages
- Use what's best for the task-at-hand
- Multi-language approach?

This is an awareness talk:

- ... on programming language research
- Not necessarily implying to use this in production
- High-level introduction, not low-level implementation details

README

Don't hear things I'm not saying!

 I discussed the typing system in Standard ML ... Part way through the explanation, one of the audience members raised his hand and asked "But what's wrong with the way Perl does it?" — Mark Jason-Dominus

Strong vs Weak Typing

Strong vs weak:

- How easy/necessary is it to violate the type system?
- Weak type systems = easy to violate, or require it as part of typical programming:

```
void callback_function (void *data) {
```

```
my_type *data = (my_type *) data;
```

}

Strong typing is always better:

- Strongly typed languages don't allow things to 'go wrong' (no segfaults, no out-of-bounds errors, no buffer overflows)
- Some strongly typed languages are mathematically proven (Haskell 98, Standard ML)

Static vs Dynamic Typing

Static typing:

- Very (very very) often confused with strong typing
- Type constraints are checked at compile-time

Dynamic typing:

- Type constraints are checked at *run-time*
- Tag every value with its type
- Language's RTS (run-time system) checks tags are valid



Java: Welcome to the 60s

- C, C++, Java uses static typing
 - C, Java's static typing sucks (C++ discussed soon)
 - Java forces you to do this:

```
Integer i = new Integer (69);
Vector v = new Vector ();
v.add(i); /* insert i into the vector named v */
...
Integer j = (Integer) v.get(0); /* get back i */
System.out.println (j.intValue() + 1);
```

- Java forces you to downcast the retrieved object to do anything useful with it
- C is even worse: cast is unsafe (weakly typed), ala callback example earlier

More Than a Syntax Problem

You can get run-time errors:

- C: segfault, or even worse, no segfault :-)
- Java: ClassCastException

Dynamic type checking solution:

- Python/Ruby use 'duck typing' (quacks like a duck, walks like a duck ⇒ is a duck)
- Pros: less syntax clutter
- Cons: still get run-time errors
- Dynamic typing advocates say ...
 - Type systems restrict how I program
 - Type system verification replaced by better testing
 - Why the hell do I need these stupid type systems?

More Than a Syntax Problem

You can get run-time errors:

- C: segfault, or even worse, no segfault :-)
- Java: ClassCastException

Dynamic type checking solution:

- Python/Ruby use 'duck typing' (quacks like a duck, walks like a duck ⇒ is a duck)
- Pros: less syntax clutter
- Cons: still get run-time errors

Dynamic typing advocates say ...

- Type systems restrict how I program
- Type system verification replaced by better testing
- Why the hell do I need these stupid type systems?

Parameterised Types

Static typing: use *parameterised types*, a.k.a. ...

Parameterised types in Haskell/ML

data List a = Cons a | Nil

- Templates in C++
- Generics in Java/C#

Benefit?

- Correctness proved at compile-time by type system
- Run-time error is not possible

Perl Poetry

#!/usr/bin/perl

APPEAL:

listen (please, please);

open yourself, wide; join (you, me), connect (us,together),

tell me.

```
do something if distressed;
```

@dawn, dance; @evening, sing; read (books,\$poems,stories) until peaceful; study if able;

write me if-you-please;

sort your feelings, reset goals, seek (friends, family, anyone);

do*not*die (like this)
if sin abounds;

keys (hidden), open (locks, doors), tell secrets; do not I-beg-you, close them, yet.

> accept (yourself, changes), bind (grief, despair);

require truth, goodness if-you-will, each
moment;

select (always), length(of-days)

listen (a perl poem)
Sharon Hopkins
rev. June 19, 1995

(Updated for Perl 5.8.1-RC3 by me)

Type System Power

Static semantics & dynamic typing:

- Perl Poetry is syntactically valid
- ... but it's semantically invalid

C/Java's static typing sucks, revisited:

- They suck because they have no power
- Cannot express anything beyond int, float, struct, union

Parameterised types add power to static semantics

- Core problem: type system not powerful enough
- Power = expressiveness

On OO & Static Typing

Inheritance & Static Typing Don't Mix:

- Derived class can add a new method 'foo' to parent class
- If you have a value of the parent class's type, can you invoke foo method on that value? Maybe, maybe not ...
- Safety dictates that you must choose 'maybe not'
- The Rise of Dynamic Typing
 - It's an object-oriented world
 - Witness ease of coding in Python, Objective-C vs Java

What about C++ templates?

- C++ templates used for STL
- STL is not object oriented" Alex Stepanov

Type Systems Research

OO languages are stagnant w.r.t. type systems:

• Type system inherently limited by inheritance

Functional languages:

- Don't have inheritance (but do have OO-like features, e.g. type classes replace interfaces/dynamic binding/virtual methods—with zero run-time overhead)
- Where all the great type research has happened

All Praise Hindley-Mildner

Hindley-Mildner-Damas Type Inference:

- No need to annotate values with types
- Basis of modern functional languages (e.g. Haskell, ML)
- Type system becomes an automated proof system
- Functional languages go to great lengths to keep type inference
- Surprisingly often, if it's compiles, it's correct!
- Mark Jason-Dominus's "Strong Typing and Perl" talk: type checking found an infinite loop bug in a merge sort!

Types for Correctness

Dependent types:

- Parameterised types where the parameter can be a *value*
- Lists of specific length
- Matrices which are guaranteed to be square
- Balanced trees enforced by type system
- Prove that a program terminates

Types for Software Eng.

Advanced generics:

- Not to be confused with Java/C#'s generics
- Haskell/Perl has a map function, can be applied to lists:
 map (* 2) [1..10]
- What about map'ping hash tables? Trees? Any type?
- Instantly add serialisation to all your new types
- Similar to what is possible with Python/Objective-C/Java/ C# metaclasses/reflection, but zero run-time overhead

Types for Optimisation

Traditional optimisation

e.g. Starkiller for Python

Linear types

- Compiler infers that a value is only used once
- Enables in-place updates of data:

```
char *get_scheme (char *url) {
   char *s = strstr (url, "://");
   return strndup (url, s - url);
}
void main (int argc, char **argv) {
   char *url_scheme = get_scheme (argv[1]);
   printf ("scheme is %s", url_scheme);
}
```

Proof-Carrying Code

Enables fast, safe execution of untrusted code

- Java can execute untrusted code in a 'sandbox' JVM
- Proof-carrying code promises to do the same, but again with *no* run-time overhead (well, not quite)

How?

- Attach types as proof certificates to object code
- Proof checker validates certificate (i.e. checks types)
- Generating proof certificate is slow, but checking it is fast

Benefits

- Guarantee a program will not delete your home directory
- Device drivers that are guaranteed not to panic the kernel
- Works even in the presence of a malicious compiler



On Objective-C

Get Mac OS X

- ... *not* for the pretty GUI!
- To taste Objective-C and Cocoa programming
- GNUstep is good, but not as polished
- Read Apple's "The Objective-C Programming Language"

Small example:

- Use xine-lib media engine to create a media player
- GNOME's Totem: 27931 lines of C
- xine-ui (the main xine player): 96791 lines of C
- Cocoaxine on Mac OS X: 1436 lines of Objective-C
- apfelXine (Mac xine front-end): 2653 lines of Objective-C
- Build a media player/web browser in < 5 minutes!</p>

Broaden Your Horizons

There's lots of fantastic technology out there!

 The Pragmatic Programmer recommends learning a new programming language each year

Language recommendations

- C: simplicity
- Objective-C: C + simple object system + dynamic typing
- Perl: integrated regular expressions
- Python: Objective-C + no memory management

Broaden Your Horizons

More language recommendations:

- C++: everything is possible, at the cost of complexity
- O'Caml: introduction to functional programming
- Haskell: introduction to type wizardry, correctness
- Nemerle: OO + functional programming (type inference!)
- Scheme/LISP: macros, subsume all these features and integrate them well into the language

Message of the talk:

 Don't be blinded by your own programming language community & advocacy

Links

Some opinions and rants ...

- What I think about language shootouts/benchmarks: http://xrl.us/cada
- On object-orientation in non-object-oriented languages: http://xrl.us/cadb
- Mark Jason-Dominus on language advocacy: http://www.perl.com/pub/a/2000/12/advocacy.html

References

- Steve Blackburn's homepage (re garbage collection): http://cs.anu.edu.au/~Steve.Blackburn/
- "Programming Languages: Theory and Practice" Bob Harper (type systems, type safety)

http://www-2.cs.cmu.edu/~rwh/plbook/

Links

References ...

- "In the Spirit of C" (article on B → C → C++/Java)
 http://www.artima.com/cppsource/spiritofc.html
- "Modern C++ Design" by Alexei Alexandrescu: design patterns enforced by C++ template wizardry http://www.moderncppdesign.com/
- "C++ Templates are Turing-Complete" http://osl.iu.edu/~tveldhui/papers/2003/turing.pdf
- Interview with Alex Stepanov (on STL and OO) http://www.stlport.org/resources/StepanovUSA.html
- Lambda the Ultimate—excellent programming languages blog (bias toward functional languages, though)
 http://www.lambda_the_ultimate.com/