autoscale: true

The Next Great Functional Programming Language

(OK, not really.)

John A. De Goes — @jdegoes

ML - 1973

Haskell - 1990¹

OCaml - 1996²

Haskell

AUGIGIGA

XNoMonomorphismRestriction

XRelaxedPolyRec

XGADTs

XMonoLocalBinds XBangPatterns XViewPatterns

XRank2Types

XExistentialQuantification

XParallelListComp XLiberalTypeSynonyms

XPArr

XDisambiguateRecordFields

XDeriveDataTypeable XFlexibleContexts

XMultiParamTypeClasses

липристи аганта

XNoNPlusKPatterns XExtendedDefaultRules

XTypeFamilies

XTemplateHaskell

XCPP

XUnicodeSyntax

XExplicitForALl

XRankNTypes XKindSignatures

XTransformListComp

XTypeOperators

XRecordWildCards

XUnboxedTuples

XGeneralizedNewtypeDeriving

XFlexibleInstances

XFunctionalDependencies

XNoMonoPatBinds

XOverloadedStrings XScopedTypeVariables

XQuasiQuotes XPatternGuards XMagicHash

XPolymorphicComponents

XImpredicativeTypes XEmptyDataDecls XUnliftedFFITypes XRecursiveDo

XNamedFieldPuns

XStandaloneDeriving XTypeSynonymInstances

X Constrained Class Methods

XPackageImports

Haskellz

144 quadrillion flavors.



Our Best FPLs Suffer from Decades Worth of Accretion

Individual Features were

Designed, but the FPLs *Came Into Existence*

What Would a *Designed* FPL Look Like Today?

?



·hrakan haart:

.DIUNCII_IICAI L.



[This Slide Intentionally Left Blank]

My Ideal FPL

- ~~Pattern Matching~~
- ~~Records~~
- ~~Modules~~
- ~~Syntax~~
- ~~Type Classes~~
- ~~Nominative Typing~~
- ~~Data~~
- ~~Recursion~~

:-1: Pattern Matching

Pattern Matching

:-1: Records

Records

```
val book =
  ("author" ->> "Benjamin Pierce") ::
  ("title" ->> "Types and Programming Languages") ::
  ("id"
       ->> 262162091) ::
  ("price" ->> 44.11) ::
  HNil
scala> book("author") // Note result type ...
res0: String = Benjamin Pierce
scala> val extended = book + ("inPrint" ->> true) //
 Add a new field
extended: ... complex type elided ... =
  Benjamin Pierce :: Types and Programming Languages
:: 262162091 :: 46.11 :: true :: HNil
scala> val noId = extended - "id" // Removed a field
noId: ... complex type elided ... =
  Benjamin Pierce :: Types and Programming Languages
:: 46.11 :: true :: HNil
```

:-1: Modules

Modules

```
structure ListStack :> STACK =
struct
  type t = 'a list
  [...]
end
```

Modules

```
data Stack f = Stack
  { makeNew :: forall a. f a,
   push :: forall a. a -> f a -> f a,
   pop :: forall a. f a -> Maybe (Tuple a (f a))
}

doSomeStackStuff :: forall f. Stack f -> Thing
```

Modules

```
data Stack f = Stack
{ makeNew :: forall a. f a,
```

```
push :: forall a. a -> f a -> f a,
pop :: forall a. f a -> Maybe (Tuple a (f a))
}

data ReservationSystem f = ReservationSystem
  (forall g. Stack g -> { ... })
```

:-1: Syntax

Syntax

Let's stop pretending programs are strings of ASCII characters.

- ~~implicits~~
- ~~order of function parameters / application~~
- ~~compiler errors~~
- ~~funky looking operators~~
- ~~scopes~~
- ~~Haskell-style (fake) modules & imports~~
- ~~name clashes~~
- ~~information elision~~
- ...

:-1: Type Classes

Type Classes

Just 'records' with compiler-enforced laws.³

:-1: Partiality

Partiality

If it's partial, it's not a &^@#% function.

:-1: Nominative Typing

Nominative Typing

```
data Email = Email String

data DOMId = DOMId String

data Positive = Positive Float

data Negative = Negative Float

data DressSize = DressSize Float
```

Nominative Typing

```
data ??? = ??? String

data ??? = ??? String

data ??? = ??? Float

data ??? = ??? Float

data ??? = ??? Float
```

Let's Stop Pretending Differences in *Names* Actually Matter

Nominative Typing

Let's play a guessing game.

```
data ??? = ??? -- {v: Float | v > 0}
data ??? = ??? -- {v: Float | v < 0}
```

:-1: Data

Data

Data: Bits-based description.

```
data Either a b = Left a | Right b
```

```
struct either {
  int tag;
  union {
    void *left;
    void *right;
  };
};
```

Data

Newbies: addicted to pattern matching.

```
data List a = Nil | Cons a (List a)

doSomething :: forall a. List a -> Int
doSomething Nil = 0
doSomething (Cons _ l) = 1 + doSomething l
```

Data

Pros: addicted to folds.

```
fold :: forall z a. z -> (z -> a -> z) -> List a -> z
fold z _ Nil = z
fold z f (Cons a l) = fold (f z a) l
```

Data

Folds: Capability-based description.

```
fold :: forall z a. z -> (z -> a -> z) -> List a -> z

data List a = List (forall z. z -> (z -> a -> z) -> z)
```

Data

```
data List a = List (forall z. z -> (z -> a -> z) -> z
)

nil = \z f -> z

cons a (List as) = \z f -> as (f a z) f
```

Array? Linked List? Vector? Skip List?

:-1: Recursion

Recursion

Goto of functional programming.⁵

```
f x = if x / 2 > x then g (2 * x) else 42

g x = if x % 1 == 0 then f (g (x + 1)) else h (x - 1)

h x = if x % 1 == 1 then f (x * 2 + 1) else g (x + 1)
```

Recursion

Induction -> Folds.

Recursion

Coinduction -> State Machines.

6

My Ideal FPL

My Ideal FPL

Layered like an onion.

- Turing incomplete for 99% of program
 - Prove / optimize more
- Turing complete 'driver'
 - Prove / optimize less
 - Possibly in a different language (e.g. Haskell)

My Ideal FPL

Structured editor.

- Friendly FF
- Destroys motivation for most language 'features'

My Ideal FPL

All the things are values.

- Math functions
- Abolish incidental complexity
- Abolish artificial distinctions

My Ideal FPL

Proof search.

- Turing complete
- Levels of proof
 - 1. Proven true
 - 2. Evidence for truth but not proven true
 - 3. Proven false (in general or by counterexample)
- Massive, persistent proof databases
- Cross-disciplinary research

o e.g. deep learning to accelerate proof search

My Ideal FPL

Zero cost abstraction.

- As long as we're shooting for the moon
 - (But genuinely easier w/o recursion/data)

Inspirations

- Unison Programming Language⁷
- LiquidHaskell⁸
- Morte⁹

THANK YOU

John A. De Goes — @jdegoes

- 1. Or 1985 if you count Miranda. 🗠
- 2 Or 1987 if you count Caml \rightleftharpoons

- 3. Type classes also add an implicitly applied
 (a: Type) → TypeClass a function that's piecewise-defined, but that's just syntax.
- 4. Strictly more powerful than a data List (pros & cons).
- 5. What's hard for a machine | human to understand is also hard for a human | machine to understand. ←
- 6. Except this is too weakly typed. 🗠