

```
fun append (xs,ys) =  
  if xs=[]  
  then ys  
  else (hd xs)::append(tl xs,ys)  
  
fun map (f,xs) =  
  case xs of  
    [] => []  
  | x::xs' => (f x)::(map(f,xs'))  
  
val a = map (increment, [4,8,12,16])  
val b = map (hd, [[8,6],[7,5],[3,0,9]])
```

# Programming Languages

Dan Grossman  
2013

*OOP vs. Functional Decomposition*

# *Breaking things down*

- In functional (and procedural) programming, break programs down into *functions that perform some operation*
- In object-oriented programming, break programs down into *classes that give behavior to some kind of data*

Beginning of this unit:

- These two forms of *decomposition* are *so exactly opposite* that they are two ways of looking at the same “matrix”
- Which form is “better” is somewhat personal taste, but also depends on *how you expect to change/extend software*
- For some operations over two (multiple) arguments, functions and pattern-matching are straightforward, but with OOP we can do it with *double dispatch* (multiple dispatch)

# The expression example

Well-known and compelling example of a common *pattern*:

- **Expressions** for a small language
- Different **variants** of expressions: ints, additions, negations, ...
- Different **operations** to perform: **eval**, **toString**, **hasZero**, ...

Leads to a matrix (2D-grid) of variants and operations

- Implementation will involve deciding what “should happen” for each entry in the grid *regardless of the PL*

	<b>eval</b>	<b>toString</b>	<b>hasZero</b>	...
<b>Int</b>				
<b>Add</b>				
<b>Negate</b>				
...				

# Standard approach in ML

	<code>eval</code>	<code>toString</code>	<code>hasZero</code>	...
<code>Int</code>				
<code>Add</code>				
<code>Negate</code>				
...				

- Define a *datatype*, with one *constructor* for each variant
  - (No need to indicate datatypes if dynamically typed)
- “Fill out the grid” via **one function per column**
  - Each function has one branch for each column entry
  - Can combine cases (e.g., with wildcard patterns) if multiple entries in column are the same

[See the ML code]

# Standard approach in OOP

	<code>eval</code>	<code>toString</code>	<code>hasZero</code>	...
<code>Int</code>				
<code>Add</code>				
<code>Negate</code>				
...				

- Define a *class*, with one *abstract method* for each operation
  - (No need to indicate abstract methods if dynamically typed)
- Define a *subclass* for each variant
- So “fill out the grid” via **one class per row** with one method implementation for each grid position
  - Can use a method in the superclass if there is a default for multiple entries in a column

[See the Ruby code] [*Optional*: See the Java code]

# *A big course punchline*

	<code>eval</code>	<code>toString</code>	<code>hasZero</code>	...
<code>Int</code>				
<code>Add</code>				
<code>Negate</code>				
...				

- FP and OOP often doing the same thing in *exact* opposite way
  - Organize the program “by rows” or “by columns”
- Which is “most natural” may depend on what you are doing (e.g., an interpreter vs. a GUI) or personal taste
- Code layout is important, but there is no perfect way since software has many dimensions of structure
  - Tools, IDEs can help with multiple “views” (e.g., rows / columns)