

* type (+)

* $foo * y = x + y$

type foo

foo inherited the type of +

types are optional, if you don't give anything.

* $char * \rightarrow void *$

$void * \rightarrow$ not compatible to boolean

Compiler won't throw an error.

* dynamic typed \rightarrow Python.

gradually typed

(Even Java, due to reflection etc, cannot determine type)

* Python support Duck type

* Scheme also has type checks in runtime

(Assembly no type. Some argue that which register specify type.)

* bool / or, and are primitive

or & and are not, only for bool. In that sense

or & add are primitive.

From here have to remember;

you can infer about program just by seeing the program.

(C is weakly typed to Java, Java is strongly type to C)

why.

* pg-6

Circle isn't a datatype.
it is a name-given to constructor of type shape.

(we've seen data constructors with arguments)

* pg-7

(Java has option programming)

2 ways of constructing type Maybe.

Maybe very useful for handling failures.

```

V. getVal (k key) {
    if (this.map.containsKey(key))
        return this.map.get(key)
    else
        return NULL
}

if (getVal(...) == NULL) {
    throw
    print
}
    
```

Instead of throwing an error & exit,

what to do if we just want handling,

(return NULL, return 0 ... many ways of what hacked does)

(purpose of "just" is just to convert into type Maybe)

3/24 class :- (25)

→ Typed lambda calculus :-

$M \rightarrow n$

$\lambda x: \textcircled{T} M$

$M_1 M_2$

This is
the change
from usual/untyped
lambda calculus

$T \rightarrow$ type environment (bindings from variables to types)

Inference rule, $t_1 \rightarrow t_1'$ $t_2 \rightarrow t_2'$ } possible evaluation $t_i \in \text{termal that}$

Actually done $\Leftarrow t_1 t_2 \rightarrow t_1' t_2'$ $v_1 v_2 \rightarrow v_1' v_2'$

$v_i \in \text{Variables}$

What is enforced here??

$M \rightarrow M_1 M_2 \rightarrow$ first we evaluate operator M_1 & then apply on operand M_2

$$t_1 t_2 \rightarrow t_1' t_2'$$

But operator had simplified to a value i.e., $v_1 t_2$

then t_2 has to be simplified $v_1 t_2 \rightarrow v_1 t_2'$

f.e., If you are applying a procedure, first simplify procedure.

* If only these 2 rules $t_1 t_2 \rightarrow t_1' t_2'$ and $v_1 t_2 \rightarrow v_1 t_2'$ } (understand; left evaluated first)

Without types,

there is no check whether t_1 simplified into a procedure / value.

We get run time error if $M_1 M_2$ applied.

Understand why we need TYPES

(Since everything is a fn in lambda calculus, even variables) ??

* $x : T \in \tau$ / $\tau \vdash x : T$ (if in environment τ , looked up for x , we get type T)
inference (similar to logic inference rules)

* consider an expression like $\lambda x : T_1. t_2$

$$\tau \vdash \lambda x : T_1. t_2 : ?$$

To know about type of this fn, I need to know type of x .

Final rules:

$$\frac{x : T \in \tau}{\tau \vdash x : T}$$

$$\tau, x : T_1 \vdash t_2 : T_2$$

$$\tau \vdash \lambda x : T_1. t_2 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$$

extending τ with x is binded with type T_1 } given one fact 2nd fact

~~they do not need~~ using these 2 facts we can say type of this fn.

* To determine t_2 's type,
type of a is needed (Bcz argument is usually used in body)

*
$$\frac{\tau \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \tau \vdash t_2 : T_1}{\tau \vdash t_1 t_2 : T_2} \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{Sir wrote} \rightarrow \\ \text{On board} \end{array} \right)$$

* Sound \equiv correct

Type-soundness theorem:-

"Well typed program cannot go wrong"

(Q) what if an unmatched types?
We'll be stuck \rightarrow then we throw error

Converse of this \Rightarrow Not well typed \rightarrow Will go wrong (throw error)

* $\tau \vdash$ if t_1 then t_2 else t_3 ?

$$\frac{\tau \vdash t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad \tau \vdash t_2 : T \quad \tau \vdash t_3 : T}{\tau \vdash \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Where some} \\ \text{type returned} \\ \text{in then,} \\ \text{else branches} \end{array} \right.$$

if true then 0 else "Hello"
(This doesn't fit into above rule) \rightarrow (He cannot assign type to this expression, so program is wrong)

say then branch $\rightarrow T_1$
else branch $\rightarrow T_2$
What should I do? ($T_1 \cup T_2$) we need union to be defined

We want a universal type (as we have Java ~~system~~ lang. object).

We define

Subtyping :-

$S \leq T$ (Monkey is subtype of Animal)

↑
subtype

(When monkey have more fields than animal,
But why monkey called sub (In some sense smaller))

Bez all monkeys are animals

But all animals aren't monkeys

* $\forall S, S \leq U$
↑
universal type (In Java, Java.lang.Object).

We maintain U, for union to be defined always.

* $S \leq S, \quad \frac{S \leq T \quad T \leq U}{S \leq U}$ } rules.

* ~~$S_1 \leq S_2, T_1 \leq T_2$~~

$T_1 \leq S_1, S_2 \leq T_2$

$S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \leq T_1 \rightarrow T_2$

english version.

Monkey \leq animal

* If a function expects animal, I can give monkey.
* If a function returns monkey, I can store it in animal

Today's class :-

We have a fundamental system to represent functional programming.
Extended it into typing & notion of subtyping \rightarrow with inheritance etc.

Why not parametric? \rightarrow Bez of ownership type.

void

* IO () "perform" an IO "action" and "store" nothing.

* ~~it~~ getLine.

IO string \rightarrow perform an IO action & store a string.

* ~~do~~ \leftarrow Extract operator.

(do is a syntactic sugar
(~~it~~ fact more) we'll see what it's for.

* ~~do~~ Scheme isn't pure functional

But Haskell is pure functional. (so everything is composition (.)

"do" illustrate like "C" do line by line.

* (>>) : sequencing operator.

* $\lambda \rightarrow$ not possible on keyboard. So Haskell have " \backslash " as λ .

* $(\gg =)$ sequencing operator \rightarrow extract the value stored by the previous action.

* Haskell programs has 2 kind of - -

(1) Action (IO) is not the only action / only side effect want to perform

(2) function

\gg & $\gg =$ compose actions

"." compose functions.

do \Rightarrow syntactic sugar of " \gg ".

disadvantage :-

Extra names has to be given as inputstr

have to collect it as a variable & then use it.

* Return is diff from what we've done before. So using word "store".

* Last statement is type of returned value.

* "Bool" vs "IO Bool" error

So return (c == 'y') Δ Return constructs an action.

takes Bool & make it IO bool.

* monad is type class (by seeing \Rightarrow)

$(+)$: $\forall m a \Rightarrow a \rightarrow a \rightarrow a$

$m \equiv IO$

~~monad~~ (\gg) : $IO a \rightarrow IO b \rightarrow IO b$

$(\gg =)$: $IO a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow IO b) \rightarrow IO b$

~~return~~ (return) : $a \rightarrow IO a$

In basic IO.hs

$\text{putStrLn} \Rightarrow \text{IO} ()$
 $\text{getLine} \Rightarrow \text{IO String}$
return type of (\gg) will be IO string.

* The reason why \gg & $\gg=$ are separated bcz,

if you want to ~~do~~ do math, have to come out of these actions

Though \gg & $\gg=$ are functions, we keep them separately.

* Monads are something in math. But Haskell developers kept it as type class, so that can be used by usual programmer.

* ~~More~~ Int, Nat are instances of type class Num (I think)
operators defined in Num ~~and~~ operators has to be overridden.

Similarly IO is an instance of type class Monad.

* class Monad m where

$\gg = \text{:: } m a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow m b) \rightarrow m b$
return $\text{:: } a \rightarrow m a$
(\gg can be derived from $\gg=$)

Instance Monad IO where

$\gg = \text{:: } \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$

return $\text{:: } \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$

* instance Monad Maybe where

return $x = \text{Just } x$

Nothing $\gg= f = \text{Nothing}$

Just $x \gg= f = \text{fn}$

(doing pattern matching
?? "f"?)

* Case lookup x a map f

Nothing \rightarrow Nothing

Just y \rightarrow case lookup y bmap of

Nothing \rightarrow Nothing

Just z \rightarrow lookup z cmap

* If Maybe is a monad class, then we can write as

do

y \leftarrow lookup x a map

z \leftarrow lookup y bmap

return (lookup z cmap)

Because of these, ~~the~~ the error handling is hidden inside
(will not be case of Java).

do is syntax sugar of

return (lookup x a map \gg lookup y bmap \gg lookup z cmap)

* main is a keyword in Haskell.

* you can "create" an IO action in fⁿ

not "perform" but can ~~not~~ force it

* Side effects not there in 7-8 yrs. \rightarrow (later some moved in math.)

call cant from c program

(before that only for math)

Exist, Maybe, IO are monads

* Newer version of Haskell

Monadic style of programming (even without knowing monads).