The Needle Programming Language

Needle is an object-oriented functional programming language with a multimethod-based OO system, and a static type system with parameterized types and substantial ML-style type inference.

1. Create extensible datatypes via subclassing

- 1. Create extensible datatypes via subclassing
- 2. Use higher-order functions to build complex abstractions

- 1. Create extensible datatypes via subclassing
- 2. Use higher-order functions to build complex abstractions
- 3. Use static typing to make "sloppy" coding easier

Usual literals:

3 'a' "string"

C-like identifiers, augmented with ? and ':

frob_foo alphanumeric? x'

Supports most C/Java syntactic conventions as sugar for function calls:

Composite Expressions

Blocks:

```
{ foo(); bar(); 3 + baz() }
```

If-then-else:

if (foo?) { bar } else { frob(); baz }

Function expressions:

fun(x) { fun(y) { x + y } }
fun(vec, pos: x, offset: y) { vec[x] - y }

Bindings

Binding:

Local recursive functions:

```
{ rec fact(n) {
    if (n == 0) { 1 } else { n * fact(n - 1) }
  };
  fact(5)
}
```

Classes have single inheritance and are multiply-rooted, with no root Object class.

```
class Point {
  constructor point;
  x Integer;
  y mutable Integer;
}
class ColorPoint (Point) {
  constructor colorpoint;
  color Color;
```

}

Making a Point object:

point(x: 3, y: 4)
colorpoint(x: 3, y: 4, color: red)

Accessing a Point:

```
{ let pt = point(xpos:3, ypos:4);
   pt.y = 9;
   pt.x + y(pt);
}
```

Classes also support *parametric polymorphism*:

```
class List[a] {}
class Nil[a] (List) {
  constructor nil;
}
class Cons[a] (List) {
  constructor cons;
 head a;
  tail List[a];
}
```

First, let's set up a simple hierarchy for the examples:

```
class Thing {} // define a root class
```

```
class Rock(Thing) { ... }
class Paper(Thing) { ... }
class Scissors(Thing) { ... }
```

Generic functions enable method selection and multiple dispatch:

```
generic beats? (Thing, Thing) -> Boolean;
```

```
method beats? (x Rock, y Scissors) { true }
method beats? (x Paper, y Rock) { true }
method beats? (x Scissors, y Paper) { true }
method beats? (x Thing, y Thing) { false }
```

beats?(rock, rock) \Rightarrow false

In traditional OO, adding new methods to a class is unmodular even if it's possible.

generic inflammable? Thing -> Boolean;

method inflammable? (x Thing) { false }
method inflammable? (x Paper) { true }

Higher-order functions easily parameterize over behavior, but they don't parameterize over similar data types very well.

In Scheme:

(map function sequence) ;; for lists
(vector-map function sequence) ;; for vectors
(string-map function sequence) ;; for strings

In Needle:

```
generic map c < Sequence . (a -> b, c[a]) -> c[b];
```

Type Expressions

- Simple classes: Integer, Boolean, Char
- Type variables: a, b, c
- Parameterized classes: List[a], Table[Integer, Boolean]
- Function types:
 - Integer -> Boolean
 - (Integer, Integer) -> Integer
 - (String, start:Integer, len:Integer) -> String

Every expression's type consists of a type expression, plus a set of subtype constraints that the type variables have to satisfy:

generic map c < Sequence . (a -> b, c[a]) -> c[b]; generic negate a < Number . a -> a;

fun(seq) { map(negate, seq) }

has type c < Sequence & a < Number . c[a] -> c[a]

Needle's type system is:

- Based on Bourdoncle and Merz's ML-sub (1997)
- Supports type inference (Bonniot 2001)

Needle has type inference. Eg:

```
{ rec error_fact(n) {
    if (n == 0) { "1" } else { n * error_fact(n - 1) }
    };
    ...
}
```

The compiler will signal an error on this function.

The basic type inference algorithm has four steps:

- 1. Generate a polymorphic constrained type at each leaf in the AST.
- 2. Merge the types together, combining their constraint sets.
- 3. Check to see if the constraints have a solution. If there is no solution, then the expression has a type error.
- 4. Simplify the constraint set to report back to the user.

The Needle Programming Language – Neel Krishnaswami – neelk@alum.mit.edu

```
generic (+) a < Number . (a, a) -> a;
```

```
fun(x) \{ x + x \}
```

```
generic (+) a < Number . (a, a) -> a;
```

```
fun(x) \{ x + x \}
```

1. {} fun(x) { x + x }

```
generic (+) a < Number . (a, a) -> a;
```

```
fun(x) \{ x + x \}
```

1. {} $fun(x) \{ x + x \}$ 2. {x : t} Abstract(t, x + x)

```
generic (+) a < Number . (a, a) -> a;
```

```
fun(x) \{ x + x \}
```

```
1. {} fun(x) { x + x }
2. {x : t} Abstract(t, x + x )
3. {x : t} Abstract(t, Apply(+, x, x))
```

```
generic (+) a < Number . (a, a) -> a;
```

```
fun(x) \{ x + x \}
```

```
1. {} fun(x) \{ x + x \}

2. {x : t} Abstract(t, x + x)

3. {x : t} Abstract(t, Apply(+, x, x))

4. {x : t} Abstract(t, Apply(a < Number . (a,a) -> a, t, t))
```

Oncae we have the type tree, we can merge the leaf types into a single constrained type:

1. Abstract(t, Apply(a < Number . (a,a) -> a, t, t))

Oncae we have the type tree, we can merge the leaf types into a single constrained type:

- 1. Abstract(t, Apply(a < Number . (a,a) -> a, t, t))
- 2. Abstract(t, a < Number & (a,a) \rightarrow a < (t,t) \rightarrow b . b)

Oncae we have the type tree, we can merge the leaf types into a single constrained type:

- 1. Abstract(t, Apply(a < Number . (a,a) -> a, t, t))
- 2. Abstract(t, a < Number & (a,a) \rightarrow a < (t,t) \rightarrow b. b)
- 3. a < Number & (a,a) -> a < (t,t) -> b . t -> b

We must verify that there is at least one assignment to the variables that satisfies the constraints:

a < Number & (a,a) -> a < (t,t) -> b . t -> b

Example: {t \leftarrow a; b \leftarrow a}

We check satisfiability using standard techniques:

- Compute the closure of the constraints.
- Run a satisfiability algorithm.

a < Number & (a,a) -> a < (t,t) -> b . t -> b

is equivalent to

a < Number . a -> a

For readability, inferred types must be simplified.

Comparison with ML

Pros:

- Datatypes can be extended with subclassing
- Generic functions give you controlled overloading

Cons:

- No principal types
- More complex type inference algorithm

Comparison with CLOS/Dylan

Pros:

- Integrates well with parametric polymorphism
- More precise types available for documentation

Cons:

• Stricter lambda-list rules

In current Needle, generic printing might have the interface:

generic print a -> String;

```
method print (s String) { s }
method print (b Boolean) { if (b) { "true" } else { "false" } }
```

method print (o a) { raise Error(); }

Throwing an exception hurts safety.

What we want is something like this:

```
interface Print(a) {
    print a -> String;
}
```

generic print Print(a) . a -> String;

String implements Print; // interfaces are added *post-hoc*
Boolean implements Print;

```
method print (s String) { s }
method print (b Boolean) { if (b) { "true" } else { "false" } }
```

- Lets you add existing types to new protocols
- Fixes weakness of generic-function style grouping methods.
- Idea stems from Haskell typeclasses.
- Implementation in progress.

- Website at: http://www.nongnu.org/needle
- Mailing list at:

http://mail.nongnu.org/mailman/listinfo/needle-hackers

• Email me at: neelk@alum.mit.edu