Programming Paradigms Languages F28PL, Lecture 4 Polymorphic and higher-order list operations

Jamie Gabbay

November 23, 2015

Polymorphic list length function

Let's design length: 'a list -> 'a list to calculate the length of a list. Note the polymorphic type. Recall our slogan: A list is either empty or a head and a tail.

```
▶ Base case: [] ==> 0.▶ Recursion case: (h::t) ==> 1 + length of t.
```

This design is almost precisely the ML code itself:

Polymorphic list append

```
First, choose the type: append: 'a list -> 'a list -> 'a list.
```

Next, recursively design the function. Classic n00b error: pattern-match on everything in sight. Don't; it's not necessary here. Just pattern-match on the first argument.

- Appending [] to l gives l.
- Appending hd::tl to l gives hd appended to the result of appending tl to l.

Obvious, isn't it? Corresponding ML code:

Polymorphic list append

```
append ["a", "b", "c"] ["d", "e", "f"]
==> "a"::append ["b", "c"] ["d", "e", "f"]
==> "a"::"b"::append ["c"] ["d", "e", "f"]
==> "a"::"b"::"c"::append [] ["d", "e", "f"]
==> "a"::"b"::"c"::["d", "e", "f"]
==> ["a", "b", "c", "d", "e", "f"]
```

In fact, append is primitive in ML.

```
> op @; (* infix operator so write "op" to fetch function *)
val it = fn : 'a list * 'a list -> 'a list
- [1,2,3]@[4,5,6];
> [1,2,3,4,5,6] : int list
```

Two differences from our function append: 1. op @ is probably optimised to the underlying list representation of the specific ML implementation; and 2. the types are different.

Make sure you understand how. Make sure you can write an append function of type 'a list * 'a list -> 'a list.

List member

Let's pick up the pace:

- 1. Intended type is 'a -> 'a list -> bool (but see below).
- 2. e1 is not in [], and
- 3. e1 is in e1::tl, and
- otherwise e1 is in e1::tl if e1 is in tl.

Patterns in ML are affine—a variable may occur at most once. So we can't write clause 2 above in ML as member e1 (e1::tl) =

No matter:

List member

Note the difference in types: we wanted 'a -> 'a list -> bool but we got.

```
> val member =
    fn : ''a -> ''a list -> bool
```

Thus member is polymorphic over equality types.

This is natural: in order to check member el l we need to be able to check whether elements of l are equal to el.

(Python would be more optimistic: it would check mathematical equality where it can, and fall back to comparison of pointers where it can't. But that relies on having a von Neumann machine in the background.)

Add (push to queue)

When you get into this, the ML becomes easier to read than the English:

List remove/delete first occurrence

Exercise: Write yourself a 'delete all occurrences' function, please.

Higher-order functions

A higher-order function is a function that inputs a function. In other languages, this may be called a functor.

In ML, no such distinction is made: functors are just a particular special case of functions.

Here are some examples of types that higher-order functions might have:

```
('a -> 'b) -> ('b -> 'c) -> ('a -> 'c)
('a -> bool) -> 'a list -> 'a list
('a -> 'b) -> 'a list -> 'b list
(('a -> 'b) -> 'b) -> 'a
```

It is often possible to deduce what a function must do, just from its type. For instance, the only thing that could populate $('a \rightarrow 'b) \rightarrow ('b \rightarrow 'c) \rightarrow ('a \rightarrow 'c)$ is fn f => fn g => g o f.

Higher-order functions

Great for abstraction and code-reuse. Consider ('a -> bool) -> 'a list -> 'a list. The only reasonable function that populates this type is filter:

In words filter p l traverses l throwing out elements that don't satisfy p.

Very common operation, that.

Lists

```
- fun isPos x = x>0; (* Our p: 'is positive' *)
> val isPos = fn : int -> bool
- filter isPos [~2,1,0,2];
> [1,2] : int list
(* Execution:
filter isPos [~2,1,0,2]
==> filter isPos [1,0,2]
==> 1::filter isPos [0,2]
==> 1::filter isPos [2]
==> 1::2::filter isPos []
```

We note that filter is tail-recursive, so an optimising compiler will optimise this to the same low-level code as might be written by a programmer-optimised interative program. But the ML code is, I believe, cleaner (even for this simple example).

Map

The other big list operation is 'apply a function f to every element of a list'.

Examples

I studied maths as an undergrad so for me, the obvious example of map is for Taylor series like these:

$$e^x = 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^4}{4!} + \dots$$

The components of this sum are an instance of map applied to a function f such that $n \mapsto x^n/n!$.

If you are into gaming and understand GPU architecture, then you might recognise that stream processors are nothing more than a hardware optimised for applying map in parallel to a list or an array of data.

Other examples abound. ML is very good at expressing this kind of thing.

Examples

Another example:

```
- fun powers (x:int) = (x,x*x,x*x*x);
> val powers = fn : int -> int * int * int
- map powers [1,2,3];
> [(1,1,1),(2,4,8),(3,9,27) : (int * int * int) list
Evaluation is:
map powers [1,2,3]
==> powers 1::map powers [2,3]
==> powers 1::powers 2::map powers [3]
==> powers 1::powers 2::powers 3::map powers []
==> powers 1::powers 2::powers 3::[]
==> [(1.1.1), (2.4.8), (3.9.27)]
```

List insert

Can we write a program insert that if given an integer i1 and a list of integers ordered in ascending order, will insert i1 into the list so the result is also a list of integers ordered in ascending order?

This is pretty much what you do when you put a library book in a shelf: you're given a list in order and an element and you want to put the element in 'the right place'.

Why not have a go at this yourself before reading the answer?

First, write an inductive specification; then convert it to ML code.

List insert

Bet you just skipped to this slide without trying it yourself.

No really; you'll learn more if you have a go first.

List insert

Sorting

We can now write an easy sorting algorithm:

Isn't that beautiful, compact, and elegant code?

Consider summing a list of integers:

```
- fun sum [] = 0

| sum (h::t) = h+sum t;

> val sum = fn: int list -> int

- sum [1,2,3];

> 6 : int

sum [1,2,3]

==> 1+sum [2,3]

==> 1+(2+sum [3])

==> 1+(2+(3+sum []))

==> 1+(2+(3+0))

==> 1+2+3+0
```

Intuitively, sum inserts + between the list elements (and calculates the result).

Consider joining a list of strings:

Intuitively, join inserts ^ between the list elements (and calculates the result).

Suppose we have a list of functions in 'a -> 'a that we want to compose:

Intuitively, bigo inserts o between the list elements.

We have a schema here:

- Base case: [] ==> base value b.
- Recursion case:

```
(h::t) ==> apply f to h and result of folding f over
```

I find this easiest to understand as follows:

```
foldr f acc [x,y,z] = f(x,f(y,f(z,acc)))
```

This is a surprisingly general recipe, because it captures the essence of iteration. This is a for-next loop. To be precise: foldr captures the essence of tail-recursion.

```
sum = foldr (fn \times => fn \text{ acc} => x+acc) 0
join = foldr (fn \times => fn \text{ acc} => x^acc) ""
bigo = foldr (fn \times => fn \text{ acc} => x \text{ o acc}) (fn \times => x)
sort = foldr insert [] (* do "insert" between elements of list
```

Now sum and join are kind of trivial, and bigo isn't trivial but it's easy to underestimate it; but you should know that sorting is a canonical non-trivial program.

foldl

Much like foldr but starts from the head of the list:

- fun foldl f acc [] = acc

```
| foldl f acc (h::t) = foldl f (f h acc) t;
> val foldl =
    fn: ('a->'b->'b) -> 'b -> 'a list -> 'b

I understand it like this:

foldl f acc [x,y,z] = f(z,f(y,f(x,acc)))
foldr f acc [x,y,z] = f(x,f(y,f(z,acc))) (* for comparison *)
```

foldl is natural because "we read the list from left-to-right and start computing on the x first".

```
Clearly, foldl is equal to fn f \Rightarrow fn acc \Rightarrow fn l \Rightarrow foldr f acc (rev l).
```

fold

Oh yes, and rev can, of course, be implemented using foldl and foldr:

```
foldr (fn x => fn acc => acc@[x]) []
foldl (fn x => fn acc => x::acc) []
```

Higher-order sort

Recall sorting using foldr:

```
sort [3,2,1]
==> foldr insert [] [3,2,1]
==> insert 3 (foldr insert [] [2,1])
==> insert 3 (insert 2 (foldr insert [] [1]))
==> insert 3 (insert 2 (insert 1 (foldr insert [] [])))
==> insert 3 (insert 2 (insert 1 []))
```

This invites generalisation.

Higher-order insert

Generalise insert to work with list of arbitrary type:

- ▶ If p holds between v and h then put v on front of list.
- Otherwise put h on front of inserting v into t with p.

Higher-order sort

In OO programming you'd probably recognise a generalised sorting algorithm over objects with 'compare' and 'insert' methods. Where do you think these ideas come from?