CHAPTER 12
Special Methods for Sequences

> Don't check whether it *is*-a duck: check whether it *quacks*-like-a duck, *walks*-like-a duck, etc., etc., depending on exactly what subset of duck-like behavior you need to play your language-games with. (`comp.lang.python`, Jul. 26, 2000)
>
> —Alex Martelli

In this chapter, we will create a class to represent a multidimensional `Vector` class—a significant step up from the two-dimensional `Vector2d` of Chapter 11. `Vector` will behave like a standard Python immutable flat sequence. Its elements will be floats, and it will support the following by the end of this chapter:

- Basic sequence protocol: `__len__` and `__getitem__`
- Safe representation of instances with many items
- Proper slicing support, producing new `Vector` instances
- Aggregate hashing, taking into account every contained element value
- Custom formatting language extension

We'll also implement dynamic attribute access with `__getattr__` as a way of replacing the read-only properties we used in `Vector2d`—although this is not typical of sequence types.

The code-intensive presentation will be interrupted by a conceptual discussion about the idea of protocols as an informal interface. We'll talk about how protocols and *duck typing* are related, and its practical implications when you create your own types.

What's New in This Chapter

There are no major changes in this chapter. There is a new, brief discussion of the `typing.Protocol` in a tip box near the end of "Protocols and Duck Typing" on page 402.

In "A Slice-Aware __getitem__" on page 406, the implementation of `__getitem__` in Example 12-6 is more concise and robust than the example in the first edition, thanks to duck typing and `operator.index`. This change carried over to later implementations of `Vector` in this chapter and in Chapter 16.

Let's get started.

Vector: A User-Defined Sequence Type

Our strategy to implement `Vector` will be to use composition, not inheritance. We'll store the components in an `array` of floats, and will implement the methods needed for our `Vector` to behave like an immutable flat sequence.

But before we implement the sequence methods, let's make sure we have a baseline implementation of `Vector` that is compatible with our earlier `Vector2d` class—except where such compatibility would not make sense.

Vector Applications Beyond Three Dimensions

Who needs a vector with 1,000 dimensions? N-dimensional vectors (with large values of N) are widely used in information retrieval, where documents and text queries are represented as vectors, with one dimension per word. This is called the Vector space model. In this model, a key relevance metric is the cosine similarity (i.e., the cosine of the angle between the vector representing the query and the vector representing the document). As the angle decreases, the cosine approaches the maximum value of 1, and so does the relevance of the document to the query.

Having said that, the `Vector` class in this chapter is a didactic example and we'll not do much math here. Our goal is just to demonstrate some Python special methods in the context of a sequence type.

NumPy and SciPy are the tools you need for real-world vector math. The PyPI package gensim, by Radim Řehůřek, implements vector space modeling for natural language processing and information retrieval, using NumPy and SciPy.

Vector Take #1: Vector2d Compatible

The first version of `Vector` should be as compatible as possible with our earlier `Vector2d` class.

However, by design, the `Vector` constructor is not compatible with the `Vector2d` constructor. We could make `Vector(3, 4)` and `Vector(3, 4, 5)` work, by taking arbitrary arguments with `*args` in `__init__`, but the best practice for a sequence constructor is to take the data as an iterable argument in the constructor, like all built-in sequence types do. Example 12-1 shows some ways of instantiating our new `Vector` objects.

Example 12-1. Tests of `Vector.__init__` and `Vector.__repr__`

```
>>> Vector([3.1, 4.2])
Vector([3.1, 4.2])
>>> Vector((3, 4, 5))
Vector([3.0, 4.0, 5.0])
>>> Vector(range(10))
Vector([0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, ...])
```

Apart from a new constructor signature, I made sure every test I did with `Vector2d` (e.g., `Vector2d(3, 4)`) passed and produced the same result with a two-component `Vector([3, 4])`.

When a `Vector` has more than six components, the string produced by `repr()` is abbreviated with `...` as seen in the last line of Example 12-1. This is crucial in any collection type that may contain a large number of items, because `repr` is used for debugging—and you don't want a single large object to span thousands of lines in your console or log. Use the `reprlib` module to produce limited-length representations, as in Example 12-2. The `reprlib` module was named `repr` in Python 2.7.

Example 12-2 lists the implementation of our first version of `Vector` (this example builds on the code shown in Examples 11-2 and 11-3).

Example 12-2. vector_v1.py: derived from vector2d_v1.py

```
from array import array
import reprlib
import math


class Vector:
```

```
    typecode = 'd'

    def __init__(self, components):
        self._components = array(self.typecode, components)  ❶

    def __iter__(self):
        return iter(self._components)  ❷

    def __repr__(self):
        components = reprlib.repr(self._components)  ❸
        components = components[components.find('['):-1]  ❹
        return f'Vector({components})'

    def __str__(self):
        return str(tuple(self))

    def __bytes__(self):
        return (bytes([ord(self.typecode)]) +
                bytes(self._components))  ❺

    def __eq__(self, other):
        return tuple(self) == tuple(other)

    def __abs__(self):
        return math.hypot(*self)  ❻

    def __bool__(self):
        return bool(abs(self))

    @classmethod
    def frombytes(cls, octets):
        typecode = chr(octets[0])
        memv = memoryview(octets[1:]).cast(typecode)
        return cls(memv)  ❼
```

❶ The `self._components` instance "protected" attribute will hold an `array` with the `Vector` components.

❷ To allow iteration, we return an iterator over `self._components`.[1]

❸ Use `reprlib.repr()` to get a limited-length representation of `self._components` (e.g., `array('d', [0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, ...])`).

❹ Remove the `array('d',` prefix, and the trailing `)` before plugging the string into a `Vector` constructor call.

1 The `iter()` function is covered in Chapter 17, along with the `__iter__` method.

❺ Build a `bytes` object directly from `self._components`.

❻ Since Python 3.8, `math.hypot` accepts N-dimensional points. I used this expression before: `math.sqrt(sum(x * x for x in self))`.

❼ The only change needed from the earlier `frombytes` is in the last line: we pass the `memoryview` directly to the constructor, without unpacking with `*` as we did before.

The way I used `reprlib.repr` deserves some elaboration. That function produces safe representations of large or recursive structures by limiting the length of the output string and marking the cut with `'...'`. I wanted the `repr` of a `Vector` to look like `Vector([3.0, 4.0, 5.0])` and not `Vector(array('d', [3.0, 4.0, 5.0]))`, because the fact that there is an `array` inside a `Vector` is an implementation detail. Because these constructor calls build identical `Vector` objects, I prefer the simpler syntax using a `list` argument.

When coding `__repr__`, I could have produced the simplified `components` display with this expression: `reprlib.repr(list(self._components))`. However, this would be wasteful, as I'd be copying every item from `self._components` to a `list` just to use the `list` `repr`. Instead, I decided to apply `reprlib.repr` to the `self._components` array directly, and then chop off the characters outside of the `[]`. That's what the second line of `__repr__` does in Example 12-2.

Because of its role in debugging, calling `repr()` on an object should never raise an exception. If something goes wrong inside your implementation of `__repr__`, you must deal with the issue and do your best to produce some serviceable output that gives the user a chance of identifying the receiver (`self`).

Note that the `__str__`, `__eq__`, and `__bool__` methods are unchanged from `Vector2d`, and only one character was changed in `frombytes` (a `*` was removed in the last line). This is one of the benefits of making the original `Vector2d` iterable.

By the way, we could have subclassed `Vector` from `Vector2d`, but I chose not to do it for two reasons. First, the incompatible constructors really make subclassing not advisable. I could work around that with some clever parameter handling in `__init__`, but the second reason is more important: I want `Vector` to be a standalone example of a class implementing the sequence protocol. That's what we'll do next, after a discussion of the term *protocol*.

Protocols and Duck Typing

As early as Chapter 1, we saw that you don't need to inherit from any special class to create a fully functional sequence type in Python; you just need to implement the methods that fulfill the sequence protocol. But what kind of protocol are we talking about?

In the context of object-oriented programming, a protocol is an informal interface, defined only in documentation and not in code. For example, the sequence protocol in Python entails just the `__len__` and `__getitem__` methods. Any class `Spam` that implements those methods with the standard signature and semantics can be used anywhere a sequence is expected. Whether `Spam` is a subclass of this or that is irrelevant; all that matters is that it provides the necessary methods. We saw that in Example 1-1, reproduced here in Example 12-3.

Example 12-3. Code from Example 1-1, reproduced here for convenience

```
import collections

Card = collections.namedtuple('Card', ['rank', 'suit'])

class FrenchDeck:
    ranks = [str(n) for n in range(2, 11)] + list('JQKA')
    suits = 'spades diamonds clubs hearts'.split()

    def __init__(self):
        self._cards = [Card(rank, suit) for suit in self.suits
                                        for rank in self.ranks]

    def __len__(self):
        return len(self._cards)

    def __getitem__(self, position):
        return self._cards[position]
```

The `FrenchDeck` class in Example 12-3 takes advantage of many Python facilities because it implements the sequence protocol, even if that is not declared anywhere in the code. An experienced Python coder will look at it and understand that it *is* a sequence, even if it subclasses `object`. We say it *is* a sequence because it *behaves* like one, and that is what matters.

This became known as *duck typing*, after Alex Martelli's post quoted at the beginning of this chapter.

Because protocols are informal and unenforced, you can often get away with implementing just part of a protocol, if you know the specific context where a class will be

used. For example, to support iteration, only `__getitem__` is required; there is no need to provide `__len__`.

With PEP 544—Protocols: Structural subtyping (static duck typing), Python 3.8 supports *protocol classes*: `typing` constructs, which we studied in "Static Protocols" on page 286. This new use of the word protocol in Python has a related but different meaning. When I need to differentiate them, I write *static protocol* to refer to the protocols formalized in protocol classes, and *dynamic protocol* for the traditional sense. One key difference is that static protocol implementations must provide all methods defined in the protocol class. "Two Kinds of Protocols" on page 434 in Chapter 13 has more details.

We'll now implement the sequence protocol in `Vector`, initially without proper support for slicing, but later adding that.

Vector Take #2: A Sliceable Sequence

As we saw with the `FrenchDeck` example, supporting the sequence protocol is really easy if you can delegate to a sequence attribute in your object, like our `self._components` array. These `__len__` and `__getitem__` one-liners are a good start:

```
class Vector:
    # many lines omitted
    # ...

    def __len__(self):
        return len(self._components)

    def __getitem__(self, index):
        return self._components[index]
```

With these additions, all of these operations now work:

```
>>> v1 = Vector([3, 4, 5])
>>> len(v1)
3
>>> v1[0], v1[-1]
(3.0, 5.0)
>>> v7 = Vector(range(7))
>>> v7[1:4]
array('d', [1.0, 2.0, 3.0])
```

As you can see, even slicing is supported—but not very well. It would be better if a slice of a `Vector` was also a `Vector` instance and not an `array`. The old `FrenchDeck` class has a similar problem: when you slice it, you get a `list`. In the case of `Vector`, a lot of functionality is lost when slicing produces plain arrays.

Consider the built-in sequence types: every one of them, when sliced, produces a new instance of its own type, and not of some other type.

To make `Vector` produce slices as `Vector` instances, we can't just delegate the slicing to `array`. We need to analyze the arguments we get in `__getitem__` and do the right thing.

Now, let's see how Python turns the syntax `my_seq[1:3]` into arguments for `my_seq.__getitem__(...)`.

How Slicing Works

A demo is worth a thousand words, so take a look at Example 12-4.

Example 12-4. Checking out the behavior of `__getitem__` and slices

```
>>> class MySeq:
...     def __getitem__(self, index):
...         return index  ❶
...
>>> s = MySeq()
>>> s[1]  ❷
1
>>> s[1:4]  ❸
slice(1, 4, None)
>>> s[1:4:2]  ❹
slice(1, 4, 2)
>>> s[1:4:2, 9]  ❺
(slice(1, 4, 2), 9)
>>> s[1:4:2, 7:9]  ❻
(slice(1, 4, 2), slice(7, 9, None))
```

❶ For this demonstration, `__getitem__` merely returns whatever is passed to it.

❷ A single index, nothing new.

❸ The notation `1:4` becomes `slice(1, 4, None)`.

❹ `slice(1, 4, 2)` means start at 1, stop at 4, step by 2.

❺ Surprise: the presence of commas inside the `[]` means `__getitem__` receives a tuple.

❻ The tuple may even hold several `slice` objects.

Now let's take a closer look at `slice` itself in Example 12-5.

Example 12-5. Inspecting the attributes of the `slice` class

```
>>> slice  ❶
<class 'slice'>
>>> dir(slice) ❷
['__class__', '__delattr__', '__dir__', '__doc__', '__eq__',
 '__format__', '__ge__', '__getattribute__', '__gt__',
 '__hash__', '__init__', '__le__', '__lt__', '__ne__',
 '__new__', '__reduce__', '__reduce_ex__', '__repr__',
 '__setattr__', '__sizeof__', '__str__', '__subclasshook__',
 'indices', 'start', 'step', 'stop']
```

❶ `slice` is a built-in type (we saw it first in "Slice Objects" on page 48).

❷ Inspecting a `slice`, we find the data attributes `start`, `stop`, and `step`, and an `indices` method.

In Example 12-5, calling `dir(slice)` reveals an `indices` attribute, which turns out to be a very interesting but little-known method. Here is what `help(slice.indices)` reveals:

```
S.indices(len) -> (start, stop, stride)
```

> Assuming a sequence of length `len`, calculate the `start` and `stop` indices, and the `stride` length of the extended slice described by `S`. Out-of-bounds indices are clipped just like they are in a normal slice.

In other words, `indices` exposes the tricky logic that's implemented in the built-in sequences to gracefully handle missing or negative indices and slices that are longer than the original sequence. This method produces "normalized" tuples of nonnegative `start`, `stop`, and `stride` integers tailored to a sequence of the given length.

Here are a couple of examples, considering a sequence of `len == 5`, e.g., `'ABCDE'`:

```
>>> slice(None, 10, 2).indices(5)  ❶
(0, 5, 2)
>>> slice(-3, None, None).indices(5)  ❷
(2, 5, 1)
```

❶ `'ABCDE'[:10:2]` is the same as `'ABCDE'[0:5:2]`.

❷ `'ABCDE'[-3:]` is the same as `'ABCDE'[2:5:1]`.

In our `Vector` code, we'll not need the `slice.indices()` method because when we get a slice argument we'll delegate its handling to the `_components array`. But if you can't count on the services of an underlying sequence, this method can be a huge time saver.

Now that we know how to handle slices, let's take a look at the improved `Vector.__getitem__` implementation.

A Slice-Aware `__getitem__`

Example 12-6 lists the two methods needed to make `Vector` behave as a sequence: `__len__` and `__getitem__` (the latter now implemented to handle slicing correctly).

Example 12-6. Part of vector_v2.py: `__len__` and `__getitem__` methods added to `Vector` class from vector_v1.py (see Example 12-2)

```
    def __len__(self):
        return len(self._components)

    def __getitem__(self, key):
        if isinstance(key, slice):  ❶
            cls = type(self)  ❷
            return cls(self._components[key])  ❸
        index = operator.index(key)  ❹
        return self._components[index]  ❺
```

❶ If the `key` argument is a `slice`…

❷ …get the class of the instance (i.e., `Vector`) and…

❸ …invoke the class to build another `Vector` instance from a slice of the `_components` array.

❹ If we can get an `index` from `key`…

❺ …return the specific item from `_components`.

The `operator.index()` function calls the `__index__` special method. The function and the special method were defined in PEP 357—Allowing Any Object to be Used for Slicing, proposed by Travis Oliphant to allow any of the numerous types of integers in NumPy to be used as indexes and slice arguments. The key difference between `operator.index()` and `int()` is that the former is intended for this specific purpose. For example, `int(3.14)` returns `3`, but `operator.index(3.14)` raises `TypeError` because a `float` should not be used as an index.

Excessive use of `isinstance` may be a sign of bad OO design, but handling slices in `__getitem__` is a justified use case. In the first edition, I also used an `isinstance` test on `key` to test if it was an integer. Using `operator.index` avoids this test, and raises `TypeError` with a very informative message if we can't get the `index` from `key`. See the last error message from Example 12-7.

Once the code in Example 12-6 is added to the `Vector` class, we have proper slicing behavior, as Example 12-7 demonstrates.

Example 12-7. Tests of enhanced `Vector.__getitem__` from Example 12-6

```
>>> v7 = Vector(range(7))
>>> v7[-1]  ❶
6.0
>>> v7[1:4]  ❷
Vector([1.0, 2.0, 3.0])
>>> v7[-1:]  ❸
Vector([6.0])
>>> v7[1,2]  ❹
Traceback (most recent call last):
  ...
TypeError: 'tuple' object cannot be interpreted as an integer
```

❶ An integer index retrieves just one component value as a `float`.

❷ A slice index creates a new `Vector`.

❸ A slice of `len == 1` also creates a `Vector`.

❹ `Vector` does not support multidimensional indexing, so a tuple of indices or slices raises an error.

Vector Take #3: Dynamic Attribute Access

In the evolution from `Vector2d` to `Vector`, we lost the ability to access vector components by name (e.g., `v.x`, `v.y`). We are now dealing with vectors that may have a large number of components. Still, it may be convenient to access the first few components with shortcut letters such as `x`, `y`, `z` instead of `v[0]`, `v[1]`, and `v[2]`.

Here is the alternative syntax we want to provide for reading the first four components of a vector:

```
>>> v = Vector(range(10))
>>> v.x
0.0
```

```
>>> v.y, v.z, v.t
(1.0, 2.0, 3.0)
```

In `Vector2d`, we provided read-only access to `x` and `y` using the `@property` decorator (Example 11-7). We could write four properties in `Vector`, but it would be tedious. The `__getattr__` special method provides a better way.

The `__getattr__` method is invoked by the interpreter when attribute lookup fails. In simple terms, given the expression `my_obj.x`, Python checks if the `my_obj` instance has an attribute named `x`; if not, the search goes to the class (`my_obj.__class__`), and then up the inheritance graph.[2] If the `x` attribute is not found, then the `__getattr__` method defined in the class of `my_obj` is called with `self` and the name of the attribute as a string (e.g., `'x'`).

Example 12-8 lists our `__getattr__` method. Essentially it checks whether the attribute being sought is one of the letters `xyzt` and if so, returns the corresponding vector component.

Example 12-8. Part of vector_v3.py: `__getattr__` method added to the `Vector` class

```
    __match_args__ = ('x', 'y', 'z', 't')  ❶

    def __getattr__(self, name):
        cls = type(self)  ❷
        try:
            pos = cls.__match_args__.index(name)  ❸
        except ValueError:  ❹
            pos = -1
        if 0 <= pos < len(self._components):  ❺
            return self._components[pos]
        msg = f'{cls.__name__!r} object has no attribute {name!r}'  ❻
        raise AttributeError(msg)
```

❶ Set `__match_args__` to allow positional pattern matching on the dynamic attributes supported by `__getattr__`.[3]

❷ Get the `Vector` class for later use.

2 Attribute lookup is more complicated than this; we'll see the gory details in Part V. For now, this simplified explanation will do.

3 Although `__match_args__` exists to support pattern matching in Python 3.10, setting this attribute is harmless in previous versions of Python. In the first edition of this book, I named it `shortcut_names`. With the new name it does double duty: it supports positional patterns in `case` clauses, and it holds the names of the dynamic attributes supported by special logic in `__getattr__` and `__setattr__`.

❸ Try to get the position of `name` in `__match_args__`.

❹ `.index(name)` raises `ValueError` when `name` is not found; set `pos` to `-1`. (I'd rather use a method like `str.find` here, but `tuple` doesn't implement it.)

❺ If the `pos` is within range of the available components, return the component.

❻ If we get this far, raise `AttributeError` with a standard message text.

It's not hard to implement `__getattr__`, but in this case it's not enough. Consider the bizarre interaction in Example 12-9.

Example 12-9. Inappropriate behavior: assigning to `v.x` raises no error, but introduces an inconsistency

```
>>> v = Vector(range(5))
>>> v
Vector([0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0])
>>> v.x  ❶
0.0
>>> v.x = 10  ❷
>>> v.x  ❸
10
>>> v
Vector([0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0])  ❹
```

❶ Access element `v[0]` as `v.x`.

❷ Assign new value to `v.x`. This should raise an exception.

❸ Reading `v.x` shows the new value, `10`.

❹ However, the vector components did not change.

Can you explain what is happening? In particular, why does `v.x` return `10` the second time if that value is not in the vector components array? If you don't know right off the bat, study the explanation of `__getattr__` given right before Example 12-8. It's a bit subtle, but a very important foundation to understand a lot of what comes later in the book.

After you've given it some thought, proceed and we'll explain exactly what happened.

The inconsistency in Example 12-9 was introduced because of the way `__getattr__` works: Python only calls that method as a fallback, when the object does not have the named attribute. However, after we assign `v.x = 10`, the `v` object now has an `x` attribute, so `__getattr__` will no longer be called to retrieve `v.x`: the interpreter will

just return the value `10` that is bound to `v.x`. On the other hand, our implementation of `__getattr__` pays no attention to instance attributes other than `self._components`, from where it retrieves the values of the "virtual attributes" listed in `__match_args__`.

We need to customize the logic for setting attributes in our `Vector` class in order to avoid this inconsistency.

Recall that in the latest `Vector2d` examples from Chapter 11, trying to assign to the `.x` or `.y` instance attributes raised `AttributeError`. In `Vector`, we want the same exception with any attempt at assigning to all single-letter lowercase attribute names, just to avoid confusion. To do that, we'll implement `__setattr__`, as listed in Example 12-10.

Example 12-10. Part of vector_v3.py: `__setattr__` method in the `Vector` class

```
    def __setattr__(self, name, value):
        cls = type(self)
        if len(name) == 1:  ❶
            if name in cls.__match_args__:  ❷
                error = 'readonly attribute {attr_name!r}'
            elif name.islower():  ❸
                error = "can't set attributes 'a' to 'z' in {cls_name!r}"
            else:
                error = ''  ❹
            if error:  ❺
                msg = error.format(cls_name=cls.__name__, attr_name=name)
                raise AttributeError(msg)
        super().__setattr__(name, value)  ❻
```

❶ Special handling for single-character attribute names.

❷ If `name` is one of `__match_args__`, set specific error message.

❸ If `name` is lowercase, set error message about all single-letter names.

❹ Otherwise, set blank error message.

❺ If there is a nonblank error message, raise `AttributeError`.

❻ Default case: call `__setattr__` on superclass for standard behavior.

The `super()` function provides a way to access methods of superclasses dynamically, a necessity in a dynamic language supporting multiple inheritance like Python. It's used to delegate some task from a method in a subclass to a suitable method in a superclass, as seen in Example 12-10. There is more about `super` in "Multiple Inheritance and Method Resolution Order" on page 494.

While choosing the error message to display with `AttributeError`, my first check was the behavior of the built-in `complex` type, because they are immutable and have a pair of data attributes, `real` and `imag`. Trying to change either of those in a `complex` instance raises `AttributeError` with the message `"can't set attribute"`. On the other hand, trying to set a read-only attribute protected by a property as we did in "A Hashable Vector2d" on page 374 produces the message `"read-only attribute"`. I drew inspiration from both wordings to set the `error` string in `__setitem__`, but was more explicit about the forbidden attributes.

Note that we are not disallowing setting all attributes, only single-letter, lowercase ones, to avoid confusion with the supported read-only attributes `x`, `y`, `z`, and `t`.

Knowing that declaring `__slots__` at the class level prevents setting new instance attributes, it's tempting to use that feature instead of implementing `__setattr__` as we did. However, because of all the caveats discussed in "Summarizing the Issues with __slots__" on page 388, using `__slots__` just to prevent instance attribute creation is not recommended. `__slots__` should be used only to save memory, and only if that is a real issue.

Even without supporting writing to the `Vector` components, here is an important takeaway from this example: very often when you implement `__getattr__`, you need to code `__setattr__` as well, to avoid inconsistent behavior in your objects.

If we wanted to allow changing components, we could implement `__setitem__` to enable `v[0] = 1.1` and/or `__setattr__` to make `v.x = 1.1` work. But `Vector` will remain immutable because we want to make it hashable in the coming section.

Vector Take #4: Hashing and a Faster ==

Once more we get to implement a `__hash__` method. Together with the existing `__eq__`, this will make `Vector` instances hashable.

The `__hash__` in `Vector2d` (Example 11-8) computed the hash of a `tuple` built with the two components, `self.x` and `self.y`. Now we may be dealing with thousands of components, so building a `tuple` may be too costly. Instead, I will apply the `^` (xor)

operator to the hashes of every component in succession, like this: `v[0] ^ v[1] ^ v[2]`. That is what the `functools.reduce` function is for. Previously I said that `reduce` is not as popular as before,[4] but computing the hash of all vector components is a good use case for it. Figure 12-1 depicts the general idea of the `reduce` function.



Figure 12-1. Reducing functions—`reduce`, `sum`, `any`, `all`—produce a single aggregate result from a sequence or from any finite iterable object.

So far we've seen that `functools.reduce()` can be replaced by `sum()`, but now let's properly explain how it works. The key idea is to reduce a series of values to a single value. The first argument to `reduce()` is a two-argument function, and the second argument is an iterable. Let's say we have a two-argument function `fn` and a list `lst`. When you call `reduce(fn, lst)`, `fn` will be applied to the first pair of elements—`fn(lst[0], lst[1])`—producing a first result, `r1`. Then `fn` is applied to `r1` and the next element—`fn(r1, lst[2])`—producing a second result, `r2`. Now `fn(r2, lst[3])` is called to produce `r3` … and so on until the last element, when a single result, `rN`, is returned.

Here is how you could use `reduce` to compute `5!` (the factorial of 5):

```
>>> 2 * 3 * 4 * 5  # the result we want: 5! == 120
120
>>> import functools
>>> functools.reduce(lambda a,b: a*b, range(1, 6))
120
```

Back to our hashing problem, Example 12-11 shows the idea of computing the aggregate xor by doing it in three ways: with a `for` loop and two `reduce` calls.

Example 12-11. Three ways of calculating the accumulated xor of integers from 0 to 5

```
>>> n = 0
>>> for i in range(1, 6):  ❶
...     n ^= i
...
```

4 The `sum`, `any`, and `all` cover the most common uses of `reduce`. See the discussion in "Modern Replacements for map, filter, and reduce" on page 235.

```
>>> n
1
>>> import functools
>>> functools.reduce(lambda a, b: a^b, range(6))  ❷
1
>>> import operator
>>> functools.reduce(operator.xor, range(6))  ❸
1
```

❶ Aggregate xor with a `for` loop and an accumulator variable.

❷ `functools.reduce` using an anonymous function.

❸ `functools.reduce` replacing custom `lambda` with `operator.xor`.

From the alternatives in Example 12-11, the last one is my favorite, and the `for` loop comes second. What is your preference?

As seen in "The operator Module" on page 243, `operator` provides the functionality of all Python infix operators in function form, lessening the need for `lambda`.

To code `Vector.__hash__` in my preferred style, we need to import the `functools` and `operator` modules. Example 12-12 shows the relevant changes.

Example 12-12. Part of vector_v4.py: two imports and `__hash__` method added to the `Vector` class from vector_v3.py

```
from array import array
import reprlib
import math
import functools  ❶
import operator  ❷


class Vector:
    typecode = 'd'

    # many lines omitted in book listing...

    def __eq__(self, other):  ❸
        return tuple(self) == tuple(other)

    def __hash__(self):
        hashes = (hash(x) for x in self._components)  ❹
        return functools.reduce(operator.xor, hashes, 0)  ❺

    # more lines omitted...
```

❶ Import `functools` to use `reduce`.

❷ Import `operator` to use `xor`.

❸ No change to `__eq__`; I listed it here because it's good practice to keep `__eq__` and `__hash__` close in source code, because they need to work together.

❹ Create a generator expression to lazily compute the hash of each component.

❺ Feed `hashes` to `reduce` with the `xor` function to compute the aggregate hash code; the third argument, `0`, is the initializer (see the next warning).

When using `reduce`, it's good practice to provide the third argument, `reduce(function, iterable, initializer)`, to prevent this exception: `TypeError: reduce() of empty sequence with no initial value` (excellent message: explains the problem and how to fix it). The `initializer` is the value returned if the sequence is empty and is used as the first argument in the reducing loop, so it should be the identity value of the operation. As examples, for `+`, `|`, `^` the `initializer` should be `0`, but for `*`, `&` it should be `1`.

As implemented, the `__hash__` method in Example 12-12 is a perfect example of a map-reduce computation (Figure 12-2).



Figure 12-2. Map-reduce: apply function to each item to generate a new series (map), then compute the aggregate (reduce).

The mapping step produces one hash for each component, and the reduce step aggregates all hashes with the `xor` operator. Using `map` instead of a *genexp* makes the mapping step even more visible:

```
    def __hash__(self):
        hashes = map(hash, self._components)
        return functools.reduce(operator.xor, hashes)
```

The solution with `map` would be less efficient in Python 2, where the `map` function builds a new `list` with the results. But in Python 3, `map` is lazy: it creates a generator that yields the results on demand, thus saving memory—just like the generator expression we used in the `__hash__` method of Example 12-8.

While we are on the topic of reducing functions, we can replace our quick implementation of `__eq__` with another one that will be cheaper in terms of processing and memory, at least for large vectors. As introduced in Example 11-2, we have this very concise implementation of `__eq__`:

```
    def __eq__(self, other):
        return tuple(self) == tuple(other)
```

This works for `Vector2d` and for `Vector`—it even considers `Vector([1, 2])` equal to `(1, 2)`, which may be a problem, but we'll overlook that for now.[5] But for `Vector` instances that may have thousands of components, it's very inefficient. It builds two tuples copying the entire contents of the operands just to use the `__eq__` of the `tuple` type. For `Vector2d` (with only two components), it's a good shortcut, but not for the large multidimensional vectors. A better way of comparing one `Vector` to another `Vector` or iterable would be Example 12-13.

Example 12-13. The `Vector.__eq__` implementation using `zip` in a `for` loop for more efficient comparison

```
def __eq__(self, other):
    if len(self) != len(other):  ❶
        return False
    for a, b in zip(self, other):  ❷
        if a != b:  ❸
            return False
    return True  ❹
```

❶ If the `len` of the objects are different, they are not equal.

❷ `zip` produces a generator of tuples made from the items in each iterable argument. See "The Awesome zip" on page 416 if `zip` is new to you. In ❶, the `len`

5 We will seriously consider the matter of `Vector([1, 2]) == (1, 2)` in "Operator Overloading 101" on page 562.

comparison is needed because `zip` stops producing values without warning as soon as one of the inputs is exhausted.

❸ As soon as two components are different, exit returning `False`.

❹ Otherwise, the objects are equal.

The `zip` function is named after the zipper fastener because the physical device works by interlocking pairs of teeth taken from both zipper sides, a good visual analogy for what `zip(left, right)` does. No relation to compressed files.

Example 12-13 is efficient, but the `all` function can produce the same aggregate computation of the `for` loop in one line: if all comparisons between corresponding components in the operands are `True`, the result is `True`. As soon as one comparison is `False`, `all` returns `False`. Example 12-14 shows how `__eq__` looks using `all`.

Example 12-14. The `Vector.__eq__` implementation using `zip` and `all`: same logic as Example 12-13

```
    def __eq__(self, other):
        return len(self) == len(other) and all(a == b for a, b in zip(self, other))
```

Note that we first check that the operands have equal length, because `zip` will stop at the shortest operand.

Example 12-14 is the implementation we choose for `__eq__` in *vector_v4.py*.

The Awesome zip

Having a `for` loop that iterates over items without fiddling with index variables is great and prevents lots of bugs, but demands some special utility functions. One of them is the `zip` built-in, which makes it easy to iterate in parallel over two or more iterables by returning tuples that you can unpack into variables, one for each item in the parallel inputs. See Example 12-15.

Example 12-15. The `zip` built-in at work

```
>>> zip(range(3), 'ABC')  ❶
<zip object at 0x10063ae48>
>>> list(zip(range(3), 'ABC'))  ❷
[(0, 'A'), (1, 'B'), (2, 'C')]
>>> list(zip(range(3), 'ABC', [0.0, 1.1, 2.2, 3.3]))  ❸
[(0, 'A', 0.0), (1, 'B', 1.1), (2, 'C', 2.2)]
```

```
>>> from itertools import zip_longest  ❹
>>> list(zip_longest(range(3), 'ABC', [0.0, 1.1, 2.2, 3.3], fillvalue=-1))
[(0, 'A', 0.0), (1, 'B', 1.1), (2, 'C', 2.2), (-1, -1, 3.3)]
```

❶ `zip` returns a generator that produces tuples on demand.

❷ Build a `list` just for display; usually we iterate over the generator.

❸ `zip` stops without warning when one of the iterables is exhausted.

❹ The `itertools.zip_longest` function behaves differently: it uses an optional `fillvalue` (`None` by default) to complete missing values so it can generate tuples until the last iterable is exhausted.

New zip() Option in Python 3.10

I wrote in the first edition of this book that `zip` silently stopping at the shortest iterable was surprising—not a good trait for an API. Silently ignoring part of the input can cause subtle bugs. Instead, `zip` should raise `ValueError` if the iterables are not all of the same length, which is what happens when unpacking an iterable to a tuple of variables of different length—in line with Python's *fail fast* policy. PEP 618—Add Optional Length-Checking To zip added an optional `strict` argument to `zip` to make it behave in that way. It is implemented in Python 3.10.

The `zip` function can also be used to transpose a matrix represented as nested iterables. For example:

```
>>> a = [(1, 2, 3),
...      (4, 5, 6)]
>>> list(zip(*a))
[(1, 4), (2, 5), (3, 6)]
>>> b = [(1, 2),
...      (3, 4),
...      (5, 6)]
>>> list(zip(*b))
[(1, 3, 5), (2, 4, 6)]
```

If you want to grok `zip`, spend some time figuring out how these examples work.

The `enumerate` built-in is another generator function often used in `for` loops to avoid direct handling of index variables. If you're not familiar with `enumerate`, you should definitely check it out in the "Built-in functions" documentation. The `zip` and

`enumerate` built-ins, along with several other generator functions in the standard library, are covered in "Generator Functions in the Standard Library" on page 619.

We wrap up this chapter by bringing back the `__format__` method from `Vector2d` to `Vector`.

Vector Take #5: Formatting

The `__format__` method of `Vector` will resemble that of `Vector2d`, but instead of providing a custom display in polar coordinates, `Vector` will use spherical coordinates—also known as "hyperspherical" coordinates, because now we support *n* dimensions, and spheres are "hyperspheres" in 4D and beyond.[6] Accordingly, we'll change the custom format suffix from `'p'` to `'h'`.

As we saw in "Formatted Displays" on page 370, when extending the Format Specification Mini-Language, it's best to avoid reusing format codes supported by built-in types. In particular, our extended mini-language also uses the float formatting codes `'eEfFgGn%'` in their original meaning, so we definitely must avoid these. Integers use `'bcdoxXn'` and strings use `'s'`. I picked `'p'` for `Vector2d` polar coordinates. Code `'h'` for hyperspherical coordinates is a good choice.

For example, given a `Vector` object in 4D space (`len(v) == 4`), the `'h'` code will produce a display like `<r, Φ₁, Φ₂, Φ₃>`, where `r` is the magnitude (`abs(v)`), and the remaining numbers are the angular components Φ_1, Φ_2, Φ_3.

Here are some samples of the spherical coordinate format in 4D, taken from the doctests of *vector_v5.py* (see Example 12-16):

```
>>> format(Vector([-1, -1, -1, -1]), 'h')
'<2.0, 2.0943951023931957, 2.186276035465284, 3.9269908169872414>'
>>> format(Vector([2, 2, 2, 2]), '.3eh')
'<4.000e+00, 1.047e+00, 9.553e-01, 7.854e-01>'
>>> format(Vector([0, 1, 0, 0]), '0.5fh')
'<1.00000, 1.57080, 0.00000, 0.00000>'
```

Before we can implement the minor changes required in `__format__`, we need to code a pair of support methods: `angle(n)` to compute one of the angular coordinates (e.g., Φ_1), and `angles()` to return an iterable of all angular coordinates. I will not

6 The Wolfram Mathworld website has an article on hypersphere; on Wikipedia, "hypersphere" redirects to the "*n*-sphere" entry.

describe the math here; if you're curious, Wikipedia's "*n*-sphere" entry has the formulas I used to calculate the spherical coordinates from the Cartesian coordinates in the `Vector` components array.

Example 12-16 is a full listing of *vector_v5.py* consolidating all we've implemented since "Vector Take #1: Vector2d Compatible" on page 399 and introducing custom formatting.

Example 12-16. vector_v5.py: doctests and all code for the final `Vector` class; callouts highlight additions needed to support `__format__`

```
"""
A multidimensional ``Vector`` class, take 5

A ``Vector`` is built from an iterable of numbers::

    >>> Vector([3.1, 4.2])
    Vector([3.1, 4.2])
    >>> Vector((3, 4, 5))
    Vector([3.0, 4.0, 5.0])
    >>> Vector(range(10))
    Vector([0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, ...])


Tests with two dimensions (same results as ``vector2d_v1.py``)::

    >>> v1 = Vector([3, 4])
    >>> x, y = v1
    >>> x, y
    (3.0, 4.0)
    >>> v1
    Vector([3.0, 4.0])
    >>> v1_clone = eval(repr(v1))
    >>> v1 == v1_clone
    True
    >>> print(v1)
    (3.0, 4.0)
    >>> octets = bytes(v1)
    >>> octets
    b'd\x00\x00\x00\x00\x00\x00\x08@\x00\x00\x00\x00\x00\x00\x10@'
    >>> abs(v1)
    5.0
    >>> bool(v1), bool(Vector([0, 0]))
    (True, False)


Test of ``.frombytes()`` class method:

    >>> v1_clone = Vector.frombytes(bytes(v1))
    >>> v1_clone
```

```
    Vector([3.0, 4.0])
    >>> v1 == v1_clone
    True


Tests with three dimensions::

    >>> v1 = Vector([3, 4, 5])
    >>> x, y, z = v1
    >>> x, y, z
    (3.0, 4.0, 5.0)
    >>> v1
    Vector([3.0, 4.0, 5.0])
    >>> v1_clone = eval(repr(v1))
    >>> v1 == v1_clone
    True
    >>> print(v1)
    (3.0, 4.0, 5.0)
    >>> abs(v1)  # doctest:+ELLIPSIS
    7.071067811...
    >>> bool(v1), bool(Vector([0, 0, 0]))
    (True, False)


Tests with many dimensions::

    >>> v7 = Vector(range(7))
    >>> v7
    Vector([0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, ...])
    >>> abs(v7)  # doctest:+ELLIPSIS
    9.53939201...


Test of ``.__bytes__`` and ``.frombytes()`` methods::

    >>> v1 = Vector([3, 4, 5])
    >>> v1_clone = Vector.frombytes(bytes(v1))
    >>> v1_clone
    Vector([3.0, 4.0, 5.0])
    >>> v1 == v1_clone
    True


Tests of sequence behavior::

    >>> v1 = Vector([3, 4, 5])
    >>> len(v1)
    3
    >>> v1[0], v1[len(v1)-1], v1[-1]
    (3.0, 5.0, 5.0)
```

```
Test of slicing::

    >>> v7 = Vector(range(7))
    >>> v7[-1]
    6.0
    >>> v7[1:4]
    Vector([1.0, 2.0, 3.0])
    >>> v7[-1:]
    Vector([6.0])
    >>> v7[1,2]
    Traceback (most recent call last):
      ...
    TypeError: 'tuple' object cannot be interpreted as an integer


Tests of dynamic attribute access::

    >>> v7 = Vector(range(10))
    >>> v7.x
    0.0
    >>> v7.y, v7.z, v7.t
    (1.0, 2.0, 3.0)

Dynamic attribute lookup failures::

    >>> v7.k
    Traceback (most recent call last):
      ...
    AttributeError: 'Vector' object has no attribute 'k'
    >>> v3 = Vector(range(3))
    >>> v3.t
    Traceback (most recent call last):
      ...
    AttributeError: 'Vector' object has no attribute 't'
    >>> v3.spam
    Traceback (most recent call last):
      ...
    AttributeError: 'Vector' object has no attribute 'spam'


Tests of hashing::

    >>> v1 = Vector([3, 4])
    >>> v2 = Vector([3.1, 4.2])
    >>> v3 = Vector([3, 4, 5])
    >>> v6 = Vector(range(6))
    >>> hash(v1), hash(v3), hash(v6)
    (7, 2, 1)


Most hash codes of non-integers vary from a 32-bit to 64-bit CPython build::
```

```
    >>> import sys
    >>> hash(v2) == (384307168202284039 if sys.maxsize > 2**32 else 357915986)
    True


Tests of ``format()`` with Cartesian coordinates in 2D::

    >>> v1 = Vector([3, 4])
    >>> format(v1)
    '(3.0, 4.0)'
    >>> format(v1, '.2f')
    '(3.00, 4.00)'
    >>> format(v1, '.3e')
    '(3.000e+00, 4.000e+00)'


Tests of ``format()`` with Cartesian coordinates in 3D and 7D::

    >>> v3 = Vector([3, 4, 5])
    >>> format(v3)
    '(3.0, 4.0, 5.0)'
    >>> format(Vector(range(7)))
    '(0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 6.0)'


Tests of ``format()`` with spherical coordinates in 2D, 3D and 4D::

    >>> format(Vector([1, 1]), 'h')  # doctest:+ELLIPSIS
    '<1.414213..., 0.785398...>'
    >>> format(Vector([1, 1]), '.3eh')
    '<1.414e+00, 7.854e-01>'
    >>> format(Vector([1, 1]), '0.5fh')
    '<1.41421, 0.78540>'
    >>> format(Vector([1, 1, 1]), 'h')  # doctest:+ELLIPSIS
    '<1.73205..., 0.95531..., 0.78539...>'
    >>> format(Vector([2, 2, 2]), '.3eh')
    '<3.464e+00, 9.553e-01, 7.854e-01>'
    >>> format(Vector([0, 0, 0]), '0.5fh')
    '<0.00000, 0.00000, 0.00000>'
    >>> format(Vector([-1, -1, -1, -1]), 'h')  # doctest:+ELLIPSIS
    '<2.0, 2.09439..., 2.18627..., 3.92699...>'
    >>> format(Vector([2, 2, 2, 2]), '.3eh')
    '<4.000e+00, 1.047e+00, 9.553e-01, 7.854e-01>'
    >>> format(Vector([0, 1, 0, 0]), '0.5fh')
    '<1.00000, 1.57080, 0.00000, 0.00000>'
"""

from array import array
import reprlib
import math
import functools
import operator
```

```
import itertools  ❶


class Vector:
    typecode = 'd'

    def __init__(self, components):
        self._components = array(self.typecode, components)

    def __iter__(self):
        return iter(self._components)

    def __repr__(self):
        components = reprlib.repr(self._components)
        components = components[components.find('['):-1]
        return f'Vector({components})'

    def __str__(self):
        return str(tuple(self))

    def __bytes__(self):
        return (bytes([ord(self.typecode)]) +
                bytes(self._components))

    def __eq__(self, other):
        return (len(self) == len(other) and
                all(a == b for a, b in zip(self, other)))

    def __hash__(self):
        hashes = (hash(x) for x in self)
        return functools.reduce(operator.xor, hashes, 0)

    def __abs__(self):
        return math.hypot(*self)

    def __bool__(self):
        return bool(abs(self))

    def __len__(self):
        return len(self._components)

    def __getitem__(self, key):
        if isinstance(key, slice):
            cls = type(self)
            return cls(self._components[key])
        index = operator.index(key)
        return self._components[index]

    __match_args__ = ('x', 'y', 'z', 't')

    def __getattr__(self, name):
        cls = type(self)
```

```
        try:
            pos = cls.__match_args__.index(name)
        except ValueError:
            pos = -1
        if 0 <= pos < len(self._components):
            return self._components[pos]
        msg = f'{cls.__name__!r} object has no attribute {name!r}'
        raise AttributeError(msg)

    def angle(self, n):  ❷
        r = math.hypot(*self[n:])
        a = math.atan2(r, self[n-1])
        if (n == len(self) - 1) and (self[-1] < 0):
            return math.pi * 2 - a
        else:
            return a

    def angles(self):  ❸
        return (self.angle(n) for n in range(1, len(self)))

    def __format__(self, fmt_spec=''):
        if fmt_spec.endswith('h'):  # hyperspherical coordinates
            fmt_spec = fmt_spec[:-1]
            coords = itertools.chain([abs(self)],
                                     self.angles())  ❹
            outer_fmt = '<{}>'  ❺
        else:
            coords = self
            outer_fmt = '({})'  ❻
        components = (format(c, fmt_spec) for c in coords)  ❼
        return outer_fmt.format(', '.join(components))  ❽

    @classmethod
    def frombytes(cls, octets):
        typecode = chr(octets[0])
        memv = memoryview(octets[1:]).cast(typecode)
        return cls(memv)
```

❶ Import `itertools` to use `chain` function in `__format__`.

❷ Compute one of the angular coordinates, using formulas adapted from the *n*-sphere article.

❸ Create a generator expression to compute all angular coordinates on demand.

❹ Use `itertools.chain` to produce *genexp* to iterate seamlessly over the magnitude and the angular coordinates.

❺ Configure a spherical coordinate display with angular brackets.

❻ Configure a Cartesian coordinate display with parentheses.

❼ Create a generator expression to format each coordinate item on demand.

❽ Plug formatted components separated by commas inside brackets or parentheses.

We are making heavy use of generator expressions in `__format__`, `angle`, and `angles`, but our focus here is in providing `__format__` to bring `Vector` to the same implementation level as `Vector2d`. When we cover generators in Chapter 17, we'll use some of the code in `Vector` as examples, and then the generator tricks will be explained in detail.

This concludes our mission for this chapter. The `Vector` class will be enhanced with infix operators in Chapter 16, but our goal here was to explore techniques for coding special methods that are useful in a wide variety of collection classes.

Chapter Summary

The `Vector` example in this chapter was designed to be compatible with `Vector2d`, except for the use of a different constructor signature accepting a single iterable argument, just like the built-in sequence types do. The fact that `Vector` behaves as a sequence just by implementing `__getitem__` and `__len__` prompted a discussion of protocols, the informal interfaces used in duck-typed languages.

We then looked at how the `my_seq[a:b:c]` syntax works behind the scenes, by creating a `slice(a, b, c)` object and handing it to `__getitem__`. Armed with this knowledge, we made `Vector` respond correctly to slicing, by returning new `Vector` instances, just like a Pythonic sequence is expected to do.

The next step was to provide read-only access to the first few `Vector` components using notation such as `my_vec.x`. We did it by implementing `__getattr__`. Doing that opened the possibility of tempting the user to assign to those special components by writing `my_vec.x = 7`, revealing a potential bug. We fixed it by implementing `__setattr__` as well, to forbid assigning values to single-letter attributes. Very often, when you code a `__getattr__` you need to add `__setattr__` too, in order to avoid inconsistent behavior.

Implementing the `__hash__` function provided the perfect context for using `functools.reduce`, because we needed to apply the xor operator `^` in succession to the hashes of all `Vector` components to produce an aggregate hash code for the whole

`Vector`. After applying `reduce` in `__hash__`, we used the `all` reducing built-in to create a more efficient `__eq__` method.

The last enhancement to `Vector` was to reimplement the `__format__` method from `Vector2d` by supporting spherical coordinates as an alternative to the default Cartesian coordinates. We used quite a bit of math and several generators to code `__format__` and its auxiliary functions, but these are implementation details—and we'll come back to the generators in Chapter 17. The goal of that last section was to support a custom format, thus fulfilling the promise of a `Vector` that could do everything a `Vector2d` did, and more.

As we did in Chapter 11, here we often looked at how standard Python objects behave, to emulate them and provide a "Pythonic" look-and-feel to `Vector`.

In Chapter 16, we will implement several infix operators on `Vector`. The math will be much simpler than in the `angle()` method here, but exploring how infix operators work in Python is a great lesson in OO design. But before we get to operator overloading, we'll step back from working on one class and look at organizing multiple classes with interfaces and inheritance, the subjects of Chapters 13 and 14.

Further Reading

Most special methods covered in the `Vector` example also appear in the `Vector2d` example from Chapter 11, so the references in "Further Reading" on page 392 are all relevant here.

The powerful `reduce` higher-order function is also known as fold, accumulate, aggregate, compress, and inject. For more information, see Wikipedia's "Fold (higher-order function)" article, which presents applications of that higher-order function with emphasis on functional programming with recursive data structures. The article also includes a table listing fold-like functions in dozens of programming languages.

"What's New in Python 2.5" has a short explanation of `__index__`, designed to support `__getitem__` methods, as we saw in "A Slice-Aware __getitem__" on page 406. PEP 357—Allowing Any Object to be Used for Slicing details the need for it from the perspective of an implementor of a C-extension—Travis Oliphant, the primary creator of NumPy. Oliphant's many contributions to Python made it a leading scientific computing language, which then positioned it to lead the way in machine learning applications.

Soapbox

Protocols as Informal Interfaces

Protocols are not an invention of Python. The Smalltalk team, which also coined the expression "object-oriented," used "protocol" as a synonym for what we now call interfaces. Some Smalltalk programming environments allowed programmers to tag a group of methods as a protocol, but that was merely a documentation and navigation aid, and not enforced by the language. That's why I believe "informal interface" is a reasonable short explanation for "protocol" when I speak to an audience that is more familiar with formal (and compiler enforced) interfaces.

Established protocols naturally evolve in any language that uses dynamic typing, that is, when type checking is done at runtime because there is no static type information in method signatures and variables. Ruby is another important object-oriented language that has dynamic typing and uses protocols.

In the Python documentation, you can often tell when a protocol is being discussed when you see language like "a file-like object." This is a quick way of saying "something that behaves sufficiently like a file, by implementing the parts of the file interface that are relevant in the context."

You may think that implementing only part of a protocol is sloppy, but it has the advantage of keeping things simple. Section 3.3 of the "Data Model" chapter suggests:

> When implementing a class that emulates any built-in type, it is important that the emulation only be implemented to the degree that it makes sense for the object being modeled. For example, some sequences may work well with retrieval of individual elements, but extracting a slice may not make sense.

When we don't need to code nonsense methods just to fulfill some overdesigned interface contract and keep the compiler happy, it becomes easier to follow the KISS principle.

On the other hand, if you want to use a type checker to verify your protocol implementations, then a stricter definition of protocol is required. That's what `typing.Protocol` provides.

I'll have more to say about protocols and interfaces in Chapter 13, where they are the main focus.

Origins of Duck Typing

I believe the Ruby community, more than any other, helped popularize the term "duck typing," as they preached to the Java masses. But the expression has been used in Python discussions before either Ruby or Python were "popular." According to Wikipedia, an early example of the duck analogy in object-oriented programming is a message to the Python-list by Alex Martelli from July 26, 2000: "polymorphism (was

Re: Type checking in python?)". That's where the quote at the beginning of this chapter comes from. If you are curious about the literary origins of the "duck typing" term, and the applications of this OO concept in many languages, check out Wikipedia's "Duck typing" entry.

A Safe `__format__`, with Enhanced Usability

While implementing `__format__`, I did not take any precautions regarding `Vector` instances with a very large number of components, as we did in `__repr__` using `reprlib`. The reasoning is that `repr()` is for debugging and logging, so it must always generate some serviceable output, while `__format__` is used to display output to end users who presumably want to see the entire `Vector`. If you think this is dangerous, then it would be cool to implement a further extension to the Format Specifier Mini-Language.

Here is how I'd do it: by default, any formatted `Vector` would display a reasonable but limited number of components, say 30. If there are more elements than that, the default behavior would be similar to what the `reprlib` does: chop the excess and put `...` in its place. However, if the format specifier ended with the special `*` code, meaning "all," then the size limitation would be disabled. So a user who's unaware of the problem of very long displays will not be bitten by it by accident. But if the default limitation becomes a nuisance, then the presence of the `...` could lead the user to search the documentation and discover the `*` formatting code.

The Search for a Pythonic Sum

There's no single answer to "What is Pythonic?" just as there's no single answer to "What is beautiful?" Saying, as I often do, that it means using "idiomatic Python" is not 100% satisfactory, because what may be "idiomatic" for you may not be for me. One thing I know: "idiomatic" does not mean using the most obscure language features.

In the Python-list, there's a thread titled "Pythonic Way to Sum n-th List Element?" from April 2003. It's relevant to our discussion of `reduce` in this chapter.

The original poster, Guy Middleton, asked for an improvement on this solution, stating he did not like to use `lambda`:[7]

```
>>> my_list = [[1, 2, 3], [40, 50, 60], [9, 8, 7]]
>>> import functools
>>> functools.reduce(lambda a, b: a+b, [sub[1] for sub in my_list])
60
```

7 I adapted the code for this presentation: in 2003, `reduce` was a built-in, but in Python 3 we need to import it; also, I replaced the names `x` and `y` with `my_list` and `sub`, for sub-list.

That code uses lots of idioms: `lambda`, `reduce`, and a list comprehension. It would probably come last in a popularity contest, because it offends people who hate `lambda` and those who despise list comprehensions—pretty much both sides of a divide.

If you're going to use `lambda`, there's probably no reason to use a list comprehension—except for filtering, which is not the case here.

Here is a solution of my own that will please the `lambda` lovers:

```
>>> functools.reduce(lambda a, b: a + b[1], my_list, 0)
60
```

I did not take part in the original thread, and I wouldn't use that in real code, because I don't like `lambda` too much myself, but I wanted to show an example without a list comprehension.

The first answer came from Fernando Perez, creator of IPython, highlighting that NumPy supports *n*-dimensional arrays and *n*-dimensional slicing:

```
>>> import numpy as np
>>> my_array = np.array(my_list)
>>> np.sum(my_array[:, 1])
60
```

I think Perez's solution is cool, but Guy Middleton praised this next solution, by Paul Rubin and Skip Montanaro:

```
>>> import operator
>>> functools.reduce(operator.add, [sub[1] for sub in my_list], 0)
60
```

Then Evan Simpson asked, "What's wrong with this?":

```
>>> total = 0
>>> for sub in my_list:
...     total += sub[1]
...
>>> total
60
```

Lots of people agreed that was quite Pythonic. Alex Martelli went as far as saying that's probably how Guido would code it.

I like Evan Simpson's code, but I also like David Eppstein's comment on it:

> If you want the sum of a list of items, you should write it in a way that looks like "the sum of a list of items," not in a way that looks like "loop over these items, maintain another variable t, perform a sequence of additions." Why do we have high-level languages if not to express our intentions at a higher level and let the language worry about what low-level operations are needed to implement it?

Then Alex Martelli comes back to suggest:

> "The sum" is so frequently needed that I wouldn't mind at all if Python singled it out as a built-in. But "reduce(operator.add, …" just isn't a great way to express it, in my opinion (and yet as an old APL'er, and FP-liker, I *should* like it—but I don't).

Alex goes on to suggest a `sum()` function, which he contributed. It became a built-in in Python 2.3, released only three months after that conversation took place. So Alex's preferred syntax became the norm:

```
>>> sum([sub[1] for sub in my_list])
60
```

By the end of the next year (November 2004), Python 2.4 was launched with generator expressions, providing what is now in my opinion the most Pythonic answer to Guy Middleton's original question:

```
>>> sum(sub[1] for sub in my_list)
60
```

This is not only more readable than `reduce` but also avoids the trap of the empty sequence: `sum([])` is `0`, simple as that.

In the same conversation, Alex Martelli suggests the `reduce` built-in in Python 2 was more trouble than it was worth, because it encouraged coding idioms that were hard to explain. He was most convincing: the function was demoted to the `functools` module in Python 3.

Still, `functools.reduce` has its place. It solved the problem of our `Vector.__hash__` in a way that I would call Pythonic.