

CS 115 Functional Programming

Lecture 5:

Higher-order functions, part 2





Today

- More Haskell basics
 - @-patterns, case expressions
- More higher-order functions on lists
 - foldr
 - foldl
 - scanl
- List comprehensions





More Haskell Basics





@-patterns

- Sometimes, when pattern matching an argument, want to destructure the argument but also have a name for the entire argument
 - so can use both in the definition





@-patterns

Example problem from assignment:

```
insert :: Integer -> [Integer] -> [Integer]
insert n [] = [n]
insert n m@(m1:_) | n < m1 = n : m
insert n (m1:ms) = m1 : insert n ms</pre>
```

- In second equation, need both the parts of the list (here, just the head m1) and the entire list m
- The @-pattern says that m is the name of the entire list and m1 is the name of the head





@-patterns

Without @-pattern we would have to write:

```
insert :: Integer -> [Integer] -> [Integer]
insert n [] = [n]
insert n (m1:ms) | n < m1 = n : m1 : ms
insert n (m1:ms) = m1 : insert n ms</pre>
```

- Problem: we are re-creating a list (m1:ms) which already exists as m!
 - Inefficient, poor style
- Use @-patterns for more elegant code





case expression

- Most often, we use pattern matching in equations that define a function
- We can also "manually" invoke pattern matching using a case expression
- All functions can be written using case expressions instead of equations
- Haskell compilers internally convert equations into case expressions





case expression

Familiar example:

```
factorial :: Integer -> Integer
factorial 0 = 1
factorial n = n * factorial (n - 1)
With case expression:
factorial n =
  case n of
    0 \to 1
    m -> m * factorial (m - 1)
```





case expression

- When should we use case expressions?
- Usually not good style to use when we can use normal equational style instead (at top level)
- Need to use a case expression if you have to pattern-match against a value which has been computed in the course of the execution of a function
- Also useful if you need a where clause that spans multiple cases





More higher-order functions





So far

- We have seen the map and filter higher-order functions
- These functions take in and return lists
- Sometimes want to take in an entire list and return a single value that represents something interesting about the list
- We say that we want to "reduce" or "fold" the list into a single value
- Various Haskell functions exist to do this





Problem

- Let's write a function to add up all the numbers in a list of Integers
- Writing a recursive definition is straightforward:

```
sum :: [Integer] -> Integer
sum [] = 0
sum (n:ns) = n + sum ns
```

- Let's try to extract the relevant parts of this into a higher-order function on lists
- What aspects of this are likely to change?





Generalizing sum

- The operation to be done on the list elements doesn't have to be +
- The value returned from the empty list doesn't have to be 0
- Let's write a more generic version of sum that can take + and 0 as arguments
- We'll call it accumulate





Generalizing sum

• First try:

```
accumulate :: (Integer -> Integer -> Integer)
  -> Integer -> [Integer] -> Integer
accumulate _ init [] = init
accumulate f init (n:ns) =
  f n (accumulate f init ns)
```

 Note that the structure of this function is identical to the sum function, with sum replaced by accumulate f init, + replaced by f, and 0 replaced by init





 Arguments don't have to use Integer; let's make this polymorphic!

```
accumulate :: (a -> a -> a) -> a -> [a] -> a
accumulate _ init [] = init
accumulate f init (n:ns) =
  f n (accumulate f init ns)
```

- Now we can accumulate any data type
- But wait: why does the type of the initial value have to be the same as the type of the contents of the list?





 We can use (possibly) different types for initial value and list contents (more general):

```
accumulate :: (a -> b -> b) -> b -> [a] -> b
accumulate _ init [] = init
accumulate f init (n:ns) =
  f n (accumulate f init ns)
```

- This very general function has a name in Haskell: foldr (for "fold right")
- Let's see how to define sum in terms of foldr





• sum in terms of foldr:

```
sum :: [Integer] -> Integer
sum lst = foldr (+) 0 lst
```

 We can also write this as follows (eta contraction, more point-free style):

```
sum :: [Integer] -> Integer
sum = foldr (+) 0 -- no lst on either side
```





 Let's expand this definition using the equations for accumulate (foldr)

```
sum [] = foldr (+) 0 [] = 0
sum (n:ns) = foldr (+) 0 (n:ns)
= n + (foldr (+) 0) ns
```

• Substituting sum for foldr (+) 0, we get:

```
sum [] = 0
sum (n:ns) = n + sum ns
```

We've derived our original function!





- What does foldr actually do?
- Consider a list: [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
- Can write it as: 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : []
- Which really means:

```
= (1 : (2 : (3 : (4 : (5 : [])))))
```

- foldr takes two arguments besides the list:
 - a function of two arguments
 - an initial value
- How does foldr use these to compute its value?





- What does foldr actually do?
- foldr takes
 - an operator (op)
 - an initial value (init)
 - a list
- and returns the result of exchanging op for the:
 operator (used to construct the list), and init for the empty list



```
foldr (+) 0 [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
foldr (+) 0 (1 : (2 : (3 : (4 : (5 : [])))))
Substitute + for :, 0 for [] to get:
1 + (2 + (3 + (4 + (5 + 0)))))
1 + (2 + (3 + (4 + 5))))
1 + (2 + (3 + 9)))
1 + (2 + 12)
1 + 14
15
```





- foldr is a very flexible function
- Many other Haskell functions can be defined in terms of foldr
- Let's see some examples



concat

- concat is a function which takes a list of lists and concatenates it into a single list ("flattening" the list of lists)
- We can define concat recursively as follows:

```
concat :: [[a]] -> [a]
concat [] = ?
concat (xs:xss) = ?
```





concat

```
concat :: [[a]] -> [a]
concat [] = []
concat (xs:xss) = xs ++ (concat xss)
• In terms of foldr:
concat xss = foldr (++) [] xss
• or just:
concat = foldr (++) []
```





concat

Why this works:

```
concat [lst1, lst2, ...]
= lst1 ++ lst2 ++ ... ++ []
```





++

- Can also define ++ (list append) in terms of foldr
- Let's try to derive it:

```
[1, 2, 3] ++ [4, 5, 6]

(1: (2: (3: []))) ++ [4, 5, 6]

foldr (:) [4, 5, 6] (1: (2: (3: []))

• Replace: with:, [] with [4, 5, 6] to get:

(1: (2: (3: [4, 5, 6])))

[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]
```







So we have this definition:

```
(++) :: [a] -> [a] -> [a]
lst1 ++ lst2 = foldr (:) lst2 lst1
```

- Let's look at an even more elegant (point-free) definition of ++
- Rewrite definition as:

```
(++) lst1 lst2 = foldr (:) lst2 lst1
```







```
(++) lst1 lst2 = foldr (:) lst2 lst1
```

We would like to define ++ as:

```
(++) = foldr (:)
```

- But this isn't correct (arguments lst1 and lst2 are in wrong order)
- Introduce the flip function:

```
flip :: (a -> b -> c) -> (b -> a -> c)
flip f x y = f y x
```







• This leads to this definition:

```
(++) = flip (foldr (:))
and concat can be defined as:
concat = foldr (flip (foldr (:))) []
```

- foldr is powerful!
- Warning: excessive use of point-free style can lead to impossible-to-understand code!
 - but it'll be really elegant ☺





Tip on using foldr

- The function argument of foldr takes two arguments:
 - the current element of the list
 - the result of applying foldr to the rest of the list
- I sometimes write the function as (\x r -> ...)
 where x is the current element, r the rest of the list
 (after processing by foldr) to keep this straight



map in terms of foldr

- Let's try to define map in terms of foldr
- The value we're accumulating is the mapped list
- We will end up with

```
map f lst = foldr (\xspace x r -> ...) [] lst
```

- Just need to fill in . . .
- Assume that r is the rest of the list, with f mapped over it
 - i.e. r is map f (tail 1st)
- Then, how to define $(\x r -> \dots)$?





map in terms of foldr

```
map f lst = foldr (\xspace x r -> ...) [] lst
```

- Assume that r is the rest of the list, with f mapped over it
 - i.e. r is map f (tail 1st)
- (\x r -> ...) must be (\x r -> f x : r) to get the entire mapped list
- Definition:

```
map f lst = foldr (x r -> f x : r) [] lst
map f = foldr (x r -> f x : r) [] -- better
```





map in terms of foldr

Definition:

```
map f = foldr (\x r -> f x : r) []
```

Even more concise (almost) point-free definition:

```
map f = foldr ((:) . f) []
```

- (Work out how this works.)
- Totally pointfree definition:

```
map = flip foldr [] . ((:) .)
```

Awesome! ©





foldl

 We've seen that foldr can be used to represent computations of this form:

```
x1 op (x2 op (x3 op (x4 op init)))
```

- This is natural for operators that associate to the right (like (:))
- It would be nice to have a fold that can represent computations of this form:

```
((((init op x1) op x2) op x3) op x4)
```

This is called a "left fold" or fold1





foldl

- fold1 combines the init value with the first list element, and keeps combining with each successive list value until the end of the list is reached
- Definition:

```
foldl :: (a -> b -> a) -> a -> [b] -> a
foldl _ init [] = init
foldl f init (x:xs) = foldl f (f init x) xs
```



foldl

Definition:

```
foldl :: (a -> b -> a) -> a -> [b] -> a
foldl _ init [] = init
foldl f init (x:xs) = foldl f (f init x) xs
```

- Thoughts on this? Advantages vs foldr?
 Disadvantages?
- Consider:

```
sum = foldl (+) 0
```





foldl

Evaluate

```
sum = foldl (+) 0 [1, 2, 3]
= foldl (+) (0 + 1) [2, 3]
= foldl (+) ((0 + 1) + 2) [3]
= foldl (+) (((0 + 1) + 2) + 3) []
= (((0 + 1) + 2) + 3)
= (1 + 2) + 3 = 3 + 3 = 6
```





foldl

This is a space leak:

```
sum = foldl (+) 0 [1, 2, 3]
= foldl (+) (0 + 1) [2, 3]
= foldl (+) ((0 + 1) + 2) [3]
= foldl (+) (((0 + 1) + 2) + 3) []
= (((0 + 1) + 2) + 3)
```

 The definition doesn't look like it would yield an expression O(N) long (N = length of list), but it does





foldl

- Space leaks are very tricky to detect!
 - Special tools ("heap profilers") exist to help
- Once detected, there are ways to make functions evaluate more strictly
- In the case of fold1, there is a strict version called fold1' which doesn't cause space leaks
 - rarely a good idea to use fold1 instead of fold1'





Space leaks

- Space leaks are an unfortunate consequence of Haskell's lazy evaluation model
- Haskell tries to be "high-level" (don't have to think about anything not related to the computation) but sometimes "low-level" concerns (like space usage) unavoidably come up



Scans

- In addition to folds, Haskell also has "scan" functions
- These are like folds except that they save a list of all the partial evaluations in a fold
- Easiest to show by example



scanl

- The most intuitive one is scan1 ("scan left")
- Example:

```
ghci> scanl (+) 0 [1,2,3,4,5] [0,1,3,6,10,15]
```

See how the partial sums are collected in a list

```
= [0, 0+1, (0+1)+2, ((0+1)+2)+3,
  (((0+1)+2)+3)+4, ((((0+1)+2)+3)+4)+5]
```

- Last element in list is the full sum
- There is also a scan1 ' if you want to avoid space leaks (recommended)





scanr

- Much less used is scanr ("scan right")
- Example:

```
ghci> scanr (+) 0 [1,2,3,4,5] [15, 14, 12, 9, 5, 0]
```

This is equal to:

```
= [1+(2+(3+(4+(5+0)))), 2+(3+(4+(5+0))),
3+(4+(5+0)), 4+(5+0), 5+0, 0]
```





Summing up

- It's remarkable how many functions can be written using just simple higher-order functions like map, filter, foldl/foldr, scanl/scanr
- If necessary, it's easy to write new HOFs
 - but it's fun to see how far you can go with just the predefined ones!







- Often the case that you want to build a list with certain properties
- Elements of list are the result of evaluating an expression for certain values of the variables in the expression
- May want to impose some other criteria on the list elements as well
- In Haskell, we can do this with a list comprehension



- A list comprehension is a description of
 - the elements of a list (expression)
 - where the variables come from (generators)
 - what other criteria must be met (filters)
- Syntax:

```
[<expression> | <generators>, <filters>]
```

Generators have the form

```
x < - [1..1000]
```

(x is taken elementwise from the list [1..1000])





Simple list comprehension:

```
Prelude> [x * 2 | x <- [1..10]]
[2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20]
```

Two generators:

```
Prelude> [(x, y) | x <- [1..3], y <- [1..3]]
[(1,1),(1,2),(1,3),(2,1),(2,2),(2,3),(3,1),
(3,2),(3,3)]
```

Note: rightmost generator "changes fastest"





Filters

 To filter out elements from a list comprehension, add a boolean expression (which must evaluate to True for the generator values to be accepted)

```
Prelude> [(x, y) | x <- [1..6], y <- [1..6], x + y == 7]
[(1,6),(2,5),(3,4),(4,3),(5,2),(6,1)]
```

- Can have multiple filters, separated by commas
- Can interleave generators and filters
 - but filters must not refer to generators that follow them





Patterns in generators

Generators can bind patterns

```
Prelude> [x + y | (x, y) <- [(1,2),(3,4),(5,6)]]
[3,7,11]
```

Here, (1, 2) unpacked into (x, y), binding 1 to x and 2 to y in the expression x + y





map, filter

List comprehensions can take the place of map:

```
map f [x1, x2, x3, ...]
== [f x | x <- [x1, x2, x3, ...]]
• List comprehensions can take the place of filter:
filter p [x1, x2, x3, ...]
== [x | x <- [x1, x2, x3, ...], p x]</pre>
```





Examples

 List comprehensions can be used to write very concise definitions

```
quicksort :: [Integer] -> [Integer]
quicksort [] = []
quicksort (x:xs) =
   quicksort lt ++ [x] ++ quicksort ge
   where
    lt = [y | y <- xs, y < x]
    ge = [y | y <- xs, y >= x]
```





Next time

- Defining new data types (algebraic data types)
- Coming up: Type classes

