CS 115
Functional Programming

Lecture 4: April 6, 2016

Higher-order functions, part 1

Today

- Higher-order functions on lists
- Anonymous functions
- Simple code transformations
- Point-free style
- More on lazy evaluation

Higher-order functions

- Functions in functional languages are *data*
  - can be passed as arguments to other functions
  - can be created on-the-fly
  - can be returned from functions
- Functions which take other functions as arguments and/or return functions as results are called "higher-order" functions

Higher-order functions

- Higher-order functions are the first distinctly "functional" aspect of functional programming we've seen
- This will lead to a style of programming where new functions can often be created by "snapping together" other functions
- Benefits:
  - easier to write code
  - greater confidence that the code is correct

List functions

- Functions on lists include many very useful higher-order functions
- Two simple examples: **`map`** and **`filter`**

`map`

- The `map` function takes a function and a list as its arguments
  - applies the function to each element of the list
  - collects all the results in a new list
  - returns the new list
- For this to work, the function must be *unary* (taking one argument)
- Fortunately, *all* Haskell functions are unary, so not a limitation ☺

`map`

- What is `map`'s type signature?

```
map :: (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b]
```

- `map` takes
  - a function from type `a` to type `b`
  - a list of values of type `a`
- and returns
  - a list of values of type `b`
  - Note: type `b` can be the same as type `a`

`map` examples

```
double :: Int -> Int
double x = 2 * x

Prelude> map double [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
[2,4,6,8,10]
Prelude> map (*2) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
[2,4,6,8,10]
```

Anonymous functions

- Often we want to create a function for a single use
- For example: `double` function on previous slide
  - maybe that's the only place `double` was ever needed
  - requiring that you write a separate function for this is overkill
  - can use an operator section like `(2*)` here, but this is not always possible

Anonymous functions

- Haskell allows you to define *anonymous functions* (functions with no name)
- This is part of what it means for functions to be data: can create them "on the fly"
- They are also referred to as *lambda expressions*
  - from lambda calculus (theoretical underpinnings of Haskell) and Lisp/Scheme

Anonymous functions

- Example:

```
Prelude> map (\x -> 2 * x) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
[2, 4, 6, 8, 10]
```

- Syntax:

```
\<pattern> -> <expression>
```

- Often `<pattern>` is one or more variables
- The `\` is the typographic symbol most similar to "lambda" (λ)

Puzzle

- What does this return?

```
Prelude> map (\x y -> x + y) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
```

- *Hint*: the lambda expression `(\x y -> x + y)` has the type `(Int -> Int -> Int)` (when used with `Int`s)
- This expression returns a list of type `[Int -> Int]`
- It's a list of adder functions:

```
[\y -> 1 + y, \y -> 2 + y, \y -> 3 + y,
\y -> 4 + y, \y -> 5 + y]
```

- Equivalent to *e.g.* `[add1, add2, add3, add4, add5]`

Puzzle

- Useful way to think about this:

```
\x y -> x + y
```

- is the same as:

```
\x -> \y -> x + y
```

- (due to currying)

Puzzle

- This is equivalent to

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

- This looks like a type error, but isn't due to curried nature of functions
- Note: if you type this into `ghci`, get error because can't print functions (no printable representation)

Definition of **`map`**

```
map :: (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b]
map f [] = []  -- or use _ for f
map f (x:xs) = f x : map f xs
```

Infinite lists and **`map`**

- This definition works with infinite lists:

```
Prelude> take 10 (map (2*) [1..])
[2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20]
```

- Interesting definition:

```
integers :: [Integer]
integers = 1 : map (1+) integers
```

- Let's evaluate:

```
take 3 integers
```

Infinite lists and `map`

- `take` definition:

```
take :: Int -> [a] -> [a]
take 0 _ = []
take _ [] = error "take: no elements"
take n (x:xs) = x : take (n-1) xs
```

  - *N.B.* This isn't exactly the same as the built-in `take` function
- Evaluate:

```
take 3 integers
```

Infinite lists and `map`

- Evaluate:

```
take 3 integers
```

- Reduce:

```
take 3 (1 : map (1+) integers)
1 : take 2 (map (1+) integers)
1 : take 2 (map (1+) (1 : map (1+) integers))
1 : take 2 (2 : map (1+) (map (1+) integers))
1 : 2 : take 1 (map (1+) (map (1+) integers))
1 : 2 : take 1 (map (1+) (map (1+) (1 : map (1+) integers)))
1 : 2 : take 1 (map (1+) (2 : map (1+) (map (1+) integers)))
1 : 2 : take 1 (3 : map (1+) (map (1+) (map (1+) integers)))
```

Infinite lists and `map`

- Continue:

```
1 : 2 : take 1 (3 : map (1+) (map (1+) (map (1+) integers)))
1 : 2 : 3 : take 0 (map (1+) (map (1+) (map (1+) integers)))
1 : 2 : 3 : []
[1, 2, 3]
```

- Answer: `[1, 2, 3]`
- Note that

```
map (1+) (map (1+) (map (1+) integers))
```

- was never calculated (lazy evaluation)

`filter`

- `filter` is a higher-order function which takes as its arguments
  - a predicate (function returning a `Bool`)
  - a list
- and returns a list of the elements in the original list that the predicate returned `True` on (in the same order)
- Type signature:

```
filter :: (a -> Bool) -> [a] -> [a]
```

filter

- Definition of **filter**:

```
filter :: (a -> Bool) -> [a] -> [a]
filter _ [] = []
filter p (x:xs) | p x = x : filter p xs
                | otherwise = filter p xs
```

filter

- Examples of `filter`:

```
Prelude> filter (\x -> x `mod` 2 == 1) [1..10]
[1,3,5,7,9]
Prelude> filter (/= 0) [0, 1, 0, 2, 0, 3, 0]
[1,2,3]
```

- `filter` works fine on infinite lists:

```
Prelude> take 3 (filter (\x -> x `mod` 2 == 1) [1..])
[1,3,5]
```

- Exercise: work through this evaluation!

`map` and `filter`

- `map` and `filter`: two great tastes that taste great together!
- Consider:

```
twiceNonzeros :: [Int] -> [Int]
twiceNonzeros [] = []
twiceNonzeros (0:xs) = twiceNonzeros xs
twiceNonzeros (x:xs) = 2 * x : twiceNonzeros xs
```

- This definition is correct, but uses explicit recursion
- It's considered poor style to define like this if we can define it without explicit recursion

`map` and `filter`

- New definition:

```
twiceNonZeros xs = map (2*)
                       (filter (\x -> x /= 0) xs)
```

- Much nicer!

The $ operator

```
twiceNonzeros :: [Int] -> [Int]
twiceNonZeros xs = map (2*)
                          (filter (\x -> x /= 0) xs)
```

- There are a couple of simple improvements we can make to this code
- We can get rid of the last set of parentheses using the `$` (apply) operator:

```
twiceNonZeros xs =
  map (2*) $ filter (\x -> x /= 0) xs
```

The $ operator

```
Prelude> :info $
($) :: (a -> b) -> a -> b
infixr 0 $
```

- This operator takes a function (from `a` to `b`) and a value of type `a`, and applies the function to the value to get a return value of type `b`
- Just an operator version of function application
- Why bother using this?
  - `f $ x` is just the same as `f x`
- The answer is in the `infixr 0 $` part

The $ operator

- The `$` operator has the lowest possible precedence, so anything on its right-hand side gets evaluated before the function is applied
- Use case: consider a chain of function applications:

```
f1 (f2 (f3 (f4 (f5 x))))
```

- Using `$` makes this cleaner:
- `f1 $ f2 $ f3 $ f4 $ f5 x`
- `$` associates to the right so it's equivalent to:

```
f1 $ (f2 $ (f3 $ (f4 $ (f5 x))))
```

- Which is the same as the expression without `$`

Function composition

```
twiceNonZeros xs =
  map (2*) $ filter (\x -> x /= 0) xs
```

- Even this can be improved!
- This function is just the composition of two smaller functions:
  - `map (2*) :: [Int] -> [Int]`
  - `filter (\x -> x /= 0) :: [Int] -> [Int]`
- Haskell has a function composition operator: the dot (`.`)
  - used everywhere in Haskell code!

Function composition

```
Prelude> :info (.)
(.) :: (b -> c) -> (a -> b) -> a -> c
infixr 9 .
```

- Definition:

```
f . g = \x -> f (g x)
```

- With this, our function now becomes:

```
twiceNonZeros =
  map (2*) . filter (\x -> x /= 0)
```

- We got rid of the function's argument!

Function composition

```
twiceNonZeros =
  map (2*) . filter (\x -> x /= 0)
```

- The `.` operator has very high precedence (9) but function application is still higher, so we don't have to write this as:

```
twiceNonZeros =
  map (2*) . (filter (\x -> x /= 0))
```

- Haskell makes it very convenient to define functions by composing other functions

Function composition

```
twiceNonZeros =
  map (2*) . filter (\x -> x /= 0)
```

- But wait! We can improve this still more!
- Can rewrite `(\x -> x /= 0)` as an operator section!

```
twiceNonZeros = map (2*) . filter (/= 0)
```

- Compare to:

```
twiceNonzeros [] = []
twiceNonzeros (0:xs) = twiceNonzeros xs
twiceNonzeros (x:xs) = 2 * x : twiceNonzeros xs
```

Function composition

- Advantages of:

```
twiceNonZeros = map (2*) . filter (/= 0)
```

- Much shorter! (Less code to get wrong)
- Two actions (mapping and filtering) are separated instead of interleaved together
- Easier to write, easier to understand what's going on
- Now you see why explicit recursion is frowned upon in Haskell

(Aside) Eta equivalence

- In Haskell, these two expressions are equivalent:
  - `\x -> f x`
  - `f`
- Theorists say that they are *eta-equivalent*
- Going from `\x -> f x` to just `f` is called an *eta-reduction*
- Going from `f` to `\x -> f x` is an *eta-expansion*
- Eta equivalence doesn't always hold in strict languages!
  - Just `f` might have to be evaluated in some context where `\x -> f x` would not require `f` to be evaluated yet

(Aside) Eta equivalence

- We can sometimes use eta equivalence to simplify function definitions
- For instance, if we had written our previous function as:

```
twiceNonZeros xs =
   (map (2*) . filter (/= 0)) xs
```

- Eta-equivalence says we can drop the `xs` from both sides
- This is (usually) considered good style

(Aside) Eta equivalence

- However, we can't change:

```
twiceNonZeros xs =
  map (2*) $ filter (/= 0) xs
```

- Into:

```
twiceNonZeros =
  map (2*) $ filter (/= 0)
```

- Why not?

(Aside) Eta equivalence

- Reason:

```
twiceNonZeros xs =
  map (2*) $ filter (/= 0) xs
```

- Can't be written as:

```
twiceNonZeros xs =
  (map (2*) $ filter (/= 0)) xs
```

- So eta-equivalence doesn't apply
- Yet another reason to prefer the version using function composition!

Point-free style

- The style of defining functions by composing together a bunch of smaller functions, without writing out the arguments, is called *point-free style*
- Can often make code much more elegant and concise
- Occasionally can make code so "tight" it's hard to read/understand
- Use your own coding judgment!

Point-free style

- Without point-free style (AKA *point-wise* style) you might have *e.g.*:

```
-- want to build function q out of
-- functions f, g, h
q x = let x1 = f x in
      let x2 = g x1 in
      let x3 = h x2 in
        x3
```

- All arguments ("points") are explicitly named: **`x`**, **`x1`**, **`x2`**, **`x3`**

Point-free style

- With point-free style this is just

```
-- want to build function q out of
-- functions f, g, h
q = h . g . f
```

- Much simpler!
- NOTE: the "point" of "point-free style" does *not* refer to the function composition (`.`) operator!
- Point-free style has no (or at least fewer) "points" (explicit names for function arguments) but more "dots" (function composition operators)

Efficiency

- Our previous function has been reduced to:

```
twiceNonZeros = map (2*) . filter (/= 0)
```

- Elegance/clarity advantages are obvious
- But… what about efficiency?
- Consider applying this function to a list of 1,000,000,000 `Int`s, about 20% of which are zeros
- Can you imagine any possible problems with this?

Efficiency

```
twiceNonZeros = map (2*) . filter (/= 0)
```

- The evaluation strategy is important here
- In a *strict* language, might have to create a temporary list to hold the filtered data (80% as long as original data), then map `(2*)` over that to get final list
- A huge amount of extra memory required!
- But in a *lazy* language like Haskell, this problem doesn't come up
- Let's work through an evaluation ☺

Efficiency

```
twiceNonZeros = map (2*) . filter (/= 0)
```

- Evaluate `twiceNonZeros [1, 0, 2, 0, 3, 0]`
- First few steps:

```
twiceNonZeros [1, 0, 2, 0, 3, 0]
(map (2*) . filter (/= 0)) [1, 0, 2, 0, 3, 0]
map (2*) (filter (/= 0) [1, 0, 2, 0, 3, 0])
map (2*) (1 : filter (/= 0) [0, 2, 0, 3, 0])
```

- What is the next step?

Efficiency

```
map (2*) (1 : filter (/= 0) [0, 2, 0, 3, 0])
2 : (map (2*) (filter (/= 0) [0, 2, 0, 3, 0]))
```

- The filtering hasn't completed, but due to lazy evaluation we're already doing the mapping!
- For instance, what if the original expression had been

```
Prelude> head $ twiceNonZeros [1, 0, 2, 0, 3, 0]
2
```

- We could stop now!
- Items are computed *on demand*

Efficiency

- Items are computed *on demand*
- What does this mean?
- Any function that "consumes" the list returned from the `map`/`filter` is going to want to first look at the head of the list
- So the head of the list is the first thing that gets computed
- The computation runs so as to first generate the head of the list, then the next item, and so on
- Items are computed one at a time

Efficiency

- Continuing…

```
2 : (map (2*) (filter (/= 0) [0, 2, 0, 3, 0]))
2 : (map (2*) (filter (/= 0) [2, 0, 3, 0]))
2 : (map (2*) (2 : filter (/= 0) [0, 3, 0]))
2 : 4 : (map (2*) (filter (/= 0) [0, 3, 0]))
2 : 4 : (map (2*) (filter (/= 0) [3, 0]))
2 : 4 : (map (2*) (3 : filter (/= 0) [0]))
2 : 4 : 6 : (map (2*) (filter (/= 0) [0]))
2 : 4 : 6 : (map (2*) (filter (/= 0) []))
2 : 4 : 6 : (map (2*) [])
2 : 4 : 6 : []
[2, 4, 6]
```

Efficiency

- Note that operations of mapping and filtering are *automatically* interleaved by lazy evaluation, even though code doesn't do that explicitly
- Consequence: code doesn't have to generate large intermediate lists: *huge* space savings!
- In strict language, might have to interleave the operations explicitly (like in first version of `twiceNonZeros`) to get space efficiency
- Conclusion: *lazy evaluation improves modularity!*

Classic paper

- *Why Functional Programming Matters* by John Hughes
- Explores consequences of lazy evaluation for modularity
- Uses a language called Miranda, which is very similar to Haskell (an ancestor language)
  - you should be able to follow it
- He argues that lazy evaluation provides "better glue" to connect independent pieces of programs together to form new programs

Next time

- More higher-order list functions: `foldr` and friends
- List comprehensions