

Principles of Functional Programming

 $Summer\ 2023$

Contents

1	Higher Order Functions (A Course Numbering Problem)				
	1.1 Currying	,			
	1.2 A Map	,			
	1.3 Folds	4			
	1.4 Compose	4			
2	Adding the Curry	!			
	Task 2.1	!			
	Task 2.2.	!			
	Task 2.3. (Recommended)				
	Task 2.4	,			
9	9 9 1 Dl-4 HOE	٠			
3	321 Blast-HOF!	7			
	3.1 Zip it, it's time to Filter	8			
	Task 3.1. (Recommended)	8			
	Task 3.2. (Recommended)	8			
	Task 3.3.	,			
4	Point-Free Programming	1(
	Task 4.1.	10			
	Task 4.2.	10			
	Task 4.3.	10			
	Task 4.4. (Recommended)	1			
	Task 4.5.	1			
	Task 4.6.	1			
5	Don't Nod Off, There's More HoF	1:			
•		1:			
	Task 5.2. (Recommended)	1:			
	Task 5.3. (Recommended)	1:			
		1			
	Task 5.5.	1			
	Task 5.6.	1			
	Task 5.7.	1			
	Task 5.8.	10			
		10			
		1			
		1'			
	Idon U.II.	1			
6		19			
	6.1 Apply				
	Took 6.1	1 (

		Task 6.2.	10
	0.0		
	6.2	Hype for Pipes	
		Task 6.3.	
		Task 6.4.	20
		Task 6.5.	20
	6.3	Curry	20
		Task 6.6. (Recommended)	20
		Task 6.7. (Recommended)	
7	Fold	ng is Entirely Overpowered	22
•		Task 7.1.	20
		Task 7.2.	22
		Task 7.3.	23
		Task 7.4.	23

1 Higher Order Functions (A Course Numbering Problem)

1.1 Currying

Previously, if we've wanted a function to take in multiple arguments, we've passed in a tuple of those arguments.

With **curried functions**, we pass in one argument, and the function application evaluates to *another* function that takes in the remaining arguments.

Example(s):

1.2 A Map

```
(* map : *)
fun map
```

Example(s):

1.3 Folds

Example(s):

1.4 Compose

(* op o : *)

Example(s):

2 Adding the Curry

In addmul.sml, we have defined the following functions:

```
fun incr (y : int) : int = 1 + y
fun addTwo (x : int) (y : int) : int = x + y
```

Task 2.1.

Which of the following are correct ways to write the type of addTwo? Hint: -> is right-associative.

```
1. int -> (int -> int)
```

- 2. (int -> int) -> int
- 3. int -> int -> int

Solution 1.

1 and 3 are correct, and are equivalent.

The following tasks should be done in addmul.sml.

Task 2.2.

Define the function

```
incr1 : int → int
REQUIRES: true
ENSURES: incr1 ≅ incr
```

Constraint: Declare your function using val, and use addTwo.

```
Solution 2.

val incr1 = addTwo 1
```

Task 2.3. (Recommended)

Define the function

```
add3 : int -> int -> int -> int 
REQUIRES: true 
ENSURES: add3 x y z \cong x + y + z 
Note that add3 x y z \cong ((add3 x) y) z, because function application is left-associative.
```

Constraint: Declare your function using fun.

```
Solution 3.

| fun add3 x y z = x + y + z |
```

Task 2.4.

Define the function

```
mul3 : int -> int -> int -> int REQUIRES: true ENSURES: mul3 x y z \cong x * y * z
```

Constraint: Declare your function using val.

```
Solution 4.

val mul3 = fn x => fn y => fn z =>
x * y * z
```

3 3...2...1... Blast-HOF!

3.1 Zip it, it's time to Filter

Let's practice implementing some more higher order functions!

For each of the following tasks, write the function in code/implementing-hofs/implementing-hofs.sml.

Task 3.1. (Recommended)

```
filter: ('a -> bool) -> 'a list -> 'a list

REQUIRES: p x is valuable for all x in L

ENSURES: Returns the list of those x in L for which p x => true
```

Task 3.2. (Recommended)

Now, implement the function

```
zipWith : ('a * 'b -> 'c) -> 'a list * 'b list -> 'c list REQUIRES: true ENSURES: zipWith f (L1,L2) \Longrightarrow L', where L' \cong map f (ListPair.zip (L1,L2))
```

Note that ListPair.zip (L1,L2): 'a list * 'b list -> ('a * 'b) list takes two lists and "zips" them together by pairing them up element by element until either list runs out of elements. Some examples:

```
ListPair.zip ([1,2,3],["a","b","c"])\cong [(1,"a"),(2,"b"),(3,"c")] ListPair.zip ([1,2,3,4],["a","b"])\cong [(1,"a"),(2,"b")]
```

Constraint: You may not use map or ListPair.zip in your implementation. Do this recursively!

In the next task, you will be writing the same functions twice: once recursively without any higher-order functions, and once using HOFs.

Task 3.3.

Implement the function

```
mapPartial : ('a -> 'b option) -> 'a list -> 'b list REQUIRES: true ENSURES: mapPartial f L \Longrightarrow L' where L' contains all elements y such that for x in L, f x \cong SOME y
```

Constraint: For mapPartial, you should write this function recursively, without using any built-in HOFs. For mapPartial', you should use higher-order functions, but you may not use filter or map in your solution.

```
Solution 3.
   fun mapPartial f [] = []
     | mapPartial f (x::xs) = (
23
         case f x of
           SOME z => z :: mapPartial f xs
         | NONE => mapPartial f xs
   (* EXPLANATION: List.foldr takes in elements of L from right side,
    * checking 1 element (x) at a time - if 'f x' evaluates to SOME y,
   \ast then the result (y) should be added to the accumulator list.
   * NOTE, foldr is used to preserve list order! *)
   fun mapPartial', f L =
33
     List.foldr (fn (x,acc) =>
35
       case f x of
         SOME y => y::acc
              => acc
       NONE
     ) [] L
```

4 Point-Free Programming

You might find the built-in infix composition function o handy, as well as the built-in List library.

It's fine if the functions you define have more general types than the ones listed below. Ignore the value restriction if you run into it.

For each of the following tasks, write the function in code/pointfree/pointfree.sml.

First, we are going to implement some functions without the constraint of being point-free (to better prepare you for the point-free versions). We will, however, have the following constraint:

Constraint: Define the functions without using fun.

Task 4.1.

```
sum_with_lambda : int -> int list -> int
REQUIRES: true
ENSURES: sum_with_lambda n l sums the elements of l, adding n to the sum
```

```
Solution 1.

val sum_with_lambda = fn n => fn L => foldr (op+) n L
```

Task 4.2.

```
sum_both_lambda : int list -> int list -> int
REQUIRES: true
ENSURES: sum_both_lambda 11 12 sums the elements of 11 and 12
```

```
Solution 2.

val sum_both_lambda = fn L1 => fn L2 => foldr (op+) (foldr (op+) 0 L1) L2
```

Now, we are going to implement the same functions except with the following constraint:

Constraint: Define the functions without using fun or fn.

Task 4.3.

```
sum_with : int -> int list -> int
REQUIRES: true
```

ENSURES: sum_with n 1 sums the elements of 1, adding n to the sum

```
Solution 3.

val sum_with = foldr (op +)
```

Task 4.4. (Recommended)

```
sum_with' : int * int list -> int
REQUIRES: true
ENSURES: sum_with' (n,1) sums the elements of 1, adding n to the sum
```

```
Solution 4.

val sum_with' = foldr (op +) 0 o (op ::)
```

Task 4.5.

```
sum_both : int list -> int list -> int

REQUIRES: true

ENSURES: sum_both 11 12 sums the elements of 11 and 12
```

Solution 5.

```
(* EXPLANATION: sums the ints of the first list with foldr
* and uses the result as the starting accumulator to the 2nd foldr call,
* which sums the ints of the second list *)
val sum_both = foldr (op +) o foldr (op +) 0
```

Task 4.6.

```
sum_both' : int list * int list -> int
REQUIRES: true
ENSURES: sum_both' (11,12) sums the elements of 11 and 12
```

Solution 6.

```
(* EXPLANATION: appends the lists together and then sums the ints of the resulting list with foldr *)
```

```
val sum_both' = foldr (op +) 0 o (op @)
```

5 Don't Nod Off, There's More HoF

Recall the definitions of foldl and foldr:

```
fun foldl (cmb : 'a * 'b -> 'b) (z : 'b) (L : 'a list) : 'b =
  case L of
  [] => z
  | x :: xs => foldl cmb (cmb (x, z)) xs

fun foldr (cmb : 'a * 'b -> 'b) (z : 'b) (L : 'a list) : 'b =
  case L of
  [] => z
  | x :: xs => cmb (x, foldr cmb z xs)
```

Consider that folding generalizes the idea behind many of the functions we've written in 15-150 up until now: write a base case (z), and then building up a return value by accumulating the result of applying some part of the value to (cmb). Let's prove how true this is by rewriting some familiar functions using only foldl/foldr!

For each of the following tasks, write the function in code/using-hofs/use-hofs.sml.

Task 5.1.

Consider

```
fun sum (L : int list) : int =
  case L of
  [] => 0
  | x :: xs => x + sum xs
```

Rewrite sum using foldl/foldr.

```
Solution 1.

val sum = foldr op+ 0
```

$\bf Task \ 5.2. \ (Recommended)$

Consider

```
fun rev ([] : int list) : int list = []
  | rev (x::xs) = (rev xs) @ [x]
```

Rewrite rev using foldl/foldr.

```
Solution 2.

fun rev L = foldl op:: [] L
```

Task 5.3. (Recommended)

Consider

```
fun flatten ([] : int list list) : int list = []
  | flatten (x::xs) = x @ flatten xs
```

Rewrite flatten using foldl/foldr.

```
Solution 3.

fun flatten L = foldr op@ [] L
```

Before we move on to more exciting functions we can implement using HOFs, let's take some time to consider how the types of these HOFs (and their inputs) are affected when given an input with a particular type.

Task 5.4.

Consider

```
val boolify = foldl g true [1, 2, 3]
```

What is the type of g?

Solution 4.

The type of g is int * bool -> bool, since the second input to foldl has type bool and the third input has type int list.

For the following tasks, consider

```
val toStringify = foldr (fn (x, y) \Rightarrow (Int.toString x) ^ y) z
```

Task 5.5.

What is the type of z?

Solution 5.

The type of z is string, since the first input to foldr has type int * string -> string.

Task 5.6.

What is the type of the function toStringify?

Solution 6.

The type of toStringify is int list -> string, since the type of the first input to foldr is int * string -> string, indicating that the third input should have type int list and the output should have type string.

For the following tasks, consider the datatype 'a idxTree, defined as

Task 5.7.

Consider

```
val treeify = foldl g (Node'(Empty',(0, 0),Empty')) ["15","1","50"]
```

What is the type of g?

Solution 7.

The type of g is string * int idxTree -> int idxTree, since the second input to foldl has type int idxTree and the third input to foldl has type string list.

Task 5.8.

Now, suppose we had

```
val treeify' = foldl g Empty' [1, 2, 3]
```

Give a type for the function g such that the declaration is well-typed.

Solution 8.

The type of g can be any instance of the type int * 'a idxTree -> 'a idxTree (including int * 'a idxTree -> 'a idxTree itself) since there are no constraints on what the type of Empty 'should be other than 'a idxTree.

Task 5.9.

Consider the following code

```
fun inord Empty' = []
  | inord (Node'(L, v, R)) = inord L @ (v :: inord R)

fun treeFold g z T = foldr g z (inord T)
```

What is the type of the function treeFold?

Solution 9.

```
The type of treeFold is ((int * 'a) * 'b \rightarrow 'b) \rightarrow 'b \rightarrow 'a idxTree \rightarrow 'b.
```

First, we note that the type of inord is 'a idxTree -> (int * a) list, which means inord T has type (int * 'a) list for all T : 'a idxTree. Since inord T has type (int * 'a) list, it must be that the function g has type (int * 'a) * 'b -> 'b, since the type of the elements in the list being folded over is int * a. Finally, we get that z : 'b from the type of g, which gives us our overall type.

Now that we've tried rewriting simple functions using foldl/foldr and have considered the types of expressions with HOFs, it's time for us to try something more interesting using all the HoFs we've seen so far!

For each of the following tasks, write the function in code/using-hofs/use-hofs.sml.

Task 5.10.

```
\begin{array}{c} \text{maxBy} : \text{ ('a * 'a -> order) -> 'a list -> 'a option} \\ \text{REQUIRES: cmp is total} \\ \text{ENSURES:} \\ \text{maxBy cmp } L \Longrightarrow \begin{cases} \text{SOME x where x is the maximum element in L according to cmp} \\ \text{NONE} & \text{if the list is empty} \end{cases} \end{array}
```

```
Solution 10.

fun maxBy cmp L =
let
fun cmp' x (SOME acc) = (case cmp (x, acc) of
GREATER => SOME x

| _ => SOME acc)
| cmp' x NONE = SOME x

in
foldr (Fn.uncurry cmp') NONE L
end
```

Task 5.11.

```
gradebook : int list list -> int list -> int list REQUIRES: For all S in scores, |S| = |\text{weights}|
ENSURES: gradebook scores weights returns a list L of the same length as scores such that L[i] \cong \sum_{j=0}^{|S|-1} \text{scores}[i][j] * \text{weights}[j]
```

Note: Which HoF can we use to combine two lists?

Example:

```
val scores = [[10, 10, 10], [9, 10, 8], [9, 9, 9], [5, 10, 10]]
val weights = [10, 10, 20]
val [400, 350, 360, 350] = gradebook scores weights
```


6 The three best things in life: Money, Pipes, and Curry

The following tasks should be done in combinators.sml.

6.1 Apply

Consider the following: You start out with some piece of data x : t1. You first want to transform it into something else using a function $f1 : t1 \rightarrow t2$. Then you want to transform that result with a function $f2 : t2 \rightarrow t3$. And so on.

An expression like this will do the trick:

```
f8 (f7 (f6 (f5 (f4 (f3 (f2 (f1 x))))))
```

There's problems with this, however.

- There's a lot of parentheses.
- Everything is written "backwards." That is, the original piece of data that we start with is written *after* the function that does the first transformation, which is written *after* the function that does the second transformation, and so on.

Let's solve the first problem with an infix operator < |, pronounced "apply." Such a < | would be defined like this:

```
infixr <|
fun L <| R = ???</pre>
```

We can then use it like this:

```
f8 <| f7 <| f6 <| f5 <| f4 <| f3 <| f2 <| f1 <| x
```

Because we said <| is a right-associative infix operator (hence infixr), everything will be done in the correct order.

Task 6.1.

What is the type of < |?|

```
Solution 1.

op <| : ('a -> 'b) * 'a -> 'b
```

Task 6.2.

Define < |.

```
Solution 2.

| fun f < | x = | f x |
```

Note that in haskell, this operator is the \$ function.

6.2 Hype for Pipes

We fixed the problem of lots of parentheses. But everything's still in the wrong order.

Let's define a new infix operator |>, pronounced "pipe." We will be able to use it like this:

```
x |> f1 |> f2 |> f3 |> f4 |> f5 |> f6 |> f7 |> f8
```

Such a |> would be defined like this:

```
infix |>
fun L |> R = ???
```

Once you figure our the definition of |>, feel free to paste it everywhere in your SML files and call all your functions with it. Doesn't it read nicely!?!?

Task 6.3.

Notice that this time, we said infix, not infixr. This means |> is left-associative. Why does this make sense?

Solution 3.

Because we go from left to right to do the function applications.

Task 6.4.

What is the type of | > ?

```
Solution 4.

op |> : 'a * ('a -> 'b) -> 'b
```

Task 6.5.

Define |>.

```
Solution 5.

| fun x |> f = f x |
```

6.3 Curry

Task 6.6. (Recommended)

Define the function

```
curry : ('a * 'b -> 'c) -> ('a -> 'b -> 'c)
REQUIRES: true
```

```
ENSURES: f(x, y) \cong curry f(x) y
Note that we could have written the right hand side as (curry f)(x) y.
```

Hint: curry takes in 3 arguments:

- An uncurried function f : ('a * 'b -> 'c),
- A value x : 'a,
- A value y : 'b.

Follow the types!

```
Solution 6.

(* curry : ('a * 'b -> 'c) -> ('a -> 'b -> 'c) *)

fun curry f =
 fn x => fn y => f (x, y)

(* curry : ('a * 'b -> 'c) -> ('a -> 'b -> 'c) *)

fun curry f x y = f (x, y)
```

Task 6.7. (Recommended)

Define the function

```
uncurry : ('a -> 'b -> 'c) -> ('a * 'b -> 'c) 

REQUIRES: true 

ENSURES: f x y \cong uncurry f (x,y)
```

```
Solution 7.

| fun uncurry f (x, y) = | f x y |
```

7 Folding is Entirely Overpowered

Given how general the concept of folding is, might it be possible to write other HOFs in terms of fold? In this task, we'll see that, in fact, it is!

Task 7.1.

Consider

```
fun map (f : 'a -> 'b) (L : 'a list) : 'b list =
  case L of
  [] => []
  | x :: xs => f x :: map f xs
```

Define map_cmb and map_z such that

- for all types t1,
- for all types t2,
- for all values $f : t1 \rightarrow t2$,

we have that

```
\texttt{foldr (map\_cmb f) map\_z} \cong \texttt{map f}
```

```
Solution 1.

fun map_cmb f (x, ac) =
f x :: ac
val map_z =
[]
```

Task 7.2.

Consider

```
fun filter (p : 'a -> bool) (L : 'a list) : 'a list =
  case L of
   [] => []
  | x :: xs =>
    if p x
    then x :: filter p xs
   else filter p xs
```

Define filter_cmb and filter_z such that

- for all types t,
- for all values p : t -> bool,

we have that

```
foldr (filter_cmb p) filter_z \cong filter p
```

```
Solution 2.

fun filter_cmb p (x, ac) =
if p x
then x :: ac
else ac
val filter_z =
[]
```

Task 7.3.

Warning: this is quite tricky. Don't worry if you can't get it!

Define foldl_cmb and foldl_z such that

- for all types t1,
- for all types t2,
- for all types t3,
- for all values cmb : $t1 * t2 \rightarrow t2$,
- for all values z : t2,
- for all values xs : t1 list,

we have that

 $\texttt{foldr} \ (\texttt{foldl_cmb} \ \texttt{cmb}) \ \texttt{foldl_z} \ \texttt{xs} \ \texttt{z} \cong \texttt{foldl} \ \texttt{cmb} \ \texttt{z} \ \texttt{xs}$

Task 7.4.

Explain how you came to your answer to the previous task and why it works.

Solution 4.

This is quite daunting, but we can make it less daunting by making some observations:

• If we invent F so that foldr (foldl_cmb cmb) foldl_z \cong F, then we know F [] \cong foldl_z, and that F (x::xs) \cong (foldl_cmb cmb) (x, F xs)

- This allows us to think about foldl_cmb cmb and foldl_z more concretely. foldl_z is the base case of F and foldl_cmb cmb tells F what to do with x and the output of a recursive call to F on xs.
- This lets us simplify the type we must think about by considering the type of F in the context of the problem, which is t1 list -> (t2 -> t2)

So let's try to write a function F: t1 list -> (t2 -> t2) such that

```
F xs z \cong foldl cmb z xs
```

.

Conceptually, we need to write a function that takes in a list, and gives back a function f so that when a base case is passed in to f, f accumulates the base case down the list from left to right. Remember how in the implementation of foldl, the base case is used as an accumulator argument? Well, since now the base case gets passed into the *output of* F, we will need to treat the *input of the output of* F as an accumulator argument!

How does this look? Well, for the base case of F, F [] should return a function so that passing in some z yields the same result as folding left with [] and z. But this result is just z! Therefore, we want F [] = fn z => z.

In the recursive case, we get to assume that F xs gives us a function which when passed a z, folds z down xs using cmb. We must provide a function which takes in a base case z1, and folds z1 down the list x::xs using cmb. We can do this by first computing cmb(x, z1), and then sending this result as the new base case value to the input of a recursive call! This is exactly analogous to how fold1 first computes the folding function and then sends it as an argument to a recursive call. the actual code looks like this:

```
fun F [] = fn x => x
| F (x::xs) = fn z1 => (F xs) (cmb(x, z1))
```

Now that we have F, we can figure out the construction of foldl_cmb and foldl_z. foldl_z is the base case of F. foldl_cmb is written in terms of cmb, and tells F what to do with x and F xs by taking them in as arguments as a tuple (x, ac), (where ac is the same thing as F xs). Thus, we can say:

```
fun foldl_z z = z

fun foldl_cmb cmb = fn (x, ac) => fn z1 => ac (cmb(x, z1))
```

A fun note about this problem: Notice how in the recursive case of F, we have (F xs) (cmb(x, z1)). This looks extreemely similar to foldl if you remove the parenthesis! This changing of the order is exactly what allows us to implement foldl with foldr. foldl requires an accumulator argument, but putting that argument as an input to the recursive function means doing the recursion after the evaluation of the folding function. On the other hand, foldr requires the recursion to be done before the folding function. It is only by making the accumulator argument an input to the output of the recursive function, that we are able to acumulate by first recursing, and then evaluating the folding function, which is exactly what lets us implement foldl using foldr!