

# CS 3110

## Lecture 6: *Map and Fold*

Prof. Clarkson

Spring 2015

Today's music: Selections from the soundtrack to *2001: A Space Odyssey*

# Review

Course so far:

- Syntax and semantics of (most of) OCaml

Today:

- No new language features
- New **idioms**:
  - *Map, fold, and other higher-order functions*

# Question #1

How much of PS1 have you finished?

- A. None
- B. About 25%
- C. About 50%
- D. About 75%
- E. I'm done!!!

# Review: higher-order functions

- Functions are values
- Can use them **anywhere** we use values
  - Arguments, results, parts of tuples, bound to variables, carried by datatype constructors or exceptions, ...
- *First-class* citizens of language, afforded all the “rights” of any other values
  - Functions can **take** functions as arguments
  - Functions can **return** functions as results
  - ...functions can be *higher-order*

# Review: anonymous functions

(aka *function expressions*)

- **Syntax:**

```
fun x -> e
```

*really*

```
fun p -> e
```

- **Type checking:**

- Conclude that  $\text{fun } x \rightarrow e : t1 \rightarrow t2$   
if  $e : t2$  under assumption  $x : t1$

- **Evaluation:**

- A function is already a value

# Lambda

- In PL, anonymous functions a.k.a. *lambda expressions*  
 $\lambda x . e$
- The lambda means “what follows is an anonymous function”
  - x is its argument
  - e is its body
  - Just like **fun** **x** **->** **e**, but slightly different syntax
- Standard feature of any functional language (ML, Haskell, Scheme, ...)
- You’ll see “lambda” show up in many places in PL, e.g.:
  - PHP: <http://www.php.net/manual/en/function.create-function.php>
  - A popular PL blog: <http://lambda-the-ultimate.org/>
  - Lambda style: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ci48kqp11F8>

# Review: currying

Recall: every OCaml function takes exactly one argument

- Can encode  $n$  arguments with one  $n$ -tuple
- Or, can write function that takes one argument and returns a function that



famo  
vs.



ell

# Haskell B. Curry



1900-1982

Languages *Haskell* and *Curry* named for him

Curry-Howard isomorphism:

- *Types are logical formulas*
- *Programs are logical proofs*

```
fun x -> x : 'a -> 'a
```





# HUGE HIGHER-ORDER FUNCTIONS

Discovery of the monolith:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ML1OZCHixR0>

# Map

*bad style!*

```
map (fun x -> shirt_color(x)) [
```



```
]
```

```
= [gold, blue, red]
```

# Map

```
map shirt_color [
```



```
]
```

```
= [gold, blue, red]
```

how would you implement map?

# Map

```
let rec map f xs =  
  match xs with  
  [] -> []  
  | x::xs' -> (f x)::(map f xs')
```

`map : ('a -> 'b) -> 'a list -> 'b list`

## Map is HUGE:

- You use it **all the time** once you know it
- Exists in standard library as `List.map`, but the idea can be used in any data structure (trees, stacks, queues...)

## Question #2

What is value of `lst` after this code?

```
let is_even x = (x mod 2 = 0)
let lst = map is_even [1;2;3;4]
```

- A. [1;2;3;4]
- B. [2;4]
- C. [false; true; false; true]
- D. false
- E. None of the above

## Question #2

What is value of `lst` after this code?

```
let is_even x = (x mod 2 = 0)
let lst = map is_even [1;2;3;4]
```

- A. [1;2;3;4]
- B. [2;4]
- C. [false; true; false; true]
- D. false
- E. None of the above

# Filter

```
filter is_vulcan [    ]
```

```
= [  ]
```

*(er, half vulcan)*

how would you implement filter?

# Filter

```
let rec filter f xs =  
  match xs with  
  | [] -> []  
  | x::xs' -> if f x  
                then x::(filter f xs')  
                else filter f xs'
```

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

Filter is also HUGE

– In library: `List.filter`



# Question #3

What is value of `lst` after this code?

```
let is_even x = (x mod 2 = 0)
let lst = filter is_even [1;2;3;4]
```

- A. [1;2;3;4]
- B. [2;4]
- C. [false; true; false; true]
- D. false

# Question #3

What is value of `lst` after this code?

```
let is_even x = (x mod 2 = 0)
let lst = filter is_even [1;2;3;4]
```

- A. [1;2;3;4]
- B. [2;4]**
- C. [false; true; false; true]
- D. false

# Iterators

- Map and filter are *iterators*
  - Not built-in to the language, an **idiom**
- Benefit of iterators: separate recursive traversal from data processing
  - Can reuse same traversal for different data processing
  - Can reuse same data processing for different data structures
  - leads to modular, maintainable, beautiful code!
- So far: iterators that change or omit data
  - what about combining data?
  - e.g., sum all elements of list

# Fold v1.0

Idea: *stick an operator between every element of list*

folding [ **1 ; 2 ; 3** ] with (+)

becomes

**1+2+3**

**-->\***

**6**

# Fold v2.0

Idea: *stick an operator between every element of list*  
*But list could have 1 element, so need an initial value*

folding [ **1** ] with **0** and **(+)**

becomes

**0+1**

**-->\***

**1**

# Fold v2.0

Idea: *stick an operator between every element of list*  
*But list could have 1 element, so need an initial value*

folding [ **1 ; 2 ; 3** ] with **0** and **(+)**

becomes

**0+1+2+3**

**-->\***

**6**

# Fold v2.0

Idea: *stick an operator between every element of list*  
But list could have 1 element, so need an initial value  
Or list could be empty; just return initial value

folding [ ] with **0** and **(+)**

becomes

**0**

## Question #4

What should the result of folding  $[1; 2; 3; 4]$  with  $1$  and  $( * )$  be?

- A. 1
- B. 24
- C. 10
- D. 0
- E. None of the above



## Question #4

What should the result of folding [ 1 ; 2 ; 3 ; 4 ] with 1 and ( \* ) be?

A. 1

**B. 24**

C. 10

D. 0

E. None of the above

# Fold v3.0

Idea: *stick an operator between every element of list*  
*But list could have 1 element, so need an initial value*  
*Or list could be empty; just return initial value*

Implementation detail: iterate left-to-right or right-to-left?

folding [ **1 ; 2 ; 3** ] with **0** and **(+)**

**left to right becomes:**  $((0+1)+2)+3$  ...**fold\_left**

**right to left becomes:**  $1+(2+(3+0))$  ...**fold\_right**

Both evaluate to 6; does it matter?

Yes: not all operators are *associative*  
e.g. subtraction, division, exponentiation, ...

## Question #5

Result of **fold\_right** with input list **[1;2;3]**, initial accumulator **1** and operator **(-)**?

- A. -5
- B. -1
- C. 1
- D. Operator has the wrong type
- E. None of the above

## Question #5

Result of **fold\_right** with input list **[1;2;3]**, initial accumulator **1** and operator **(-)**?

- A. -5
- B. -1
- C. 1
- D. Operator has the wrong type
- E. None of the above

## Question #6

Result of `fold_left` with input list `[1;2;3]`, initial accumulator `1` and operator `(-)`?

- A. -5
- B. -1
- C. 1
- D. Operator has the wrong type
- E. None of the above

## Question #6

Result of `fold_left` with input list `[1;2;3]`, initial accumulator `1` and operator `(-)`?

- A. -5
- B. -1
- C. 1
- D. Operator has the wrong type
- E. None of the above

# Fold v4.0

- (+) *accumulated* a result of the same type as list itself
- What about operators that change the type?
  - e.g., **let cons x xs = x::xs**  
**cons : 'a -> 'a list -> 'a list**  
folding from the right **[1;2;3]** with **[]** and **cons**  
should produce  
**1::(2::(3::[])) = [1;2;3]**
- So the operator needs to accept
  - the accumulated result so far, and
  - the next element of the input list

...which may have different types!

# Fold for real

Two versions in OCaml library:

**List.fold\_left**

**: ('a -> 'b -> 'a) -> 'a -> 'b list -> 'a**

**List.fold\_right**

**: ('a -> 'b -> 'b) -> 'a list -> 'b -> 'b**



# Fold for real

Two versions in OCaml library:

**List.fold\_left**

**: ('a -> 'b -> 'a) -> 'a -> 'b list -> 'a**

**List.fold\_right**

**: ('a -> 'b -> 'b) -> 'a list -> 'b -> 'b**

Operator

mnemonic: operator takes in accumulator on the (left|right)

# Fold for real

Two versions in OCaml library:

**List.fold\_left**

**: ('a -> 'b -> 'a) -> 'a -> 'b list -> 'a**

**List.fold\_right**

**: ('a -> 'b -> 'b) -> 'a list -> 'b -> 'b**

Input list

# Fold for real

Two versions in OCaml library:

```
List.fold_left
```

```
: ('a -> 'b -> 'a) -> 'a -> 'b list -> 'a
```

```
List.fold_right
```

```
: ('a -> 'b -> 'b) -> 'a list -> 'b -> 'b
```

Initial value of accumulator

mnemonic: fold takes in accumulator on the (left|right) of the list

# Fold for real

Two versions in OCaml library:

```
List.fold_left
```

```
: ('a -> 'b -> 'a) -> 'a -> 'b list -> 'a
```

```
List.fold_right
```

```
: ('a -> 'b -> 'b) -> 'a list -> 'b -> 'b
```

Final value of accumulator

# fold\_left

```
let rec fold_left f acc xs =  
  match xs with  
  | []       -> acc  
  | x::xs'   -> fold_left f (f acc x) xs'
```

Accumulates an answer by

- repeatedly applying **f** to “answer so far”,
- starting with initial value **acc**,
- folding “from the left”

**fold\_left f acc [a;b;c]**

computes

**f (f (f acc a) b) c**

# fold\_right

```
let rec fold_right f xs acc =  
  match xs with  
  []       -> acc  
  | x::xs' -> f x (fold_right f xs' acc)
```

Accumulates an answer by

- repeatedly applying **f** to “answer so far”,
- starting with initial value **acc**,
- folding “from the right”

**fold\_right f [a;b;c] acc**

computes

**f a (f b (f c acc))**

# Behold the HUGE power of fold

Implement so many other functions with fold!

```
let rev xs = fold_left (fun xs x -> x::xs) [] xs
let length xs = fold_left (fun a _ -> a+1) 0 xs
let map f xs = fold_right
  (fun x a -> (f x)::a) xs []
let filter f xs = fold_right
  (fun x a -> if f x then x::a else a) xs []
```

# Beware the efficiency of fold

- Implementation of **fold\_left** more space efficient than **fold\_right** for long lists
  - what is "long"? maybe 10,000 elements
- But that doesn't mean that one is strictly better than the other
- More in recitation...



# Map-Reduce

- Fold has many synonyms/cousins in various functional languages, including **scan** and **reduce**
- Google organizes large-scale data-parallel computations with Map-Reduce
  - open source implementation by Apache called Hadoop

*“[Google’s Map-Reduce] abstraction is inspired by the map and reduce primitives present in Lisp and many other functional languages. We realized that most of our computations involved applying a map operation to each logical record in our input in order to compute a set of intermediate key/value pairs, and then applying a reduce operation to all the values that shared the same key in order to combine the derived data appropriately.”*

[Dean and Ghemawat, 2008]