

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]