

COSC 3015: Lecture 9

Lecture given by Prof. Caldwell and scribed by Sunil Kothari

September 23, 2008

1 Functions on lists

Lists are the bread and butter of functional programming. At least they started out that way. The first functional programming language, LISP - List Processing, 1960 by John McCarthy, had list as the fundamental data-structure. LISP is great at symbolic processing - the AI programming language.

Using the Haskell notation we can write list as `data Nat [a] = [] | a:[a]`
so we can say

```
Hugs> :t []
[] :: [a]
Hugs> :t (:)
(:) :: a -> [a] -> [a]
```

1.1 null function

The term `cons` actually means list constructor.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{null2 } [] &= \text{True} \\ \text{null2 } _ &= \text{False} \end{aligned}$$

"_" is a specification that matches any pattern

Alternative:

If we define `null` as

$$\text{null3 } x = (x == [])$$

then the type is

```
Main> :t null
null1 :: Eq [a] => [a] -> Bool
```

`if (x==[]) then True else False` is a really dumb way of defining the above function.

if `b` then `e1` else `e2`, where

- `b` - bool
- `e1, e2` - both must have the same type.

Evaluation for if-then-else

if True then `e1` else `e2` \rightsquigarrow `e1`

if False then `e1` else `e2` \rightsquigarrow `e2`

In the book *null* is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{null2 } [] &= \text{True} \\ \text{null2 } (x : xs) &= \text{False} \end{aligned}$$

How is this different from one above ?

$$\text{null1 } \perp = \perp$$

So- *null* is strict - i.e. if it is applied to \perp then the result is \perp . *null*[(+),(-)]

```
:t [(+),(-)]
[(+),(-)] :: Num a => [a -> a -> a]
Main>
```

But we cannot do so for *null3*, it generates a type error.

```
Main> null3 [(+),(-)]
ERROR - Unresolved overloading
*** Type      : (Num a, Eq (a -> a -> a)) => Bool
*** Expression : null3 [(+),(-)]
```

But, *null2* and *null1* behave differently than *null3*.

```
Main> null2 [(+),(-)]
False
Main> null1 [(+),(-)]
False
```

So *null1* and *null2* apply to a wider class of list types - those that are instances of the Eq type class and those that are not.

1.2 Append (++)

We want that $[1,2]++[3,4,5] = [1,2,3,4,5]$ If we had some reflection we can do it. So how can we do it ? We are gonna define it by recursion on the first argument.

$$\begin{aligned} [] ++ ys &= ys \\ (x : xs) ++ ys &= x : (xs ++ ys) \end{aligned}$$

So how dowe think about it. We have a cons and we want to glue together it with ys. So what is thew first element of what we wwant ? The first element is x. So the pattern is almost always same. In this case we take out x and recurse down on the smaller structure.

$$\begin{aligned} [1, 2] ++ [3, 4, 5] &= 1 : ([2] ++ [3, 4, 5]) \\ &= 1 : (2 : ([] ++ [3, 4, 5])) \\ &= 1 : (2 : [3, 4, 5]) \\ &= [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] \end{aligned}$$

Let's try another recursive definition.

1.3 length

What about *length* ? It's defined as

```
Main> :t length
length :: [a] -> Int
Main>
```

$$\begin{aligned} length [] &= 0 \\ length (x : xs) &= 1 + (length xs) \end{aligned}$$

1.4 reverse

Let's try reverse:

```
Main> :t reverse
reverse :: [a] -> [a]
```

and is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} reverse [] &= [] \\ reverse (x : xs) &= reverse xs ++ [x] \end{aligned}$$

1.5 concat

Let's do concat

Main> :t concat

concat :: [[a]] -> [a]

concat [[1,2],[],[3,4,5]] = [1,2,3,4,5] and is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{concat } [] &= [] \\ \text{concat } (x : xs) &= x ++ (\text{concat } xs) \end{aligned}$$

How do we compute with the concat function ?

$$\begin{aligned} \text{concat}[[1, 2, 3]] &= [1, 2, 3] ++ \text{concat } [] \\ &= [1, 2, 3] ++ [] \\ &= [1, 2, 3] \end{aligned}$$

Another example:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{concat}[[1, 2, 3], [], [4, 5]] &= [1, 2, 3] ++ \text{concat } ([], [4, 5]) \\ &= [1, 2, 3] ++ [] ++ \text{concat } [[4, 5]] \\ &= [1, 2, 3] ++ ([] ++ [4, 5] ++ \text{concat } []) \\ &= [1, 2, 3] ++ ([] ++ ([4, 5] ++ [])) \\ &= \dots \\ &= [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] \end{aligned}$$

1.6 zip

Main> :t zip

zip :: [a] -> [b] -> [(a,b)]

We define it by recursion on the first argument.

Here's an alternate definition

$$\begin{aligned} \text{zip } [] ys &= [] \\ \text{zip } (x : xs) ys &= (x, \text{head } ys) : \text{zip } xs (\text{tail } ys) \\ \text{zip } (x : xs) (y : ys) &= (x, y) : \text{zip } xs ys \end{aligned}$$

Design choice for zip - what is the right length ??

$$\begin{aligned} \text{length } (\text{zip } xs \ ys) &\stackrel{?}{=} \min(\text{length } xs, \text{length } ys) \\ &\stackrel{?}{=} \max(\text{length } xs, \text{length } ys) \\ &\stackrel{?}{=} \text{if length } xs <> \text{length } ys \text{ then error else length } xs \\ &\stackrel{?}{=} \text{length } xs \text{ or if length } xs > \text{length } ys \text{ then error} \end{aligned}$$

zip1 is strict in both argument

$$\begin{aligned} \text{zip1 } [] [] &= [] \\ \text{zip1 } (x : xs) [] &= [] \\ \text{zip1 } [] (x : xs) &= [] \\ \text{zip1 } (x : xs)(y : ys) &= (x, y) : \text{zip1 } xs\ ys \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{zip}' [] \perp &= [] \\ \text{zip}' \perp [] &= \perp \\ \text{zip } [] \perp &= \perp \end{aligned}$$

zip' is not strict in its second argument.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{zip } [] ys &= [] \\ \text{zip } xs [] &= [] \\ \text{zip } (x : xs) (y : ys) &= (x, y) : \text{zip } xs\ ys \end{aligned}$$

In Haskell there is interesting notation

- An infinite list of ints:
[1..] = [1, 2, 3, 4, ...]
- Partial lists
 1. \perp
 2. $1 : \perp$
 3. $1 : 2 : \perp$
- Finite lists $[\perp, \perp]$ - the type of lists is [a]

1.7 last

$$\begin{aligned} \text{last } [] &= \text{error} \\ \text{last } (x : xs) &= \text{if (null xs) then x else last xs} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{last } [1, 2, 3] &= \text{last } [2, 3] \\ &= \text{last } [3] \\ &= 3 \end{aligned}$$

Here's another way of doing it

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{last} [x] &= x \\ \textit{last} x : xs &= \textit{last} xs \end{aligned}$$

yet another way is:
 $\textit{last} = \textit{head} \cdot \textit{reverse}$

```
Main> :t error  
error :: String -> a
```

In a way the result of error is like bottom.