



Functional Abstraction and Polymorphism

Corky Cartwright
Department of Computer Science
Rice University
(with thanks to John Greiner)



Abstracting Designs

- The elimination of repetitions is the most important step in the (program) editing process – HTDP
- Software engineering term for revising a program to make it better or accommodate an extension: *refactoring*.
- Repeated code should be avoided at almost all costs. Why? Revisions involving repeated code are almost impossible to get right.
- *Abstractions* help us avoid this problem.



The Need for Abstractions

```
;; contains-doll? : los -> boolean
;; to determine whether alos contains
;; the symbol 'doll
(define (contains-doll? alos)
  (cond
    [(empty? alos) false]
    [else (or (symbol=? (first alos) 'doll)
              (contains-doll? (rest alos)))]))
```



The Need for Abstractions

```
;; contains-car? : los -> boolean
;; to determine whether alos contains
;; the symbol 'car
(define (contains-car? alos)
  (cond
    [(empty? alos) false]
    [else (or (symbol=? (first alos) 'car)
              (contains-car? (rest alos)))]))
```



Creating Abstractions

How can we write one function that replaces

- contains-doll?
- contains-car?
- contains-pizza?
- contains-number?
- ...

As we design code that embodies an abstraction (such as containing a particular object), performing explicit type checks **blocks** abstraction. Explicit type checking expressed as executable code is a terrible software engineering idea! Why? The type information to should be confirmed in a given invocation depends on the context of the invocation!



Creating Abstractions

```
;; contains? : symbol, los -> boolean
;; to determine whether alos contains
;; the symbol s
(define (contains? s alos)
  (cond
    [(empty? alos) false]
    [else (or (symbol=? (first alos) s)
              (contains? s (rest alos)))]))
```



Creating Abstractions, cont.

```
;; contains? : any list -> boolean
;; (contains? v alist) determines whether
;; alist contains the value v
(define (contains? v alist)
  (cond
    [(empty? alist) false]
    [else (or (equals? (first alist) v)
              (contains? v (rest alist)))]))
```

Using generic (parametric typing), the correct type contract is:

```
;; contains? : (list-of T) -> boolean
```

Note that the “scope” of the type parameter T is the entire type expression
(list-of T) -> boolean



Using Abstractions

- How do we use `contains`?

```
(contains? 'doll (list ...))  
(contains? 'car (list ...))
```

- How can we better define `contains-doll?`, `contains-car?`

```
(define (contains-doll? alos) (contains? 'doll alos))  
(define (contains-car? alos) (contains? 'car alos))
```

- This idea is called **reuse**. Let's run with it!



A more complex example

```
;; below : lon number -> lon
;; contract: to construct a list of those numbers
;; in alon that are less than or equal to t
(define (below alon t)
  (cond [(empty? alon) empty]
        [else
         (cond [(<= (first alon) t)
                  (cons (first alon)
                        (below (rest alon) t))]
               [else (below (rest alon) t)]))]))
```



A more complex example ...

```
;; above : lon number -> lon
;; contract: to construct a list of those numbers
;; in alon that are greater than t
(define (above alon t)
  (cond [(empty? alon) empty]
        [else
         (cond [(> (first alon) t)
                  (cons (first alon)
                        (above (rest alon) t))]
               [else (above (rest alon) t)]))]))
```



Creating Abstractions

How can we write one function that replaces the functions

- `below`
- `above`
- `equal`
- `same-sign-as`
- ...



Creating Functional Abstractions

```
;; filter1: (number number -> boolean) (list-of number) number -> lon
;; contract: to construct a list of those numbers n in alon such that
;; (test t n) is true
(define (filter1 test alon t)
  (cond [(empty? alon) empty]
        [else
         (cond [(test (first alon) t)
                  (cons (first alon)
                        (filter1 test (rest alon) t))]
                [else (filter1 test (rest alon) t)]))]))
```

What did we do? Use a function as an argument!



Using Abstractions

- How do we denote (express) function *values*? Two ways: names and lambda-abstractions. We will only use the first way for now: write the *name* of a defined function (primitive, library, or program-defined) as in:

```
(filter1 < (list ...) 0))  
(filter1 > (list ...) 0))
```
- How can we define the functions above, below without code duplication?

```
(define (below alon t) (filter1 <= alon t))  
(define (above alon t) (filter1 > alon t))
```
- Both functions will work just as before!
- Can we do better? This example is warped by assumption that the abstracted function is a relational operator. The standard `filter` operation that takes a unary predicate which is simpler, but it requires lambda-notation to express the function arguments in our examples!



Repetition in Types

Repetition also happens in type definitions.

A `lon` is one of:

- `empty`
- `(cons n alon)`,

where `n` is a number and `alon` is a `lon`.

A `los` is one of:

- `empty`
- `(cons s alos)`,


where `s` is a symbol and `alos` is a `los`.



Abstracting Types

A (list-of T) is one of:

- empty
- (cons t $alot$),
where t is a T and $alot$ is an (list-of T).

A variable at the type level.

In FP, called **parametric polymorphism**

In OOP, called **genericity (generic types)**



Abstracting Types

Type	Example(s)
<code>(list-of number)</code>	<code>(list 1 2 3)</code>
<code>(list-of symbol)</code>	<code>(list 'a 'b 'pizza)</code>
<code>(list-of any)</code>	<code>(list 1 2 3)</code> <code>(list 'a 'b 'pizza)</code> empty <code>(list 1 'a +)</code>

Important! `(list-of x)` is NOT the same type as `(list-of any)`. In some contexts, it is a sub-type.



Improving `filter1`

Can we generalize the type of `filter1`?

```
;; filter1: (number number -> boolean) (list-of number) number ->  
;;          (list-of number
```

What is special about `number`? Does `filter1` rely on any of the properties of `number`?

No. It could be any type `X`.

```
;; filter1 : (X X -> boolean) (list-of X) -> (list-of X)
```

Comment: `filter1` is still lame. It should be unary:

```
;; filter : (X -> boolean) (list-of X) -> (list-of X)
```



A Better Filter function

```
;; filter: (T -> boolean) (list-of T) -> (list-of T)
;; contract: (filter f alot) constructs the (list-of T) consisting of all
;; elements e in alot such that (f e) is true. The ordering of elements
;; is preserved
(check-expect (filter number? empty) empty)
(check-expect (filter number? (list 1 false 2 true 3)) (list 1 2 3))

(define (filter f alot)
  (cond [(empty? alot) empty]
        [else
         (cond [(f (first alot))
                 (cons (first alot)
                       (filter f (rest alot)))]
               [else (filter f (rest alot))])]))
```



Final thoughts

- Function abstraction adds **expressiveness** to a programming language
- Type abstraction (polymorphism) does the same for type annotations.
- They work well together, e.g. the ML family (OCAML, Haskell).
- Core Racket does not have static type system but we still use types (homogeneous subsets of the data domain) in stating contracts. A type declaration is a restricted form of contract!
- Function abstraction is very lightweight in Racket and other functional languages. In contrast, it is rather clumsy and heavier (both in notation and implementation cost), but still important in Java; single inheritance is not a general mechanism for expressing function abstraction but it is notationally simpler in the cases where it is applicable. Since Java 8, Java supports a clean form of multiple inheritance via interfaces with concrete methods (code!). The “default” method nomenclature is unfortunate.