LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 Type Classes

Henrik Nilsson

University of Nottingham, UK

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.1/3

Haskell Overloading (2)

A function like the identity function

id ::
$$a \rightarrow a$$
 id $x = x$

is *polymorphic* precisely because it works uniformly for all types: there is no need to "inspect" the argument.

In contrast, to compare two "things" for equality, they very much have to be inspected, and an *appropriate method of comparison* needs to be used.

Haskell Overloading (1)

What is the type of (==)?

E.g. the following both work:

I.e., (==) can be used to compare both numbers and characters.

No!!! Cannot work uniformly for arbitrary types!

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.2/35

Haskell Overloading (3)

Moreover, some types do not in general admit a decidable equality. E.g. functions (when their domain is infinite).

Similar remarks apply to many other types. E.g.:

- We may want to be able to add numbers of any kind.
- But to add properly, we must understand what we are adding.
- Not every type admits addition.

Haskell Overloading (4)

Idea:

- Introduce the notion of a type class: a set of types that support certain related operations.
- Constrain those operations to only work for types belonging to the corresponding class.
- Allow a type to be made an instance of (added to) a type class by providing type-specific implementations of the operations of the class.

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.5/35

Instances of Eq (1)

Various types can be made instances of a type class like Eq by providing implementations of the class methods for the type in question:

```
instance Eq Int where
    x == y = primEqInt x y
instance Eq Char where
    x == y = primEqChar x y
```

The Type Class Eq

```
class Eq a where
   (==) :: a -> a -> Bool
```

(==) is not a function, but a *method* of the *type class* Eq. It's type signature is:

```
(==) :: Eq a => a -> a -> Bool
```

 \mathbb{E}_{q} a is a *class constraint*. It says that that the equality method works for any type belonging to the type class \mathbb{E}_{q} .

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.6/35

Instances of Eq (2)

Suppose we have a data type:

```
data Answer = Yes | No | Unknown
```

We can make Answer an instance of Eq as follows:

```
instance Eq Answer where
  Yes == Yes = True
  No == No = True
  Unknown == Unknown = True
  == _ = False
```

Instances of Eq (3)

Consider:

Can Tree be made an instance of Eq?

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.9/35

Derived Instances (1)

Instance declarations are often obvious and mechanical. Thus, for certain *built-in* classes (notably Eq, Ord, Show), Haskell provides a way to *automatically derive* instances, as long as

- the data type is sufficiently simple
- we are happy with the standard definitions

Thus, we can do:

Instances of Eq (4)

Yes, for any type a that is already an instance of Eq:

```
instance (Eq a) => Eq (Tree a) where

Leaf a1 == Leaf a2 = a1 == a2

Node t11 t1r == Node t21 t2r = t11 == t21

&& t1r == t2r

== _{-} = False
```

Note that (==) is used at type a (whatever that is) when comparing a1 and a2, while the use of (==) for comparing subtrees is a recursive call.

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.10/35

Derived Instances (2)

GHC provides some additional possibilities. With the extension -XGeneralizedNewtypeDeriving, a new type defined using newtype can "inherit" any of the instances of the representation type:

```
newtype Time = Time Int deriving Num
```

With the extension -XStandaloneDeriving, instances can be derived separately from a type definition (even in a separate module):

```
deriving instance Eq Time
deriving instance Eq a => Eq (Tree a)
```

Lill ED2016: Leeburg 9 p 11/25

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.12/35

Class Hierarchy

Type classes form a hierarchy. E.g.:

```
class Eq a => Ord a where
  (<=) :: a -> a -> Bool
...
```

Eq is a superclass of Ord; i.e., any type in Ord must also be in Eq.

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.13/35

Haskell vs. OO Overloading (2)

```
> let xs = [1,2,3] :: [Int]
> let ys = [1,2,3] :: [Double]
> xs
[1,2,3]
> ys
[1.0,2.0,3.0]
> (read "42" : xs)
[42,1,2,3]
> (read "42" : ys)
[42.0,1.0,2.0,3.0]
> read "'a'" :: Char
'a'
```

Haskell vs. OO Overloading (1)

A method, or overloaded function, may thus be understood as a family of functions where the right one is chosen depending on the types.

A bit like OO languages like Java. But the underlying mechanism is quite different and much more general. Consider read:

```
read :: (Read a) => String -> a
```

Note: overloaded on the *result* type! A method that converts from a string to *any* other type in class Read!

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 – p.14/35

Implementation (1)

The class constraints represent extra implicit arguments that are filled in by the compiler. These arguments are (roughly) the functions to use.

Thus, internally (==) is a *higher order function* with *three* arguments:

$$(==)$$
 eqF x y = eqF x y

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.16/35

Implementation (2)

An expression like

```
1 == 2
```

is essentially translated into

```
(==) primEqInt 1 2
```

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.17/35

Some Basic Haskell Classes (1)

Implementation (3)

So one way of understanding a type like

```
(==) :: Eq a => a -> a -> Bool
```

is that \mathbb{E}_q a corresponds to an extra implicit argument.

The implicit argument corresponds to a so called directory, or tuple/record of functions, one for each method of the type class in question.

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.18/35

Some Basic Haskell Classes (2)

Quiz: What is the type of a numeric literal like 42? What about 42.0? Why?

Haskell's numeric literals are overloaded. E.g. 42 is expanded into fromInteger 42.

LULED2016 Lookura R. in 20/25

A Typing Conundrum (1)

Overloaded (numeric) literals can lead to some surprises.

What is the type of the following list? Is it even well-typed???

```
[1, [2,3]]
```

Surprisingly, it is well-typed:

```
> :type [1, [2,3]]
[1, [2,3]] :: (Num [t], Num t) => [[t]]
Why?
```

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.21/35

Application: Automatic Differentiation

- Automatic Differentiation: method for augmenting code so that derivative(s) computed along with main result.
- Purely algebraic method: arbitrary code can be handled
- Exact results
- But no separate, self-contained representation of the derivative.

A Typing Conundrum (2)

The list is expanded into:

```
[ fromInteger 1,
  [fromInteger 2, fromInteger 3] ]
```

Thus, if there were some type t for which [t] were an instance of Num, the 1 would be an overloaded literal of that type, matching the type of the second element of the list.

Normally there are no such instances, so what almost certainly is a mistake will be caught. But the error message is rather confusing.

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.22/35

Automatic Differentiation: Key Idea

Consider a code fragment:

$$z1 = x + y$$

 $z2 = x * z1$

Suppose the derivatives of x and y w.r.t. common variable is available in the variables x' and y'.

Then code can be augmented to compute derivatives of z1 and z2:

$$z1 = x + y$$

 $z1' = x' + y'$
 $z2 = x * z1$
 $z2' = x' * z1 + x * z1'$

Approaches

- Source-to-source translation
- Overloading of arithmetic operators and mathematical functions

The following variation is due to Jerzy Karczmarczuk. Infinite list of derivatives allows derivatives of *arbitrary* order to be computed.

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 – p.25/35

Functional Automatic Differentiation (2)

Constants and the variable of differentiation:

```
zeroC :: C
zeroC = C 0.0 zeroC

constC :: Double -> C
constC a = C a zeroC

dVarC :: Double -> C
dVarC a = C a (constC 1.0)
```

Functional Automatic Differentiation (1)

Introduce a new numeric type C: value of a continuously differentiable function at a point along with *all* derivatives at that point:

data
$$C = C$$
 Double C

valC $(C a _) = a$

derC $(C _ x') = x'$

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.26/35

Functional Automatic Differentiation (3)

Part of numerical instance:

Functional Automatic Differentiation (4)

Computation of $y = 3t^2 + 7$ at t = 2:

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.29/35

Functor (2)

Common examples of functors include (but are certainly not limited to) *container types* like lists:

Functor (1)

A Functor is a notion that originated in a branch of mathematics called Category Theory.

However, for our purposes, we can think of functors as type constructors T (of arity 1) for which a function map can be defined:

$$map :: (a \to b) \to Ta \to Tb$$

that satisfies the following laws:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} map \ id & = & id \\ map(f \circ g) & = & map \ f \circ map \ g \end{array}$$

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.30/35

Functor (3)

Another important example is Haskell's option type Maybe:

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.31/35

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.32/35

Functor (4)

Of course, the notion of a functor with a type class in Haskell:

```
class Functor f where
    fmap :: (a -> b) -> f a -> f b
```

Instances are provided for [], Maybe, and many other types in Haskell's standard prelude.

However, Haskell's type system is not powerful enough to enforce the functor laws.

In general: the responsibility for ensuring that an instance respects any laws associated with a type class rests squarely with the programmer.

LiU-FP2016: Lecture 8 - p.33/35

Reading

 Jerzy Karczmarczuk. Functional differentiation of computer programs. Higher-Order and Symbolic Computation, 14(1):35–57, March 2001.

Functor (5)

Note that the type of fmap can be read:

$$(a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)$$

That is, we can see fmap as promoting a function to work in a different context.