

Advanced Functional Programming

Tim Sheard

- Polymorphism
- Hindley-Milner Polymorphism
- Rank 2 polymorphism

Polymorphism

- A function is polymorphic if it can work on any kind of argument.

```
f x = (x, x)
```

```
Main> :t f
```

```
f :: a -> (a, a)
```

- In essence it makes no reference to the value of its argument, it only manipulates it abstractly.

Local Polymorphism

Polymorphism can be scoped.

What type does f have?
forall b . b -> (a,b)

```
g x = let f = \ y -> (x,y)
      w1 = f "z"
      w2 = f True
      in (x,f)
```

```
Main> :t g
```

```
g :: a -> (a,b -> (a,b))
```

Let as function application

Let is often defined in terms of application

$$\text{let } x = e \text{ in } y \quad == \quad (\backslash x \rightarrow y) e$$

But there are difference in how let is typed.

```
g x = (\ f -> let w1 = f "z"
                w2 = f True
                in (x,f))
      (\ y -> (x,y))
```

```
g x = let f = \ y -> (x,y)
        w1 = f "z"
        w2 = f True
      in (x,f)
```

```
ERROR " (line 12): Type error in application
```

```
*** Expression      : f True
```

```
*** Term           : True
```

```
*** Type           : Bool
```

```
*** Does not match : [Char]
```

Let polymorphism

Let-bound functions can be polymorphic,
but lambda-bound arguments cannot.

This is the essence of Hindley-Milner
polymorphism.

This means

no function can be defined to take an argument
which must be polymorphic

No argument can ever be used in more than
one polymorphic context.

All types have the forall on the outermost

$\text{forall } a . (x \rightarrow (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (x,b))$

as opposed to

$x \rightarrow (\text{forall } a . a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (x,b)$

Example

```
h f x = let w1 = f "z"  
        w2 = f True  
        in (w1,w2)
```

```
ERROR (line 18): Type error in application  
*** Expression      : f True  
*** Term            : True  
*** Type            : Bool  
*** Does not match : [Char]
```

Rank 2 polymorphism

Rank 2 polymorphism relaxes some of this restriction.

```
h :: (forall a . a -> a) -> x -> (x, Bool)
h f x = let w1 = f x
          w2 = f True
          in (w1, w2)
```

forall's can be in the back-end of an arrow,
but never the front end.

```
(forall ...) -> ((forall ...) -> z)
```

Type inference

Type inference of polymorphic arguments is undecidable.

If we want rank 2 polymorphism, we must use type annotations. Type-checking of rank 2 polymorphism is decidable

What kind of annotations must we give?

The answer to this is hard to find.

Giving the full signature of *every* function is enough.

Is there any compromise using less information?

Full application

In order to do type checking, rank 2 functions must be *fully applied*. That is all polymorphic arguments must be supplied.

```
ex2 = (4,h)
```

```
(line 28): Use of h requires at least 1 argument
```

Arguments to rank 2 functions must really be polymorphic.

```
ex4 = h id 5
```

```
Main> :t ex4
```

```
ex4 :: (Integer,Bool)
```

```
ex3 = h ( \ x -> 1) 5
```

```
ERROR (line 33): Cannot justify constraints in
  application
```

```
*** Expression      : \x -> 1
```

```
*** Type           : b -> b
```

```
*** Given context  : ()
```

```
*** Constraints    : Num b
```

Rank 2 Data Constructors

Data Constructors with polymorphic components give enough information to do type inference.

```
data Test x = C (forall a . a -> x -> (a,x)) x
```

```
ex5 = C (\ a x -> (a,x+1)) 3
```

```
ex6 = C (\ a x -> (a,not x)) True
```

```
f3 (C h n) w = h "z" w
```

What is the type of `ex5`, `ex6`, and `f3` ?

Church Numerals

Recognize the data type definition for natural numbers

```
data Nat = Z | S Nat
```

The catamorphism for Nat is the natural recursion pattern for Nat (sometimes called the fold)

```
cataNat zobj sfun Z = zobj  
cataNat zobj sfun (S x) =  
    sfun (cataNat zobj sfun x)
```

Many functions on Nat can be defined in terms of cataNat

```
plus x y = cataNat y S x  
ex7 = plus (S Z) (S (S Z))  
Main> ex7  
S (S (S Z))
```

CataNat for multiplication

```
times x y = cataNat Z (plus x) y
```

```
one = S Z
```

```
two = S one
```

```
three = S two
```

```
ex8 = times two three
```

```
Main> ex8
```

```
S (S (S (S (S (S Z))))))
```

Nat as a rank 2 function

```
data N = N (forall z . z -> (z -> z) -> z)
```

```
cataN zobj sfun (N f) = f zobj sfun
```

```
n0 = N(\ z s -> z)
```

```
n1 = N(\ z s -> s z)
```

```
n2 = N(\ z s -> s(s z))
```

```
n3 = N(\ z s -> s(s(s z)))
```

```
n4 = N(\ z s -> s(s(s(s z))))
```

```
n2Int n = cataN 0 (+1) n
```

```
ex9 = n2Int n3
```

```
Main> ex9
```

```
3
```

Plus in data type N

```
--plus x y = cataNat y S x
```

```
succN :: N -> N
```

```
succN (N f) = N(\ z s -> s(f z s))
```

```
plusN :: N -> N -> N
```

```
plusN x y = cataN y succN x
```

```
ex10 = n2Int (plusN n2 n3)
```

```
Main> ex10
```

```
5
```

Church Numerals for List

```
data L1 a = L1 (forall b . b -> (a -> b -> b) -> b)
```

```
-- [1,2,3,4]
```

```
ex1 = L1 ( \ n c -> c 1 (c 2 (c 3 (c 4 n))))
```

```
toList (L1 f) = f [] (:)
```

```
ex11 = toList ex1
```

```
Main> :t ex11
```

```
ex11 :: [Integer]
```

```
Main> ex11
```

```
[1,2,3,4]
```

Append in "church numeral" lists

```
cataList nobj cfun [] = nobj
cataList nobj cfun (x:xs) =
    cfun x (cataList nobj cfun)

cataL nobj cfun (L1 f) = f nobj cfun

cons x (L1 f) = L1(\ n c -> c x (f n c))

app x y = cataL y cons x

ex12 = app ex1 ex1
ex13 = toList ex12

Main> ex13
[1,2,3,4,1,2,3,4]
```


lists, fusion, and rank 2 polymorphism

- This form of rank 2 polymorphism has been exploited to justify fusion or deforestation.
- Consider

```
sum (map (+1) (upto 3))
sum (map (+1) [1,2,3])
sum [2,3,4]
9
```
- Produces, then consumes a bunch of intermediate lists, which never needed to be produced at all

Discovering fusion

How can we take an arbitrary expression about lists like:

```
sum(map (+1) (upto 3))
```

and discover an equivalent expression that does not build the intermediate lists?

Answer: write functions in terms of abstract recursion patterns, and rank-2 representations of lists.

```
cata : b -> (a -> b -> b) -> [a] -> b
```

```
build: (forall b . b -> (a -> b -> b) -> b) -> [a]
```

with the law: $\text{cata } n \ c \ (\text{build } f) == f \ n \ c$

```
build :: (forall b . b -> (a -> b -> b) -> b) -> [a]
build f = f [] (:)
cata nobj cfun [] = nobj
cata nobj cfun (x:xs) = cfun x (cata nobj cfun xs)
upto x =
  build(\ n c ->
    let h m = if m>x
              then n
              else c m (h (m+1))
    in h 1)

mapX f x =
  build(\ n c -> cata n (\ y ys -> c (f y) ys) x)
sumX xs = cata 0 (+) xs
```

```

sum(map (+1) (upto 3)) ==
sum(map (+1)
  (build(\ n c ->
    let h m = if m>3
              then n
              else c m (h (m+1))
    in h 1) ==
sum(build(\ n c ->
  cata n (\ y ys -> c (f y) ys)
    (build(\ n c ->
      let h m = if m>3
                then n
                else c m (h (m+1))
      in h 1))) ==

```

```

sum(build(\ n c ->
      let h m = if m>3
                then n
                else c (f m) (h (m+1))
      in h 1)) ==
cata 0 (+)
  (build(\ n c ->
        let h m = if m>3
                  then n
                  else c (f m) (h (m+1))
        in h 1)) ==
let h m = if m>3
          then 0
          else (f m) + (h (m+1))]
in h 1 == sum(map (+1) (upto 3))

```

We can encode this as such

```
data List a
  = Nil
  | Cons a (List a)
  | Build (forall b . b -> (a -> b -> b) -> b)
```

```
cataZ nobj cfun Nil = nobj
cataZ nobj cfun (Cons y ys) = cfun y (cataZ nobj cfun ys)
cataZ nobj cfun (Build f) = f nobj cfun
```

```
uptoZ x =
  Build(\ n c -> let h m = if m>x
                    then n
                    else c m (h (m+1))
              in h 1)
```

```
mapZ f x =
  Build(\ n c -> cataZ n (\ y ys -> c (f y) ys) x)
sumZ xs = cataZ 0 (+) xs
```

Results

```
ex14 = sumZ(mapZ (+1) (uptoZ 3))
```

```
ex15 = sum(map (+1) ([1..3]))
```

```
Main> ex14
```

```
9
```

```
(81 reductions, 177 cells)
```

```
Main> ex15
```

```
9
```

```
(111 reductions, 197 cells)
```

Type inference and Hindley-Milner

How is type inference done?

- Structural recursion over a term.
- Uses an environment which maps variables to their types
- Returns a computation in a monad
- $\text{type infer} :: \text{Exp} \rightarrow \text{Env} \rightarrow \text{M Type}$
- What does the Env look like
 - partial function from Name \rightarrow Scheme
 - Scheme is an encoding of a Hindley-Milner polymorphic type. All the forall's to the outermost position.
 - Often implemented as a list

How is Env used

```
g x = let f = \ y -> (x,y)
```

```

    w1 = f "z"
    w2 = f True
in (x,f)
```

Every instance of a variable is given a new instance of its type.

Let Capital letters (A,B,C,A1,B1,C1, ...) indicate new fresh type variables.

In the box

suppose $f :: \text{forall } a . a \rightarrow (x,a)$

Instantiation

```
g x = let f = \ y -> (x,y)
      w1 = f "z"
      w2 = f True
      in (x, f)
```

```
the f in (f "z")
```

```
A1 -> (x,A1)    A1 gets "bound" to String
```

```
the f in (f True)
```

```
A2 -> (x,A2)    A2 gets "bound" to Bool
```

```
the f in (x,f)
```

```
A3 -> (x,A3)    A3 remains "unbound"
```

Binding Introduction

```

g x = let f = \ y -> (x, y)
      w1 = f "z"
      w2 = f True
      in (x, f)

```

Every Bound program variable is assigned a new fresh type variable

- $\{g :: E1\}$
- $\{g :: E1, x :: A1\}$
- $\{g :: E1, x :: A1, f :: B1, y :: C1\}$
- $\{g :: E1, x :: A1, f :: B1, w1 :: D1\}$
- $\{g :: E1, x :: A1, f :: B1, w1 :: D1, w2 :: F1\}$

Type inference

```
g x = let f = \ y -> (x,y)
      w1 = f "z"
      w2 = f True
      in (x,f)
```

{g :: E1, x :: A1, f :: B1}

As type inference proceeds type variables become "bound", thus the type of

(\ y -> (x,y))

becomes

C1 -> (A1,C1)

Since f = (\ y -> (x,y))

the type variable B1 could be bound to

C1 -> (A1,C1)

Generalization

But the rules of Hindley-Milner type inference say for every let-bound variable generalize it on all the type variables not in the current scope.

```
g x = let f = ((\ y -> (x,y)) :: C1 -> (A1,C1))
      w1 = f "z"
      w2 = f True
      in (x,f)
{g :: E1, x :: A1, f :: B1}
```

Since c_1 does not appear in the types of the current scope, it is generalized and the type of f (B_1) becomes polymorphic.

```
{g :: E1, x :: A1, f :: forall c . c -> (A1,c)}
```

The monad of Type Inference

Methods required

```
unify :: Type -> Type -> M ()  
lambdaExt :: Name -> Env -> M (Env, Type)  
letExt :: Name -> Env -> M (Env, Scheme)  
lookup :: Name -> Env -> Scheme  
instantiate :: Scheme -> M Type  
generalize :: Type -> Env -> M Scheme  
freshTypeVar :: M Type
```

Rank 2 polymorphism

- The Type of `runSt` is a rank 2 polymorphic type

– `runST :: ∀a . (∀s . ST s a) -> a`

- The `forall` is not all the way to the outside.
- There are other uses of rank 2 types.