Chapter 8

Declaring types and classes

Connor Baker

8.1 Type declarations

We can introduce new names for types that we already have by means of the type keyword. As an example, if we wanted to think of an ordered pair of integers as some position, we could do so by writing

```
type Pos = (Int, Int)
```

and we might declare a transformation as a function which maps a Pos to another Pos

```
type Trans = Pos -> Pos
```

type declarations are not allowed to be recursive. Recursive types may be declared using the data mechanism, which is discussed in the next section.

type declarations can be parameterized by other types. If we wanted a more generic two-tuple instead of one specifically meant for integers, we could write

```
type Pair a = (a,a)
```

Additionally, we can use more than one parameter. Suppose we wanted a type which is a list of keys associated with values:

```
type Assoc k v = [(k,v)]
```

We could define a function which returns the first value that is associated with a key

```
find :: Eq k => k -> Assoc k v -> v
find k t = head [v | (k',v) <- t, k == k']
```

find is a function which takes a key (which must be a type which derives Eq), a list of key-value pairs, and returns a value. It works by taking the first element of the list of values which match the key used as an argument.

8.2 Data declarations

A new type, as opposed to a synonym for an existing type, can be declared by specifying its values using the data mechanism.

If we wanted to define a new type which describes the cardinal directions, we could do

```
data Move = North | South | East | West
```

The pipe (|) symbol is read as *or* and the new values of the type are called *constructors*. The names of new constructors must begin with a capital letter, just like the name of the new types. Additionally, the same constructor name cannot be used in multiple types.

With pattern matching, we can define functions which apply a move to a position, which apply a sequence of moves to a position, and which apply the reverse direction of a move.

Connor Baker 1 of 10

```
move :: Move -> Pos -> Pos
move North (x,y) = (x,y+1)
move South (x,y) = (x, y-1)
move East (x,y) = (x+1,y)
move West (x,y) = (x-1,y)

moves :: [Move] -> Pos -> Pos
moves [] p = p
moves (m:ms) p = moves ms (move m p)

rev :: Move -> Move
rev North = South
rev south = North
rev East = West
rev West = East
```

Note: If you want to try these in GHCi, the phrase deriving Show must be added to the end of the data declaration so that the system can display values of the new type. We'll discuss this more later in the chapter.

Constructors can have arguments. As an example, consider the Shape data type:

```
data Shape = Circle Float | Rect Float Float
```

These constructors are used to define functions on Shapes. As examples, consider the following:

```
square :: Float -> Shape
square n = Rect n n

area :: Shape -> Float
area (Circle r) = pi * r ^ 2
area (Rect x y) = x * y
```

Due to their taking arguments, the constructors Circle and Rect are considered *constructor functions* which map Floats to Shapes.

The difference between functions and constructor functions is that the latter have no defining equations and exist solely for the purpose of building pieces of data. As an example, negate 1.0 can be evaluated to -1.0; Circle 1.0 is fully evaluated and cannot be further simplified. The expression Circle 1.0 is a piece of data in the same way that 1.0 is.

Data declaration can also be parameterized. Consider the following type from Prelude:

```
data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
```

This type is thought of as being values of a type a which may either fail or succeed. As an example, let's consider the same versions of div and head (recall that div will not work if the divisor is 0 and that head will not work on the empty list):

```
safediv :: Int -> Int -> Maybe Int
safedif _ 0 = Nothing
```

Connor Baker 2 of 10

```
safediv m n = Just (div m n)
safehead :: [a] -> Maybe a
safehead [] = Nothing
safehead xs = Just (head xs)
```

8.3 Newtype declarations

If a type has a single constructor with a single argument, then it can also be declared with the newtype mechanism. As an example, a natural number type could be defined as

```
newtype Nat = N Int
```

The single constructor N takes an Int as an argument – it is up to the library to ensure that it is non-negative.

Let's look at how newtype compares with these two alternative definitions of the natural number type

```
type Nat = Int
data Nat = N Int
```

Using newtype instead of type means that Nat and Int are different types instead of synonyms; this ensures that the type system does not allow using one in place of the other.

Using newtype instead of data brings a performance benefit. newtype constructors (like N) don't incur any costs when the programs are evaluated since they are automatically removed by the compiler once type-checking has completed.

8.4 Recursive types

As mentioned in the first section, type declarations can't be recursive. However, both data and newtype can be recursive. Consider a recursive definition of the natural numbers

```
data Nat = Zero | Succ Nat
```

Then the values of type Nat correspond to natural numbers – Zero represents the number zero and Succ represents the successor function (as defined on the naturals, that's (+1)).

We can define the following conversion functions:

```
nat2int :: Nat -> Int
nat2int Zero = 0
nat2int (Succ n) = 1 + nat2int n

int2nat :: Int -> Nat
int2nat 0 = Zero
int2nat n = Succ (int2nat (n-1))
```

Connor Baker 3 of 10

We can define addition on the Nat type as

```
add :: Nat -> Nat -> Nat
add Zero n = n
add (Succ m) n = Succ (add m n)
```

This definition draws on the idea that the addition of two natural numbers takes place by moving the Succ constructors from the first number until they exhausted, at which point the Zero at the end is replaced by the second number. As an example, let's see what happens with add 2 1:

```
add (Succ (Succ Zero)) (Succ Zero)
= {applying add}
Succ (add (Succ Zero) (Succ Zero))
= {applying add}
Succ (Succ (add Zero (Succ Zero))
= {applying add}
Succ (Succ (Succ Zero))
```

As another example, consider the following definition of the List type:

```
dat List a = Nil | Cons a (List a)
```

A value of type List a is either Nil (the empty list) or of the form Cons x xs for some values x of type a and xs of type List a, which represent a non-empty list.

We can re-define the len function so that it operates on our own List:

```
len :: List a -> Int
len Nil = 0
len (Cos _ xs) = 1 + len xs
```

Recursion makes representing some data structures, like binary trees, fairly simple:

```
data BinTree a = Leaf a | Node (BinTree a) a (BinTree a)
```

The second constructor can be interpreted as the left child, the value, and the right child of a node in the tree.

We can define the tree



as

```
t :: BinTree Int
t = Node (Node (Leaf 1) 3 (Leaf 4)) 5
```

Connor Baker 4 of 10

```
(Node (Leaf 6) 7 (Leaf 9))
```

Consider a function that searches such a tree and reports whether a value exists within it (where l, v, and r are the left node, value, and right node, respectively):

```
occurs :: Eq a => a -> Tree a -> Bool
occurs x (Leaf v) = x == v
occurs x (Node l v r) = x == v || occurs x l || occurs x r
```

As an added benefit of lazy evaluation, if either of the first two conditions are true, then the remaining conditions are not evaluated. In the worst case occurs traverses the entire tree.

Consider a function which flattens a tree to a list:

```
flatten :: Tree a -> [a]
flatten (Leaf x) = [x]
flatten (Node l x r) = flatten l ++ [x] ++ flatten r
```

If applying this function to a tree yields a sorted list, then the tree is called a search tree.

Applying flatten to our tree yields [1,3,4,5,6,7,9] so we do have a search tree. Since that is the case, we can re-write occurs to take advantage of the fact that we have a binary search tree:

This version only traverses one path down the tree instead of testing every node.

We can declare many different types of trees. We can have trees that only have data in their leaves,

```
data Tree a = Leaf a | Node (Tree a) (Tree a)
```

trees that have data only in their nodes,

```
data Tree a = Leaf | Node (Tree a) a (Tree a)
```

trees that have different data types in their leaves and nodes,

```
data Tree a b = Leaf a | Node (Tree a b) b (Tree a b)
```

or trees that have a list of sub-trees

```
data Tree a = Node a [Tree a]
```

Connor Baker 5 of 10

8.5 Class and instance declarations

Classes are different from types and are defined by the **class** mechanism. As an example, the class Eq of equality types is declared in the standard prelude as

```
class Eq a where
  (==), (/=) :: a -> a -> Bool
  x /= y = not (x == y)
```

We interpret this as meaning that a type a is an instance of the class Eq if and only if it supports the equality and inequality operators defined within the class. In actuality, because we have a *default definition* for the /= operator, instances of Eq only require a definition for the == operator.

Type classes were created as a structured way to express "ad-hoc polymorphism", which is basically the technical term for overloaded functions. In the example Eq class given above, if we have a complex data structure like a tree, our definition of the == operator will be different from one which compares two Pairs. Making a type an instance of Eq is a promise to the compiler that that type has a specialized definition of the == operator. Additionally, default definitions can be overridden by an instance if (as the word default implies).

As another example, we can make the type Bool into an instance of Eq as follows:

```
instance Eq Bool where
False == False = True
True == True = True
_ == _ = False
```

Only types which are declared by the data and newtype mechanisms can be made into instances of classes.

Classes can be extended to form new classes. As an example consider the class Ord, which contains values which have a total ordering. It is defined as an extension of Eq:

As illustrated by the definition of the class Ord, instances must be instances of Eq and support six additional operators

We can have Bool implement Ord by adding support for the additional operators which do not have a default implementation:

Connor Baker 6 of 10

Derived instances

When new types are declared, it's usually appropriate to make them instances of a few built-in classes. We can do this by using the deriving mechanism:

```
data Bool = False | True
deriving (Eq, Ord, Show, Read)
```

Haskell then automagically implements the required definitions for those classes.

```
> False == False
True
> False < True
True
> show False
"False"
```

You might wonder how the compiler could decide how to implement an ordering on Bool. In the case of deriving instances of Ord, the ordering of the constructors is determined by their position in its declaration. If we had defined Bool as data Bool = True | False then we would have True < False == True.

In the case of constructors with arguments, the types of these arguments *must* be instances of any derived classes. Recall our definitions of Shape and Maybe:

```
data Shape = Circle Float | Rect Float Float

data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
```

Deriving Shape as an equality type requires that the type Float is also an equality type (which is the case here). The same requirement holds for Maybe: if Maybe a derives, Ord then a must also derive Ord (which means that we have created a class constraint on the accepted parameters).

Just like with lists and tuples, Shape's values using with constructors have their arguments ordered lexicographically. Assuming that Shape derives Ord, we might have

Connor Baker 7 of 10

```
> Rect 1.0 4.0 < Rect 2.0 3.0 True

> Rect 1.0 4.0 < Rect 1.0 3.0 False
```

8.6 Tautology checker

The remainder of this chapter contains two extended programming exercises. The first exercise is to develop a function that decides if simple logical propositions are always true (in which case, we call them *tautologies*).

Consider a language of propositions built up from basic values (False, True) and variables (A, B, ..., Z) using negation (\neg), conjunction ($^{\wedge}$), implication (=>), and parentheses. As an example, consider the following propositions:

```
\begin{array}{cccc}
A & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
(A & & & (A & => & B)) & & & & & & & \\
\end{array}
```

The meaning of the logical operators can be defined using truth tables.

A ¬A
F T
T F

A B A^B
F F F
T F
T F F
T T T

A B A => B
F F T
F T T
T F F

Connor Baker 8 of 10

They can be combined to evaluate the results of more complex propositions.

A	A ^ ¬A
F	F
Т	F

Α	В	(A ^ (A => B)) => B
F	F	Т
F	T	Т
Т	F	Т
Т	T	Т

We see that the first is in fact always false (which is called a *contradiction*) while the second is a tautology.

Our first step should be to define a data type to represent our propositions.

```
data Prop = Const Bool
| Var Char
| Not Prop
| And Prop Prop
| Imply Prop Prop
```

We might define our propositions as

```
p1 :: Prop
p1 = And (Var 'A') (Not (Var 'A))

p2 :: Prop
p2 = Imply (And (Var 'A') (Imply (Var 'A') (Var 'B'))) (Var 'B')
```

To evaluate the proposition we need to know the value of each of its variables. We can declare a substitution as a lookup table which associates variable names ot logical values, re-using the Assoc type we introduced earlier in the chapter:

```
type Subst = Assoc Char Bool
```

Connor Baker 9 of 10

As an example, the substitution [('A', False), ('B', True)] assigns the variable A to False and the variable B to True. With the ability to perform substitutions, we can define a function which evaluates propositions given a substitution.

```
eval :: Subst -> Prop -> Bool
eval _ (Const b) = b
eval s (Var x) = find x s
eval s (Not p) = not (eval s p)
eval s (And p q) = eval s p && eval s q
eval s (Imply p q) = eval s p <= eval s q</pre>
```

Note: The logical operator for implication, =>, is implemented by using the ordering we get for free on logical values.

A proposition is a tautology if it is true for all possible substitutions. To make progress towards being able to evaluate whether a proposition is a tautology, we need a function that yields a list of all the variables in a proposition.

```
vars :: Prop -> [Char]
vars (Const _) = []
vars (Var x) = [x]
vars (Not p) = vars p
vars (And p q) = vars p ++ vars q
vars (Imply p q) = vars p ++ vars q
```

Note: vars doesn't provide any sort of mechanism for removing duplicates - that's okay since we can do it later on.

Our goal now is to create a function that returns a list containing every possible set of combinations of true and false. An example of the desired use might be (formatted for clarity):

```
> bools 3
[[False, False, False]
,[False, False, True]
,[False, True, False]
,[False, True, True]
,[True, False, False]
,[True, False, True]
,[True, True, False]
,[True, True, True, True]]
```

We can think of this function as counting in binary (where [False, False, False] corresponds to the binary number 000, [False, False, True] to 001, and so on).

```
bools :: Int -> [[Bool]]
```

Connor Baker 10 of 10