Functional programming, Seminar No. 2

Danya Rogozin
Institute for Information Transmission Problems, RAS
Serokell OÜ
Higher School of Economics
The Faculty of Computer Science

Intro

On the previous seminar, we:

- discussed the general aspects of Haskell
- took a look at the Haskell ecosystem

Intro

On the previous seminar, we:

- discussed the general aspects of Haskell
- took a look at the Haskell ecosystem

Today, we:

- study the basic Haskell syntax
- study the list data type as one of the Haskell data structures
- realise why Haskell is a lazy language

Bindings

The equality sign in Haskell denotes binding:

Example

```haskell
fortyTwo = 42
coolString = "coolString"
```

Local binding with the `let`-keyword:

Example

```haskell
fortyTwo = let number = 43 in number - 1
```

Function definitions

The following functions are also defined as bindings:

Example

```
add x y = x + y
userName name = "Username: " ++ name
id x = x
```

The same functions defined with lambda:

Example

```
add = \x y -> x + y
userName = \name -> "Username: " ++ name
id = \x -> x
```

Function application

As in the lambda calculus, function application is left associative by default

Example

```
{-
foo x y z = f x y z = ((f x) y) z
-}
```

One may use the dollar infix operator. That would allow us to avoid too many brackets. For example, the functions `function` and `function1` are equivalent:

Example

```
function f x y z = f ((x y) z)
function1 f x y z = f $ x y $ z
```

Prefix and infix notation

Any operator or function might be called in prefix and infix:

Example

```
> map (\x -> x * pi * 100) [1..3]
[314.1592653589793,628.3185307179587,942.4777960769379]
> (\x -> x * pi * 100) `map` [1..3]
[314.1592653589793,628.3185307179587,942.4777960769379]
```

One may declare an operator defining its priority and associativity explicitly. Here's an example:

Example

```
(^) :: (Num a, Integral b) => a -> b -> a
infixr 8 ^
```

Currying and partial application

Recall the function `add` once more. Here is an example of partial application:

Example

```
add x y = x + y
addFive = add 5
twentyEight = addFive 23
  -- 28
```

Partial application is well-defined since all many-argument functions in Haskell are curried by default.

Immutability and laziness

In Haskell, values are immutable. A small example:

Example

```
> list = [1,2,3,4]
> reverse list
[4,3,2,1]
> list
[1,2,3,4]
> 10 : list
[10,1,2,3,4]
> list
[1,2,3,4]
```

Recursion

The straighforward factorial and the tail-recursive one:

Example

```
factorial n
  = if n == 0 then 1 else n * factorial (n - 1)

tailFactorial n = helper 1 n
  where
  helper acc x =
    if x > 1
    then helper (acc * x) (x - 1)
    else acc
```

Guards

Let us take a look at the factorial implementation via guards:

Example

```
tailFactorial n = helper 1 n
  where
  helper acc x | x > 1 = helper (acc * x) (x - 1)
               | otherwise acc
```

Basic datatypes

The basic datatypes are:

- `Bool`
- `Int`
- `Integer`
- `Char`
- `()`
- If `a` and `b` are types, then `a -> b` is a type
- If `a` and `b` are types, then `(a,b)` is a type
- If `a` is a type, then `[a]` is a type

A type declaration has the following form:

```
term :: type
```

Datatypes and constructors

We take the list of basic data types and associate constructors with these types. A constructor is a term that allows one to obtain a value of a given type.

`Bool`	`True` and `False`
`Int`	Integers from -2^{29} to $2^{29}-1$
`Integer`	The set of integers
`Char`	Characters `'0'`, ..., `'9'`, `'a'`, ..., `'z'`, etc
`()`	`()` only
`a -> b`	$\lambda x \to m$
`(a,b)`	if `x :: a` and `y :: b`, then `(x, y) :: (a,b)`
`[a]`	the empty list `[]`
`[a]`	if `x :: a` and `xs :: [a]`, then `x : xs :: [a]`

Types in GHCi

Use the GHCi command `:t` to know a type of an expression:

Example

```
> :t 5
5 :: Num p => p
> :t not
not :: Bool -> Bool
> :t [0.5, 0.6, 0.7]
[0.5, 0.6, 0.7] :: Fractional a => [a]
> :t (\x -> "dratuti, " ++ x)
(\x -> "dratuti, " ++ x) :: [Char] -> [Char]
> :t 'x'
'x' :: Char
```

Function declaration with datatypes

Let us recall the examples of function declarations:

Example

```
add x y = x + y
userName name = "Username: " ++ name
```

One may annotate these functions with type signatures as follows:

Example

```
add :: Int -> Int -> Int
add x y = x + y

userName :: String -> String
userName name = "Username: " ++ name
```

Lists

Let's talk about lists. In Haskell, a list is a homogeneous collection of elements.

Example

```haskell
empty :: [Int]
empty = []

ten :: [Int]
ten = [10]

tenEleven :: [Int]
tenEleven = 11 : ten

tenElevenTwelve :: [Int]
tenElevenTwelve = 12 : tenEleven
-- 12 : (11 : [])
```

Lists. Ranges

Example

```
oneToFive :: [Int]
oneToFive = [1..5]

oneToSevenOdd :: [Int]
oneToSevenOdd = [1,3..7]

nat :: [Int]
nat = [0,1..]

evens :: [Int]
evens = [0,2,4..]
```

Lists. Heads and Tails

Example

```
> tail [1..3]
[2,3]
> head [1..3]
1
> head []
*** Exception: Prelude.head: empty list
> tail []
*** Exception: Prelude.tail: empty list
```

Lists. Heads and Tails

Example

```
> tail [1..3]
[2,3]
> head [1..3]
1
> head []
*** Exception: Prelude.head: empty list
> tail []
*** Exception: Prelude.tail: empty list
```



Other helpful list functions

Example

```
Prelude> drop 3 [1..7]
[4,5,6,7]
Prelude> take 4 ['a'..'h']
"abcd"
Prelude> replicate 3 "d"
["d","d","d"]
Prelude> replicate 3 'd'
"ddd"
Prelude> zip [1,2,3] "this is a word"
[(1,'t'),(2,'h'),(3,'i')]
Prelude> unzip [(1,'t'),(2,'h'),(3,'i')]
([1,2,3],"thi")
Prelude> ['a'..'h'] !! 3
'd'
```

List compeherension

Example

```
> take 4 [(i, j) | i <- [1..10], j <- [1..10], i == j*j]
[(1,1),(4,2),(9,3),(16,4)]
> [ i | i <- "a cool sentence", i < 'h']
"a c eece"
> [ i | i <- "a cool sentence", fromEnum i < 100 ]
"a c c"
```

Higher order functions

Function is a first-class object and one may pass any function as an argument:

Example

```
inc :: Int -> Int
inc x = x + 1

changeTwiceBy :: (Int -> Int) -> Int -> Int
changeTwiceBy operation value
  = operation (operation value)

seven :: Int
seven = changeTwiceBy inc 5
```

`Case`-expressions

`Case`-expressions allows one to perform case analysis within a function body.

Example

```haskell
getFont :: Int -> String
getFont n =
  case n of
    0 -> "PLAIN"
    1 -> "BOLD"
    2 -> "ITALIC"
    _ -> "UNKNOWN"
```

We recall a couple of definitions related to the lambda calculus:

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

We recall a couple of definitions related to the lambda calculus:

1. A term M is called *weakly normalisable* (WN), if there exists some halting reduction path that starts from M

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

We recall a couple of definitions related to the lambda calculus:

1. A term M is called *weakly normalisable* (WN), if there exists some halting reduction path that starts from M
2. A term M is called *strongly normalisable* (SN), if any reduction path that starts from M terminates

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

We recall a couple of definitions related to the lambda calculus:

1. A term M is called *weakly normalisable* (WN), if there exists some halting reduction path that starts from M
2. A term M is called *strongly normalisable* (SN), if any reduction path that starts from M terminates

It is clear, that SN implies WN, not vice versa. In other words, there exists a term that has an infinite reduction path, but it has a finite reduction path at the same time.

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Let us consider the example of the following ridiculous term: $(\lambda xy.x)(\lambda z.z)((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx))$. One may reduce this term in two ways:

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Let us consider the example of the following ridiculous term: $(\lambda xy.x)(\lambda z.z)((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx))$. One may reduce this term in two ways:

From the one hand:

$$
\begin{array}{l}
(\lambda xy.x)(\lambda z.z)((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)) \rightarrow_\beta \\
(\lambda y.[x := (\lambda z.z)])((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)) \rightarrow_\beta \\
(\lambda y.\lambda z.z)((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)) \rightarrow_\beta \\
(\lambda z.z)[y := (\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)] \rightarrow_\beta \\
\lambda z.z
\end{array}
$$

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Let us consider the example of the following ridiculous term: $(\lambda xy.x)(\lambda z.z)((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx))$. One may reduce this term in two ways:

From the one hand:

$$(\lambda xy.x)(\lambda z.z)((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)) \to_\beta$$
$$(\lambda y.[x := (\lambda z.z)])((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)) \to_\beta$$
$$(\lambda y.\lambda z.z)((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)) \to_\beta$$
$$(\lambda z.z)[y := (\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)] \to_\beta$$
$$\lambda z.z$$

From the other hand:

$$(\lambda xy.x)(\lambda z.z)((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)) \to_\beta$$
$$(\lambda xy.x)(\lambda z.z)(xx)(x := [\lambda x.xx]) \to_\beta$$
$$(\lambda xy.x)(\lambda z.z)((\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)) \to_\beta \dots$$

spasiti pamagiti pajalusta ya tak bolshe ni magu (((((((9(99(lol kek

Let us consider the example above in some other aspects.

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Let us consider the example above in some other aspects.

- In the first case, we have got a sensible result by several reduction steps. On the other hand, we have a loop in the second case.

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Let us consider the example above in some other aspects.

- In the first case, we have got a sensible result by several reduction steps. On the other hand, we have a loop in the second case.
- Also, in the first case, we start our reduction from the leftmost innermost redex. But when we were trying to reduce the term $(\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)$, we have seen that something went wrong.

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Let us consider the example above in some other aspects.

- In the first case, we have got a sensible result by several reduction steps. On the other hand, we have a loop in the second case.
- Also, in the first case, we start our reduction from the leftmost innermost redex. But when we were trying to reduce the term $(\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)$, we have seen that something went wrong.
- Can we distinguish all possible ways of term reduction?

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Let us consider the example above in some other aspects.

- In the first case, we have got a sensible result by several reduction steps. On the other hand, we have a loop in the second case.
- Also, in the first case, we start our reduction from the leftmost innermost redex. But when we were trying to reduce the term $(\lambda x.xx)(\lambda x.xx)$, we have seen that something went wrong.
- Can we distinguish all possible ways of term reduction?

In fact, we need to distinguish possible ways of application reduction, so far as we have no other options in the remaining cases:

1. If x is a variable, then x is already in normal form
2. If a term has the form $\lambda x.M$, then we reduce M

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Thus, one needs to overview of the possible ways of application reduction. We have two chairs:

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Thus, one needs to overview of the possible ways of application reduction. We have two chairs:

1. $(\lambda x_1 \ldots x_n.M)N_1 \ldots N_n$: we firtsly reduce $(N_i)_{i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}}$
2. $(\lambda x_1 \ldots x_n.M)N_1 \ldots N_n$: reduce $(\lambda x.M)N_1$ and go further from left to right

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Thus, one needs to overview of the possible ways of application reduction. We have two chairs:

1. $(\lambda x_1 \dots x_n.M)N_1 \dots N_n$: we firtsly reduce $(N_i)_{i \in \{1,\dots,n\}}$
2. $(\lambda x_1 \dots x_n.M)N_1 \dots N_n$: reduce $(\lambda x.M)N_1$ and go further from left to right

The first way is called *applicative order reduction*, the second one is normal order reduction. In the following sense, the second is better:

Theoretical Flashback. Reduction strategies

Thus, one needs to overview of the possible ways of application reduction. We have two chairs:

1. $(\lambda x_1 \dots x_n.M)N_1 \dots N_n$: we firtsly reduce $(N_i)_{i \in \{1,\dots,n\}}$
2. $(\lambda x_1 \dots x_n.M)N_1 \dots N_n$: reduce $(\lambda x.M)N_1$ and go further from left to right

The first way is called *applicative order reduction*, the second one is normal order reduction. In the following sense, the second is better:

Theorem
Let M be a term such that M has a normal form M', then M might be reduced to M' with normal order reduction.

Theoretical Flashback. Call-by-value and call-by-name

- The applicative (normal) order is often called call-by-value (call-by-name)

Theoretical Flashback. Call-by-value and call-by-name

- The applicative (normal) order is often called call-by-value (call-by-name)
- The most mainstream programming languages you know (Java, Python, Kotlin, etc) have call-by-value semantics

Theoretical Flashback. Call-by-value and call-by-name

- The applicative (normal) order is often called call-by-value (call-by-name)
- The most mainstream programming languages you know (Java, Python, Kotlin, etc) have call-by-value semantics
- The Haskell reduction has a call-by-need strategy which is quite close to call-by-name. Informally, such a stragety is called *lazy*. Laziness denotes that Haskell doesn't compute a value if it's not needed at the moment

Theoretical Flashback. Call-by-value and call-by-name

- The applicative (normal) order is often called call-by-value (call-by-name)
- The most mainstream programming languages you know (Java, Python, Kotlin, etc) have call-by-value semantics
- The Haskell reduction has a call-by-need strategy which is quite close to call-by-name. Informally, such a stragety is called *lazy*. Laziness denotes that Haskell doesn't compute a value if it's not needed at the moment
- Call-by-name reduction reduces reducible terms to the bitter end, but it's not always optimal, unfortunately

Haskell reduction

Suppose we have the following trivial function:

Example

```haskell
square :: Int -> Int
square x = x * x
```

Haskell reduction

Suppose we have the following trivial function:

Example

```
square :: Int -> Int
square x = x * x
```

If we call this function on $(1+2)$, then we would have the following story:

$\text{square}\,(1+2) = (1+2)*(1+2) = 3*(1+2) = 3*3 = 9$

Haskell reduction

Suppose we have the following trivial function:

Example

```
square :: Int -> Int
square x = x * x
```

If we call this function on $(1+2)$, then we would have the following story:

$\text{square}\,(1+2) = (1+2)*(1+2) = 3*(1+2) = 3*3 = 9$ We evalutate $(1+2)$ twice, even if we know that $1+2=3$ a priori.

Haskell reduction

Suppose we have the following trivial function:

Example

```haskell
square :: Int -> Int
square x = x * x
```

If we call this function on $(1+2)$, then we would have the following story:

$\text{square}\,(1+2) = (1+2)*(1+2) = 3*(1+2) = 3*3 = 9$ We evalutate $(1+2)$ twice, even if we know that $1+2=3$ a priori. The question of performance is still relevant.

The notion of a weak head normal form

In Haskell, reduction evalutates a term to its weak head normal form, where the outermost must be either constructor or lambda. Here are examples: WHNFs from the left and non-WHNFs from the right

`78`	
`2 : [1,2]`	`1 + 665`
`'p' : ("ri" ++ "vet")`	`(\x -> x ++ "ab") "cd"`
`[1, 1 + 2, 1 + 3]`	`length [1..145]`
`("hel" ++ "lo", "world")`	`(\f g x -> f (g x)) id`
`\x -> (x + 2) + 2`	

Pure functions and side-effects

Pure functions and side-effects

- A function is called *pure* if it has no side effects

Pure functions and side-effects

- A function is called *pure* if it has no side effects
- It means that such a function behaves ’in the same way’ at every point. This principle is also called *referential transparency*

Pure functions and side-effects

- A function is called *pure* if it has no side effects
- It means that such a function behaves ’in the same way’ at every point. This principle is also called *referential transparency*
- A side-effect function is a function that may yield different values passing the same arguments. Mathematically, such a function is not function at all.

Pure functions and side-effects

- A function is called *pure* if it has no side effects
- It means that such a function behaves 'in the same way' at every point. This principle is also called *referential transparency*
- A side-effect function is a function that may yield different values passing the same arguments. Mathematically, such a function is not function at all.
- Haskell functions are (mostly) pure ones, but Haskell is not confluent as a version of the lambda calculus

The failure of the Church-Rosser property

Let us consider the following quite simple example. In Haskell one has a function called `seq`. According to Hackage, “The value of `seq a b` is bottom if a is bottom, and otherwise equal to b.” This function is a sort of instrument to introduce the restricted strictness to Haskell. The listing below demostrates the failure of the CRP:

```
seq :: a -> b -> b
seq _|_ _ = _|_
seq _ b   = b

bottom = undefined

seq bottom 14          == bottom
seq (bottom  . id) 14 == 14
```

Finally

On this seminar, we

- got acquinted with the basic Haskell syntax and basic data types
- discussed pure functions and the example of the confluence failure

Finally

On this seminar, we

- got acquinted with the basic Haskell syntax and basic data types
- discussed pure functions and the example of the confluence failure

On the next seminar, we will

- start to learn polymorphism and its advantages
- introduce typeclasses
- study the very first examples of typeclasses

Thank you!