

Why does `Applicative (StateT s f)` instance require `Monad f` bound? #134

New issue

Open ktt3ja opened this issue on May 3, 2015 · 1 comment





```
+00
thejohnfreeman commented on Nov 14, 2015
Can you offer an implementation of <*> for StateT s f that only uses pure and <*> for f? I'm not
sure it's possible, because the function within a StateT is essentially monadic. Consider the signature of
  StateT g <^*> StateT h = ...
  -- g :: s -> f (a -> b, s)
  -- h :: s -> f (a, s)
  -- g and h have signatures like that of the left argument of >>=
We need to apply g and h to get the function and argument respectively. We cannot apply them to the
same state, though, or we will have to drop one of the two intermediate states, since the state type s is
not a monoid:
  -- choose the first intermediate state
  StateT g <*> StateT h = StateT $ \s -> keepFirst <$> g s <*> h s
    where keepFirst (f, s')(x, _) = (f x, s')
  -- choose the second intermediate state
  StateT g <*> StateT h = StateT $ \s -> \ensuremath{ \text{keepSecond}} < \s g \s <*> h \s
    where keepSecond (f, \underline{\ }) (x, s') = (f x, s')
The intermediate state is locked within an applicative in the result of g s, and we want to thread it through
h . That sequencing suggests to me that we need f to be a monad, and in fact, the Applicative
instance for StateT in the transformers package requires f to be a monad, and its implementation of
<*> uses the monadic function ap .
```

I tried but could not succeed without using it as a monad. Here's the implementation I settled on:

```
StateT g <*> StateT h = StateT $ \s -> do
  (f, s') <- g s
  (x, s'') <- h s'
  return (f x, s'')</pre>
```



(7)

© 2016 GitHub, Inc. Terms Privacy Security Contact Help

Status API Training Shop Blog About