# Functional Programming Functors, Applicatives, and Parsers

Prof. Dr. Peter Thiemann

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany

SS 2019

#### Introduction

- Functors and applicatives are concepts from category theory
- A very general and abstract theory about structures and maps between them
- So general that mathematicians call it "general abstract nonsense"
- Yields very useful abstractions for functional programming
- We only review them specialized for Haskell

#### Functors

#### **Definition**

A Functor is a mapping f between types such that for every pair of type a and b there is a function fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b) such that the functorial laws hold:

- the identity function on a is mapped to the identity function on f a: fmap id fx == id fx, for all fx in fa
- fmap is compatible with function composition fmap (f . g) == fmap f . fmap g, for all f :: b -> c and g :: a -> b

#### **Functors**

#### **Definition**

A Functor is a mapping f between types such that for every pair of type a and b there is a function fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b) such that the functorial laws hold:

- the identity function on a is mapped to the identity function on f a: fmap id fx == id fx, for all fx in f a
- ② fmap is compatible with function composition fmap (f . g) == fmap f . fmap g, for all f ::  $b \rightarrow c$  and g ::  $a \rightarrow b$

## Functions on types

- Int, Bool, Double etc are types.
- parameterized types like [a], BTree a, IO a can be considered as a type constructor (i.e., [], BTree, IO) applied to a type
- We can express that formally by writing kindings: Int :: \*, Bool :: \*,
   Double :: \*, but [] :: \* -> \*, BTree :: \* -> \*, IO :: \* -> \*

## Functors in Haskell

#### The functor class

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

• **NEW:** f is a type variable that can stand for **type constructors** (ie, functions on types) like IO, [], and others. So f :: \* -> \*!

## Functors in Haskell

#### The functor class

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

• **NEW:** f is a type variable that can stand for **type constructors** (ie, functions on types) like IO, [], and others. So f :: \* -> \*!

#### Good news

We already know a couple of functors!

• To make list an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by [], the list type constructor

- To make list an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by [], the list type constructor
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)

- To make list an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by [], the list type constructor
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> ([a] -> [b])

- To make list an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by [], the list type constructor
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> ([a] -> [b])
- I ooks familiar?

- To make list an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by [], the list type constructor
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> ([a] -> [b])
- Looks familiar?
- It's the type of map

- To make list an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by [], the list type constructor
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- fmap :: (a → b) → ([a] → [b])
- Looks familiar?
- It's the type of map
- It remains to check the functorial laws on map

## Functorial laws for list

#### fmap id fx == id fx

fx is a list, so we must proceed by induction

- map id [] == [] == id []
- map id (x:xs) == id x : map id xs == x : xs == id (x : xs)

## Functorial laws for list

#### fmap id fx == id fx

fx is a list, so we must proceed by induction

- $\bullet \ \, \mathsf{map} \,\, \mathsf{id} \,\, [] == [] == \mathsf{id} \,\, []$
- map id (x:xs) == id x : map id xs == x : xs == id (x : xs)

#### fmap (f . g) == fmap f . fmap g

Must hold when applied to any list fx

- $\bullet \ \mathsf{map} \ (\mathsf{f} \ . \ \mathsf{g}) \ [] == [] == \mathsf{map} \ \mathsf{f} \ (\mathsf{map} \ \mathsf{g} \ [])$
- map (f . g) (x : xs) == (f . g) x : map (f . g) xs
- $== f(g \times) : (map f. map g) \times s by function composition and induction$ 
  - == f(g x) : map f(map g xs) by function composition
  - == map f (g x : map g xs) by map f
  - == map f (map g (x : xs)) by map g
  - == (map f. map g) (x : xs)

 $\bullet \ \ Reminder: \ \ \textbf{data} \ \ \textbf{Maybe} \ a = \textbf{Nothing} \ | \ \textbf{Just} \ a$ 

- Reminder: data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
- To make Maybe an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor Maybe

- Reminder: data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
- To make Maybe an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor Maybe
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)

- Reminder: data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
- To make Maybe an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor Maybe
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapMaybe ::  $(a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (Maybe \ a \rightarrow Maybe \ b)$

- Reminder: data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
- To make Maybe an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor Maybe
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapMaybe ::  $(a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (Maybe \ a \rightarrow Maybe \ b)$
- There is actually no real choice for its definition

- Reminder: data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
- To make Maybe an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor Maybe
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapMaybe ::  $(a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (Maybe \ a \rightarrow Maybe \ b)$
- There is actually no real choice for its definition
- mapMaybe g Nothing = Nothing

- Reminder: data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
- To make Maybe an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor Maybe
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapMaybe ::  $(a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (Maybe \ a \rightarrow Maybe \ b)$
- There is actually no real choice for its definition
- mapMaybe g Nothing = Nothing
- mapMaybe g (Just a) = Just (g a)

- Reminder: data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
- To make Maybe an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor Maybe
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapMaybe :: (a −> b) −> (Maybe a −> Maybe b)
- There is actually no real choice for its definition
- mapMaybe g Nothing = Nothing
- mapMaybe g (Just a) = Just (g a)
- Second equation could return Nothing, but that would violate the functorial laws

- Reminder: data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
- To make Maybe an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor Maybe
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapMaybe :: (a −> b) −> (Maybe a −> Maybe b)
- There is actually no real choice for its definition
- mapMaybe g Nothing = Nothing
- mapMaybe g (Just a) = Just (g a)
- Second equation could return Nothing, but that would violate the functorial laws
- It remains to check the functorial laws on mapMaybe

# Functorial laws for Maybe

## $fmap \ \textbf{id} \ fx == \textbf{id} \ fx$

fx is a Maybe, so we must proceed by induction (cases)

- mapMaybe id Nothing == Nothing == id Nothing
- mapMaybe id (Just x) == Just x == id (Just x)

# Functorial laws for Maybe

#### fmap id fx == id fx

fx is a Maybe, so we must proceed by induction (cases)

- mapMaybe id Nothing == Nothing == id Nothing
- mapMaybe id (Just x) == Just x == id (Just x)

#### fmap (f . g) == fmap f . fmap g

Must hold when applied to any Maybe fx

- mapMaybe (f . g) Nothing == Nothing == map f (map g Nothing)
- mapMaybe (f . g) (Just x)
  - == Just ((f . g) x)
  - == Just (f (g x)) by function composition
  - == mapMaybe f (Just (g x)) by map f
  - == mapMaybe f (mapMaybe g (Just x)) by map g
  - == (mapMaybe f . mapMaybe g) (Just x)

• Reminder: data BTree  $a = Leaf \mid Node$  (BTree a) a (BTree a)

- Reminder: data BTree a = Leaf | Node (BTree a) a (BTree a)
- To make BTree an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor BTree

- Reminder: data BTree a = Leaf | Node (BTree a) a (BTree a)
- To make BTree an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor BTree
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)

- Reminder: data BTree a = Leaf | Node (BTree a) a (BTree a)
- To make BTree an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor BTree
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapBTree :: (a -> b) -> (BTree a -> BTree b)

- Reminder: data BTree a = Leaf | Node (BTree a) a (BTree a)
- To make BTree an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor BTree
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapBTree :: (a -> b) -> (BTree a -> BTree b)
- There is actually no real choice for its definition

```
mapBTree g Leaf = Leaf mapBTree g (Node I a r) = Node (mapBTree g I) (g a) (mapBTree g r)
```

- Reminder: data BTree a = Leaf | Node (BTree a) a (BTree a)
- To make BTree an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor BTree
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapBTree :: (a -> b) -> (BTree a -> BTree b)
- There is actually no real choice for its definition

```
mapBTree g Leaf = Leaf mapBTree g (Node I a r) = Node (mapBTree g I) (g a) (mapBTree g r)
```

 In the second equation we need to transform the data at the node by g and the subtrees of type BTree a recursively to BTree b using the mapBTree function

- Reminder: data BTree a = Leaf | Node (BTree a) a (BTree a)
- To make BTree an instance of functor, we need to instantiate the type f in the type of fmap by the type constructor BTree
- fmap :: (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)
- mapBTree :: (a -> b) -> (BTree a -> BTree b)
- There is actually no real choice for its definition

```
\begin{array}{l} \text{mapBTree g Leaf} = \text{Leaf} \\ \text{mapBTree g (Node I a r)} = \text{Node (mapBTree g I) (g a) (mapBTree g r)} \end{array}
```

- In the second equation we need to transform the data at the node by g and the subtrees of type BTree a recursively to BTree b using the mapBTree function
- It remains to check the functorial laws on mapBTree, but we'll leave this inductive proof to you.

## **Applicatives**

- An applicative (functor) is a special kind of functor
- It has further operations and laws
- We motivate it with a couple of examples

## **Applicative**

## Example 1: sequencing IO commands

# **Applicative**

# Example 1: sequencing IO commands sequence :: [IO a] -> IO [a] sequence [] = return []

```
sequence (io:ios) = do x <- io
xs <- sequence ios
return (x:xs)
```

## Alternative way

```
sequence [] = return []
sequence (io:ios) = return (:) 'ap' io 'ap' sequence ios

return :: Monad m => a -> m a
ap :: Monad m => m (a -> b) -> m a -> m b
```

## **Applicative**

```
Example 2: transposition

transpose :: [[a]] -> [[a]]
transpose [] = repeat []
transpose (xs:xss) = zipWith (:) xs (transpose xss)
```

# **Applicative**

# Example 2: transposition transpose :: [[a]] -> [[a]] transpose [] = repeat [] transpose (xs:xss) = zipWith (:) xs (transpose xss)

#### Rewrite

```
transpose [] = repeat []
transpose (xs:xss) = repeat (:) 'zapp' xs 'zapp' transpose xss

zapp :: [a -> b] -> [a] -> [b]
zapp fs xs = zipWith ($) fs xs
```

# Applicative Interpreter

## A datatype for expressions

```
data Exp v
= Var v -- variables
| Val Int -- constants
| Add (Exp v) (Exp v) -- addition
```

# Applicative Interpreter

## A datatype for expressions

```
data Exp v
= Var v — variables
| Val Int — constants
| Add (Exp v) (Exp v) — addition
```

## Standard interpretation

```
eval :: Exp v -> Env v -> Int
eval (Var v) env = fetch v env
eval (Val i) env = i
eval (Add e1 e2) env = eval e1 env + eval e2 env

type Env v = v -> Int
fetch :: v -> Env v -> Int
fetch v env = env v
```

## Applicative Interpreter

#### Alternative implementation

```
eval' :: Exp v -> Env v -> Int
eval' (Var v) = fetch v
eval' (Val i) = const i
eval' (Add e1 e2) = const (+) 'ess' (eval' e1) 'ess' (eval' e2)
ess a b c = (a c) (b c)
```

# **Applicative**

#### Extract the common structure

class Functor f => Applicative f where

pure ::  $a \rightarrow fa$ 

(<\*>) :: f(a -> b) -> fa -> fb

# **Applicative**

#### Laws

Identity

$$_{1}$$
 pure **id**  $<*>$  v  $==$  v

Composition

$$| pure (.) <*> u <*> v <*> w = u <*> (v <*> w)$$

Homomorphism

pure 
$$f < *> pure x = pure (f x)$$

Interchange

$$|u| < *> pure y = pure ($ y) < *> u$$

# Instances of Applicative

• List, Maybe, and IO are also applicatives

# Instances of Applicative

• List, Maybe, and IO are also applicatives

#### Lists

```
instance Applicative [] where
-- pure :: a -> [a]
pure a = [a]
-- (<*>) :: [a -> b] -> [a] -> [b]
fs <*> xs = concatMap (<math>f -> map f xs) fs
```

# Instances of Applicative

• List, Maybe, and IO are also applicatives

#### Lists

```
instance Applicative [] where

-- pure :: a -> [a]

pure a = [a]

-- (<*>) :: [a -> b] -> [a] -> [b]

fs <*> xs = concatMap (\f -> map f xs) fs
```

## Maybe

```
instance Applicative Maybe where

-- pure :: a -> Maybe a

pure a = Just a

-- (<*>) :: Maybe (a -> b) -> Maybe a -> Maybe b

Just f <*> Just a = Just (f a)

- <*> - = Nothing
```

# An interesting example for Applicatives

# An interesting example for Applicatives

## Parsing expressions

- Read a string like "3+42/6"
- Recognize it as a valid term
- Return Bin (Con 3) Add (Bin (Con 42) Div (Con 6))

# **Parsing**

## The type of a simple parser

```
| \mathbf{type} | \mathsf{Parser} | \mathsf{token} | \mathsf{result} = [\mathsf{token}] | -> [(\mathsf{result}, [\mathsf{token}])]
```

# Combinator parsing

## Primitive parsers

```
pempty :: Parser t r
succeed :: r \rightarrow Parser t r
satisfy :: (t \rightarrow Bool) \rightarrow Parser t t
msatisfy :: (t \rightarrow Maybe a) \rightarrow Parser t a
lit :: Eq t => t \rightarrow Parser t t
```

# Combinator parsing II

## Combination of parsers

```
palt :: Parser t r -> Parser t r r
pseq :: Parser t (s -> r) -> Parser t s -> Parser t r
pmap :: (s -> r) -> Parser t s -> Parser t r
```

# A taste of compiler construction

#### A lexer

A lexer partitions the incoming list of characters into a list of tokens. A token is either a single symbol, an identifier, or a number. Whitespace characters are removed.

# Underlying concepts

#### Parsers have a rich structure

 parsing illustrates functors, applicatives, as well as monads that we already saw in the guise of IO instructions

# Parsing is . . .

#### A functor

Check the functorial laws!

## An applicative

Check applicative laws!

#### A monad

Check the monad laws (upcoming)!

### Consequence

Can use do notation for parsing!

# Parsers are Applicative!

```
instance Applicative (Parser' token) where
pure = return
(<*>) = ap
instance Alternative (Parser' token) where
empty = mzero
(<|>) = mplus
```

• what if there are multiple applicatives?

- what if there are multiple applicatives?
- they just compose (unlike monads)

- what if there are multiple applicatives?
- they just compose (unlike monads)
- applicative do notation

- what if there are multiple applicatives?
- they just compose (unlike monads)
- applicative do notation
- applicatives cannot express dependency

- what if there are multiple applicatives?
- they just compose (unlike monads)
- applicative do notation
- applicatives cannot express dependency
- enable more clever parsers