Functional Programming 10

Prof. Dr. Peter Thiemann

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany

WS 2022/23

Referential transparency and substitutivity

Remember the first class?

- Every variable and expression has just one value referential transparency
- Every variable can be replaced by its definition substitutivity

Referential transparency and substitutivity

Remember the first class?

- Every variable and expression has just one value referential transparency
- Every variable can be replaced by its definition substitutivity

Enables reasoning

```
 \begin{array}{l} 1 \\ -- \text{ sequence of function calls does not matter} \\ \text{f ()} + \text{g ()} == \text{g ()} + \text{f ()} \\ -- \text{ number of function calls does not matter} \\ \text{4} \\ \text{f ()} + \text{f ()} == 2 * \text{f ()} \\ \end{array}
```

Bad example

Suppose we had

input :: () -> Integer

Bad example

Suppose we had

```
input :: () -> Integer
```

Consider

```
_{1} let \times = input () in
```

Bad example

Suppose we had

```
input :: () -> Integer
```

Consider

```
\begin{array}{c|c}
1 & \text{let } x = \text{input () in} \\
2 & x + x
\end{array}
```

• Expect to read one input and use it twice

Bad example

Suppose we had

```
input :: () -> Integer
```

Consider

```
\begin{vmatrix}
\mathbf{let} & \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{input} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}
\end{vmatrix}
```

- Expect to read one input and use it twice
- By substitutivity, this expression must behave like

```
input () + input ()
```

which reads two inputs!

Bad example

Suppose we had

```
input :: () -> Integer
```

Consider

```
\begin{vmatrix}
\mathbf{let} & \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{input} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}
\end{vmatrix}
```

- Expect to read one input and use it twice
- By substitutivity, this expression must behave like

```
input () + input ()
```

which reads two inputs!

VERY WRONG!!!

The dilemma

Haskell is a pure language, but IO is a side effect

The dilemma

Haskell is a pure language, but IO is a side effect

A contradiction?

The dilemma

Haskell is a pure language, but IO is a side effect

A contradiction?

No!

- Instead of performing IO operations directly, there is an abstract type of IO instructions, which get executed lazily by the operating system
- Some instructions (e.g., read from a file) return values, so the abstract IO type is parameterized over their type
- Keep in mind: instructions are just values like any other

Haskell IO

The main function

Top-level result of a program is an IO "instruction".

```
main :: IO ()
main = undefined
```

- an instruction describes the effect of the program
- effect = IO action, imperative state change, ...

Kinds of instructions

Primitive instructions

```
-- defined in the Prelude
putChar :: Char -> IO ()
getChar :: IO Char
writeFile :: FileName -> String -> IO ()
readFile :: FileName -> IO String
and many more
```

Kinds of instructions

Primitive instructions

```
-- defined in the Prelude
putChar :: Char -> IO ()
getChar :: IO Char
writeFile :: FileName -> String -> IO ()
readFile :: FileName -> IO String
```

and many more

No op instruction

```
₁ return :: a -> 10 a
```

The IO instruction return 42 performs no IO, but yields the value 42.

Combining two instructions

The bind operator >>=

Intuition: next instruction may depend on the output of the previous one

The instruction m >>= f

- executes m :: IO a first
- gets its result x :: a
- applies f :: a -> IO b to the result
- ullet to obtain an instruction f x :: IO b that returns a b
- and executes this instruction to return a b

Combining two instructions

The bind operator >>=

Intuition: next instruction may depend on the output of the previous one

```
ı (>>=) :: IO a −> (a −> IO b) −> IO b
```

The instruction m >>= f

- executes m :: IO a first
- gets its result x :: a
- applies f :: a -> IO b to the result
- ullet to obtain an instruction f x :: IO b that returns a b
- and executes this instruction to return a b

Example

```
readFiles f1 f2 = \frac{1}{2} readFile f1 >>= \frac{1}{2} readFile f2
```

More convenient: do notation

```
| copyFile source target =
   undefined
 doTwice io =
   undefined
 doNot io =
   undefined
```

Translating do notation into >>= operations

- ullet do lastinstruction \longrightarrow lastinstruction
- do { $x \leftarrow action1$; instructions } \longrightarrow $action1 >>= <math>x \rightarrow action1 >>= x \rightarrow$

Instructions vs functions

Functions

produce the same result each time they are called

Instructions vs functions

Functions

produce the same result each time they are called

Instructions

- are interpreted each time they are executed,
- the result depends on the context
- may be different each time

Underlying concept: Monad

What's a monad? (first approximation)

- abstract datatype for instructions that produce values
- built-in combination >>=
- abstracts over different interpretations (computations)

Underlying concept: Monad

What's a monad? (first approximation)

- abstract datatype for instructions that produce values
- built-in combination >>=
- abstracts over different interpretations (computations)

IO is a special case of a monad

- one very useful application for monad
- built into Haskell
- but there's more to the concept
- many more instances to come!

Hands-on task

Define a function

```
sortFile :: FilePath -> FilePath -> IO ()

-- sortFile inFile outFile
-- reads inFile, sorts its lines, and writes the result to outFile

-- recall
-- sort :: Ord a => [a] -> [a]
-- lines :: String -> [String]
-- unlines :: [String] -> String
```

Utilities

```
sequence :: [IO a] -> IO [a] sequence_ :: [IO a] -> IO ()
```

Another hands-on task

Define a function

```
printTable :: [String] -> IO ()

{-
printTable ["New York", "Rio", "Tokio"]
outputs
1: New York
2: Rio
3: Tokio
-}
```

Wrapup

First encounter with monads

- A monad is an abstract data type of instructions returning results.
- The next instruction can depend on previous results.
- Instructions are just values.
- Haskell's IO operations are instructions of the IO monad.