Functional Programming for Logicians Homework 7

Péter Mekis Department of Logic, ELTE Budapest

Deadline: 2019 April 1 17:59 pm

- Solve four of the fifteen exercises below. Some of them are follow-ups to others; it may be a good idea to choose them together.
- Create a miniproject of your own, including
 - the definition of a datatype (preferably recursive) that hasn't been discussed in the course yet,
 - the instantiation of a few type classes,
 - a few function definitions.
- 1. In the session we defined the List type, deriving the Show class. This way lists were printed in a not so readable fashion. Instantiate Show with an explicite definition so that 'Colon 1 (Colon 2 (Colon 3 Empty))' will be printed as '<1,2,3>' (to avoid confusion with the built-in list type).
- 2. We also derived Ord for the List type. The derived default ordering uses the following definition:

This definition makes

Colon True (Colon False Empty) < Colon True (Colon True Empty) true, and Colon True (Colon True (Colon False (Colon False Empty)) false. Define a function that generates an infinite descending chain of lists of Booleans, witnessing that the derived ordering of List a is not a well-ordering even if the ordering of a is a well-ordering. (In an infinite descending chain, every element is greater than its successor.)

- Instantiate Ord for List a so that the defined ordering of lists will be a well-ordering whenever the ordering of a is a well-ordering.
- 4. Instantiate the Foldable class for the Tree type defined in the session.
- 5. In homework 6, exercise 18 the task was to define a version of the Tree type with two parameters, so that the type of the data at the nodes might be different from the type of the data at the leaves. Define that type if you haven't done yet. Look up the Bifunctor class in the Haskell documentation, and make this new Tree type an instance of it.

- 6. Instantiate the Foldable class for the version of Tree with two parameters fromm the previous exercise.
- 7. Instantiate the Foldable class for the HunMaybe type introduced in the session.
- 8. Another frequently used type of Haskell somewhat similar to 'Maybe a' is 'Either a b'. The documentation says:

"The Either type represents values with two possibilities: a value of type Either a b is either Left a or Right b.

The Either type is sometimes used to represent a value which is either correct or an error; by convention, the Left constructor is used to hold an error value and the Right constructor is used to hold a correct value (mnemonic: "right" also means "correct")."

Define your own version of the type, just as we did with Maybe, Bool, and List, deriving from Eq, Show, and Ord. Try to find a meaningful way to use the type based on the explanation above, and define a few functions that exploit its potential.

- 9. Does it make sense to make your version of Either an instance of Functor? How about Bifunctor (see exercise 5)? (Resist the temptation to look up the answers in the documentation of Either.)
- 10. Does it make sense to make your version of Either an instance of Foldable? (Resist the temptation to look up the answer in the documentation of Either.)
- 11. Consider the following definition:

```
data Set a = Set [a]
```

The Set constructor creates a set from a list. Instantiate Eq so that two sets will be the same if and only if their elements are the same, with no regard to their order and the numbers of their occurrences in the lists from which they are constructed. Instantiate Show so that 'Set [1,2,7,7,2]' will be shown as '{1,2,7}' (the order of the elements might be different).

- 12. Define the following functions for the Set type: element, elementlist (not just an accessor function that returns the list from which a set is constructed, it should remove duplicates), boolUnion, and boolIntersection.
- 13. Instantiate the Functor class for the Set type defined above.
- 14. Why is the instantiation of the Foldable class for the Set type problematic? Can you find a solution to this problem?
- 15. Finally a more advanced exercise: The Zermelo–Fraenkel style concept of pure sets used in set theory is different from the above one. In this approach every set belongs to the same type. This set concept is not recursive, but it has a recursive core: finite sets are the result of iterated application of the pair, unary union, and power set operations to the empty set. This core can be implemented by the following type definition:

Find a way to define equality and elementhood for this type in accordance with the set-theoretical meaning of *empty set*, *pair*, *union*, and *power set*.