

Chapter 10: Free type constructions

Sergei Winitzki

Academy by the Bay

2018-11-22

The interpreter pattern I. Expression trees

Main idea: Represent a program as a data structure, run it later

- Example: a simple DSL for complex numbers

```
val a = "1+2*i".toComplex      Conj(  
val b = a * "3-4*i".toComplex  Mul(  
b.conj                        Str("1+2*i"), Str("3-4*i")  
                                ))
```

- *Unevaluated* operations `Str`, `Mul`, `Conj` are defined as case classes:

```
sealed trait Prg  
case class Str(s: String) extends Prg  
case class Mul(p1: Prg, p2: Prg) extends Prg  
case class Conj(p: Prg) extends Prg
```

- An *interpreter* will “run” the program and return a complex number

```
def run(prg: Prg): (Double, Double) = ...
```

- Benefits: programs are data, can compose & transform before running
- Shortcomings: this DSL works only with simple expressions
 - ▶ Cannot represent variable binding and conditional computations
 - ▶ Cannot use any non-DSL code (e.g. a numerical algorithms library)

The interpreter pattern II. Variable binding

A DSL with variable binding and conditional computations

- Example: imperative API for reading and writing files
 - ▶ Need to bind a *non-DSL variable* to a value computed by DSL
 - ▶ Later, need to use that non-DSL variable in DSL expressions
 - ▶ The rest of the DSL program is a (Scala) function of that variable

```
val p = path("/file")
val str: String = read(p)
if (str.nonEmpty)
  read(path(str))
else "Error: empty path"
```

```
Bind(
  Read(Path(Literal("/file"))),
  { str => // read value 'str'
    if (str.nonEmpty)
      Read(Path(Literal(str)))
    else Literal("Error: empty path")
  })
```

- Unevaluated operations are implemented via case classes:

```
sealed trait Prg
case class Bind(p: Prg, f: String => Prg) extends Prg
case class Literal(s: String) extends Prg
case class Path(s: Prg) extends Prg
case class Read(p: Prg) extends Prg
```

- Interpreter: `def run(prg: Prg): String = ...`

The interpreter pattern III. Type safety

- So far, the DSL has no type safety: every value is a `Prg`
 - ▶ We want to avoid errors, e.g. `Read(Read(...))` should not compile
- Let `Prg[A]` denote a DSL program returning value of type `A` *when run*:

```
sealed trait Prg[A]
case class Bind(p: Prg[String], f: String ⇒ Prg[String])
  extends Prg[String]
case class Literal(s: String) extends Prg[String]
case class Path(s: Prg[String]) extends Prg[nio.file.Path]
case class Read(p: Prg[nio.file.Path]) extends Prg[String]
```

- Interpreter: `def run(prg: Prg[String]): String = ...`
- Our example DSL program is type-safe now:

```
val prg: Prg[String] = Bind(
  Read(Path(Literal("/file"))),
  { str: String ⇒
    if (str.nonEmpty)
      Read(Path(Literal(str)))
    else Literal("Error: empty path")
  })
```

The interpreter pattern IV. Cleaning up the DSL

Our DSL so far:

```
sealed trait Prg[A]
case class Bind(p: Prg[String], f: String ⇒ Prg[String])
  extends Prg[String]
case class Literal(s: String) extends Prg[String]
case class Path(s: Prg[String]) extends Prg[nio.file.Path]
case class Read(p: Prg[nio.file.Path]) extends Prg[String]
```

Problems with this DSL:

- Cannot use `Read(p: nio.file.Path)`, only `Read(p: Prg[nio.file.Path])`
- Cannot bind variables or return values other than `String`

To fix these problems, make `Literal` a fully parameterized operation and replace `Prg[A]` by `A` in case class arguments

```
sealed trait Prg[A]
case class Bind[A, B](p: Prg[A], f: A ⇒ Prg[B]) extends Prg[B]
case class Literal[A](a: A) extends Prg[A]
case class Path(s: String) extends Prg[nio.file.Path]
case class Read(p: nio.file.Path) extends Prg[String]
```

- The type signatures of `Bind` and `Literal` are like `flatMap` and `pure`

The interpreter pattern V. Define Monad-like methods

- We can actually define the methods `map`, `flatMap`, `pure`:

```
sealed trait Prg[A] {  
  def flatMap[B](f: A ⇒ Prg[B]): Prg[B] = Bind(this, f)  
  def map[B](f: A ⇒ B): Prg[B] = flatMap(this, f andThen Prg.pure)  
}  
object Prg { def pure[A](a: A): Prg[A] = Literal(a) }
```

- These methods don't run anything, only create unevaluated structures
- DSL programs can now be written as functor blocks and composed:

```
def readPath(p: String): Prg[String] = for {  
  path ← Path(p)  
  str  ← Read(path)  
} yield str
```

```
val prg: Prg[String] = for {  
  str ← readPath("/file")  
  result ← if (str.nonEmpty)  
    readPath(str)  
    else Prg.pure("Error: empty path")  
} yield result
```

- Interpreter: `def run[A](prg: Prg[A]): A = ...`

The interpreter pattern VI. Refactoring to an abstract DSL

- Write a DSL for complex numbers in a similar way:

```
sealed trait Prg[A] { def flatMap ... } // no code changes
case class Bind[A, B](p: Prg[A], f: A⇒Prg[B]) extends Prg[B]
case class Literal[A](a: A) extends Prg[A]
type Complex = (Double, Double) // custom code starts here
case class Str(s: String) extends Prg[Complex]
case class Mul(c1: Complex, C2: Complex) extends Prg[Complex]
case class Conj(c: Complex) extends Prg[Complex]
```

- Refactor this DSL to separate common code from custom code:

```
sealed trait DSL[F[_], A] { def flatMap ... } // no code changes
type Prg[A] = DSL[F, A] // just for convenience
case class Bind[A, B](p: Prg[A], f: A⇒Prg[B]) extends Prg[B]
case class Literal[A](a: A) extends Prg[A]
case class Ops[A](f: F[A]) extends Prg[A] // custom operations here
```

- Interpreter is parameterized by a “value extractor”

$$\text{Ex}^F \equiv \forall A. (F^A \Rightarrow A)$$

```
def run[F[_], A](ex: Ex[F])(prg: DSL[F, A]): A = ...
```

The interpreter pattern VII. Handling errors

- To handle errors, we want to evaluate `DSL[F[_], A]` to `Either[Err, A]`
- Suppose we have a value extractor of type $\text{Ex}^F \equiv \forall A. (F^A \Rightarrow \text{Err} + A)$
- The code of the interpreter is almost unchanged:

```
def run[F[_], A](extract: Ex[F])(prg: DSL[F, A]): Either[Err, A] =  
  prg match {  
    case b: Bind[F, _, A]  $\Rightarrow$  b match { case Bind(p, f)  $\Rightarrow$   
      run(extract)(p).flatMap(f andThen run(extract))  
    }    // Here, the .flatMap is from Either.  
    case Literal(a)  $\Rightarrow$  Right(a) // pure: A  $\Rightarrow$  Err + A  
    case Ops(f)  $\Rightarrow$  extract(f)  
  }
```

- The code of `run` only uses `flatMap` and `pure` from `Either`
- We can generalize to any other monad M^A instead of `Either[Err, A]`

The resulting construction:

- Start with an “operations type constructor” F^A (often not a functor)
- Use $\text{DSL}^{F,A}$ and interpreter $\text{run}^{M,A} : (\forall X. F^X \Rightarrow M^X) \Rightarrow \text{DSL}^{F,A} \Rightarrow M^A$
- Create a DSL program $\text{prg} : \text{DSL}^{F,A}$ and an extractor $\text{ex}^X : F^X \Rightarrow M^X$
- Run the program with the extractor: `run(ex)(prg)`; get a value M^A

The interpreter pattern VIII. Monadic DSLs: summary

- Begin with a number of operations, which are typically functions of fixed known types such as $A_1 \Rightarrow B_1$, $A_2 \Rightarrow B_2$ etc.
- Define a type constructor (typically not a functor) encapsulating all the operations as case classes, with or without type parameters

```
sealed trait F[A]  
case class Op1(a1: A1) extends F[B1]  
case class Op2(a1: A2) extends F[B2]
```

- Use `DSL[F,A]` with this `F` to write monadic DSL programs `prg: DSL[F,A]`
- Choose a target monad `M[A]` and implement an extractor `ex: F[A] \Rightarrow M[A]`
- Run the program with the extractor, `val res: M[A] = run(ex)(prg)`

Further directions (out of scope for this chapter):

- May choose another monad `N[A]` and use interpreter `M[A] \Rightarrow N[A]`
 - ▶ E.g. transform into another monadic DSL to optimize, test, etc.
- Since `DSL[F,A]` has a monad API, we can use monad transformers on it
- Can combine two or more DSLs in a disjunction: `DSLF+G+H,A`

Monad laws for DSL programs

Monad laws hold for DSL programs only after evaluating them

- Consider the law $\text{flm}(\text{pure}) = \text{id}$; both functions $\text{DSL}^{F,A} \Rightarrow \text{DSL}^{F,A}$
- Apply both sides to some $\text{prg} : \text{DSL}^{F,A}$ and get the new value

```
prg.flatMap(pure) == Bind(prg, a  $\Rightarrow$  Literal(a))
```

- This new value is *not equal* to `prg`, so this monad law fails!
 - ▶ Other laws fail as well because operations never reduce anything
- After interpreting this program into a target monad M^A , the law holds:

```
run(ex)(prg).flatMap((a  $\Rightarrow$  Literal(a)) andThen run(ex))  
  == run(ex)(prg).flatMap(a  $\Rightarrow$  run(ex)(Literal(a))  
  == run(ex)(prg).flatMap(a  $\Rightarrow$  pure(a))  
  == run(ex)(prg)
```

- ▶ Here we have assumed that the laws hold for M^A
- ▶ All other laws also hold after interpreting into a lawful monad M^A

The monad law violations are “not observable”

Free constructions in mathematics: Example I

- Consider the Russian letter \mathfrak{u} (tsè) and the Chinese word 水 (shuǐ)
- We want to *multiply* \mathfrak{u} by 水. Multiply how?
- Say, we want an associative (but noncommutative) product of them
 - ▶ So we want to define a *semigroup* that *contains* \mathfrak{u} and 水 as elements
 - ★ while we still know nothing about \mathfrak{u} and 水
- Consider the set of all *unevaluated expressions* such as $\mathfrak{u} \cdot \text{水} \cdot \text{水} \cdot \mathfrak{u} \cdot \text{水}$
 - ▶ Here $\mathfrak{u} \cdot \text{水}$ is different from $\text{水} \cdot \mathfrak{u}$ but $(a \cdot b) \cdot c = a \cdot (b \cdot c)$
- All these expressions form a **free semigroup** generated by \mathfrak{u} and 水
 - ▶ This is the most unrestricted semigroup that contains \mathfrak{u} and 水
- Example calculation: $(\text{水} \cdot \text{水}) \cdot (\mathfrak{u} \cdot \text{水}) \cdot \mathfrak{u} = \text{水} \cdot \text{水} \cdot \mathfrak{u} \cdot \text{水} \cdot \mathfrak{u}$

How to represent this as a data type:

- **Tree encoding**: the full expression tree: $(((\text{水}, \text{水}), (\mathfrak{u}, \text{水})), \mathfrak{u})$
 - ▶ Implement the operation $a \cdot b$ as pair constructor (easy)
- **Reduced encoding**, as a “smart” structure: $\text{List}(\text{水}, \text{水}, \mathfrak{u}, \text{水}, \mathfrak{u})$
 - ▶ Implement $a \cdot b$ by concatenating the lists (more expensive)

Free constructions in mathematics: Example II

- Want to define a product operation for n -dimensional vectors: $\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \mathbf{v}_2$
- The \otimes must be linear and distributive (but not commutative):

$$\mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{v}_1 + (\mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{v}_2 + \mathbf{u}_3 \otimes \mathbf{v}_3) = (\mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{v}_2) + \mathbf{u}_3 \otimes \mathbf{v}_3$$

$$\mathbf{u} \otimes (a_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + a_2 \mathbf{v}_2) = a_1 (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v}_1) + a_2 (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{v}_2)$$

$$(a_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + a_2 \mathbf{v}_2) \otimes \mathbf{u} = a_1 (\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \mathbf{u}) + a_2 (\mathbf{v}_2 \otimes \mathbf{u})$$

- ▶ We have such a product for 3-dimensional vectors only; ignore that
- Consider *unevaluated expressions* of the form $\mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{v}_2 + \dots$
 - ▶ A free vector space generated by pairs of vectors
- Impose the equivalence relationships shown above
 - ▶ The result is known as the **tensor product**
- Tree encoding: full unevaluated expression tree
 - ▶ A list of any number of vector pairs $\sum_i \mathbf{u}_i \otimes \mathbf{v}_i$
- Reduced encoding: an $n \times n$ matrix
 - ▶ Reduced encoding requires proofs and more complex operations

Worked example I: Free semigroup

Implement a free semigroup `FSIS` generated by two types `Int` and `String`

- A value of `FSIS` can be an `Int`; it can also be a `String`
- If `x, y` are of type `FSIS` then so is `x |+| y`

```
sealed trait FSIS // tree encoding: full expression tree
case class Wrap1(x: Int) extends FSIS
case class Wrap2(x: String) extends FSIS
case class Comb(x: FSIS, y: FSIS) extends FSIS
```

- Short type notation: $\text{FSIS} \equiv \text{Int} + \text{String} + \text{FSIS} \times \text{FSIS}$
- For a semigroup S and given $\text{Int} \Rightarrow S$ and $\text{String} \Rightarrow S$, map $\text{FSIS} \Rightarrow S$
- Simplify and generalize this construction by setting $Z = \text{Int} + \text{String}$
 - ▶ The tree encoding is $\text{FS}^Z \equiv Z + \text{FS}^Z \times \text{FS}^Z$

```
def |+|(x: FS[Z], y: FS[Z]): FS[Z] = Comb(x, y)
def run[S: Semigroup, Z](extract: Z ⇒ S): FS[Z] ⇒ S = {
  case Wrap(z) ⇒ extract(z)
  case Comb(x, y) ⇒ run(extract)(x) |+| run(extract)(y)
} // Semigroup laws will hold after applying run().
```

- The reduced encoding is $\text{FSR}^Z \equiv Z \times \text{List}^Z$ (non-empty list of Z 's)
 - ▶ `x |+| y` requires concatenating the lists, but `run()` is faster

Worked example II: Free monoid

Implement a free monoid `FM[Z]` generated by type `Z`

- A value of `FM[Z]` can be the empty value; it can also be a `Z`
- If `x, y` are of type `FM[Z]` then so is `x |+| y`

```
sealed trait FM[Z] // tree encoding
case class Empty[Z]() extends FM[Z]
case class Wrap[Z](z: Z) extends FM[Z]
case class Comb[Z](x: FM[Z], y: FM[Z]) extends FM[Z]
```

- Short type notation: $FM^Z \equiv 1 + Z + FM^Z \times FM^Z$
- For a monoid M and given $Z \Rightarrow M$, map $FM^Z \Rightarrow M$

```
def |+|(x: FM[Z], y: FM[Z]): FM[Z] = Comb(x, y)
def run[M: Monoid, Z](extract: Z => M): FM[Z] => M = {
  case Empty() => Monoid[M].empty
  case Wrap(z) => extract(z)
  case Comb(x, y) => run(extract)(x) |+| run(extract)(y)
} // Monoid laws will hold after applying run().
```

- The reduced encoding is $FMR^Z \equiv List^Z$ (list of `Z`'s)
 - ▶ Implementing `|+|` requires concatenating the lists
- Reduced encoding and tree encoding give identical results after `run()`

Mapping a free semigroup to different targets

What if we interpret FS^X into *another* free semigroup?

- Given $Y \Rightarrow Z$, can we map $\text{FS}^Y \Rightarrow \text{FS}^Z$?
 - Need to map $\text{FS}^Y \equiv Y + \text{FS}^Y \times \text{FS}^Y \Rightarrow Z + \text{FS}^Z \times \text{FS}^Z$
 - This is straightforward since FS^X is a functor in X :

```
def fmap[Y, Z](f: Y => Z): FS[Y] => FS[Z] = {  
  case Wrap(y) => Wrap(f(y))  
  case Comb(a, b) => Comb(fmap(f)(a), fmap(f)(b))  
}
```

- Now we can use `run` to interpret $\text{FS}^X \Rightarrow \text{FS}^Y \Rightarrow \text{FS}^Z \Rightarrow S$, etc.
 - Functor laws hold for FS^X , so `fmap` is composable as usual
 - The “interpreter” commutes with `fmap` as well (naturality law):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \text{FS}^Y & \\ \text{fmap } f: X \Rightarrow Y \nearrow & & \searrow \text{run}^S g: Y \Rightarrow S \\ \text{FS}^X & \xrightarrow{\text{run}^S (f \circ g): X \Rightarrow S} & S \end{array}$$

- Combine two free semigroups: FS^{X+Y} ; inject parts: $\text{FS}^X \Rightarrow \text{FS}^{X+Y}$

Church encoding I. Motivation

- Multiple target semigroups S_i require many “extractors” $\text{ex}_i : Z \Rightarrow S_i$
- Refactor extractors ex_i into evidence of a typeclass constraint on S_i

// Typeclass `ExZ[S]` has the single method ‘`extract: Z \Rightarrow S`’.

```
implicit val exZ: ExZ[MySemigroup] = { z  $\Rightarrow$  ... }  
def run[S: ExZ: Semigroup](fm: FM[Z]): S = fm match {  
  case Wrap(z)  $\Rightarrow$  implicitly[ExZ[S]].extract(z)  
  case Comb(x, y)  $\Rightarrow$  run(x) |+| run(y)  
}
```

- Refactor `run` using a helper function `wrap`

```
def wrap[S: ExZ](z: Z): S = implicitly[ExZ[S]].extract(z)
```

- Refactor the rest of `run` into functions with constraint `[S: ExZ]`,

```
def x[S: ExZ : Semigroup]: S = wrap(1) |+| wrap(2)
```

- The type of `x` is $\forall S. (Z \Rightarrow S) \times (S \times S \Rightarrow S) \Rightarrow S$; equivalently:

$$\forall S. (Z \Rightarrow S) \times (S \times S \Rightarrow S) \Rightarrow S \cong \forall S. ((Z + S \times S) \Rightarrow S) \Rightarrow S$$

- This is known as the “**Church encoding**” (for the free semigroup)
- Church encoding works for any type: $A \cong \forall X. (A \Rightarrow X) \Rightarrow X$
 - ▶ which *resembles* the type of the continuation monad, $(A \Rightarrow R) \Rightarrow R$
 - ▶ but $\forall X$ makes the function fully generic and a natural transformation

Church encoding II. Disjunction types

- Consider the Church encoding for the disjunction type $P + Q$
 - The encoding is $\forall X. (P + Q \Rightarrow X) \Rightarrow X \cong \forall X. (P \Rightarrow X) \Rightarrow (Q \Rightarrow X) \Rightarrow X$
- ```
trait Disj[P, Q] { def run[X](cp: P => X)(cq: Q => X): X }
```

- Define some values of this type:

```
def left[P, Q](p: P) = new Disj[P, Q] {
 def run[X](cp: P => X)(cq: Q => X): X = cp(p)
}
```

- Now we can implement the analog of the `case` expression simply as
- ```
val result = disj.run {p => ...} {q => ...}
```

- This works in programming languages that have no disjunction types

General recipe for implementing the Church encoding:

```
trait Blah { def run[X](cont: ... => X): X }
```

- For convenience, define a type class `Ex` describing the inner function:

```
trait Ex[X] { def cp: P => X; def cq: Q => X }
```

- Different methods of this class return `X`; convenient with disjunctions

- Church-encoded types have to be “run” for pattern-matching

Church encoding III. How it works

Why is the type $\text{Ch}^A \equiv \forall X. (A \Rightarrow X) \Rightarrow X$ equivalent to the type A ?

```
trait Ch[A] { def run[X](cont: A => X): X }
```

- If we have a value of A , we can get a Ch^A

```
def a2c[A](a: A): Ch[A] = new Ch[A] {  
  def run[X](cont: A => X): X = cont(a)  
}
```

- If we have a $\text{ch} : \text{Ch}^A$, we can get an $a : A$

```
def c2a[A](ch: Ch[A]): A = ch.run[A](a => a)
```

- The functions `a2c` and `c2a` are inverses of each other

- ▶ To implement a value $\text{ch} : \text{Ch}^A$, we must compute an $x : X$ given $f : A \Rightarrow X$, for *any* X , which *requires* having a value $a : A$ available

- To show that $\text{ch} = \text{a2c}(\text{c2a}(\text{ch}))$, apply both sides to an $f : A \Rightarrow X$ and get $\text{ch.run}(f) = \text{a2c}(\text{c2a}(\text{ch})).\text{run}(f) = f(\text{c2a}(\text{ch})) = f(\text{ch.run}(a \Rightarrow a))$

- ▶ This is naturality of `ch.run` as a transformation between `Reader` and `Id`
 - ★ Naturality of `ch.run` follows from parametricity of its code
- ▶ It is straightforward to compute $\text{c2a}(\text{a2c}(a)) = \text{identity}(a) = a$

- Church encoding satisfies laws: it is built up from parts of `run` method

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{id} : (A \Rightarrow A) & \xrightarrow{\text{ch.run}^A} & A \\ \downarrow \text{fmap}_{\text{Reader}_A}(f) & & \downarrow f \\ f : (A \Rightarrow X) & \xrightarrow{\text{ch.run}^X} & X \end{array}$$

Church encoding IV. Recursive types and type constructors

- Consider the recursive type $P \equiv Z + P \times P$ (tree with Z -typed leaves)
 - ▶ The Church encoding is $\forall X. ((Z + X \times X) \Rightarrow X) \Rightarrow X$
 - ▶ This is *non-recursive*: the recursive use of P is replaced by X
- Generalize to recursive type $P \equiv S^P$ where S is a “structure functor”:
 - ▶ The Church encoding is $\forall X. (S^X \Rightarrow X) \Rightarrow X$
 - ★ Church encoding of recursive types is non-recursive
- Church encoding for a type constructor P^\bullet :
 - ▶ Notation: P^\bullet is a type function; Scala syntax is `P[_]`
 - ▶ The Church encoding is $\text{Ch}^{P^\bullet, A} = \forall F^\bullet. (\forall X. P^X \Rightarrow F^X) \Rightarrow F^A$
 - ▶ Note: $\forall X. P^X \Rightarrow F^X$ or $P^\bullet \rightsquigarrow F^\bullet$ resembles a natural transformation
 - ★ Except that P^\bullet and F^\bullet are not necessarily functors, so no naturality law
- Church encoding for a recursively defined type constructor P^\bullet :
 - ▶ Definition: $P^A \equiv S^{P^\bullet, A}$ where $S^{\bullet, A}$ is the “structure transformation”
 - ▶ Notation: $S^{\bullet, A}$ is a higher-order type function; Scala syntax: `S[_][_], A`
 - ★ Example: $\text{List}^A \equiv 1 + A \times \text{List}^A \equiv S^{\text{List}^\bullet, A}$ where $S^{P^\bullet, A} \equiv 1 + A \times P^A$
 - ▶ The Church encoding of P^A is $\text{Ch}^{P^\bullet, A} = \forall F^\bullet. (S^{F^\bullet} \rightsquigarrow F^\bullet) \Rightarrow F^A$
- Works the same if P^\bullet belongs to a typeclass – use $\forall F^\bullet : C. (...)$
 - ▶ Laws of the typeclass are satisfied automatically

Properties of free type constructions

Generalizing from our examples so far:

- We “enriched” Z to a monoid FM^Z and F^A to a monad $DSL^{F,A}$
 - ▶ The “enrichment” adds case classes representing the needed operations
 - ▶ Very similar recipes for a type Z and for a type constructor F^A
- Obtain a **free type construction**, which performs no computations
 - ▶ wrap Z in just enough stuff to make it look like a monoid
- A value of a free construction can be “run” to yield concrete values

Questions:

- Can we construct a free typeclass C over any type constructor F^A ?
 - ▶ Yes, with typeclasses: (contra)functor, filterable, monad, applicative
- Which of the possible encodings to use?
 - ▶ Tree encoding, reduced encodings, Church encoding
- What are the laws for the $FreeC^{F,A}$ – “free instance of C over F ”?
 - ▶ For all F^\bullet , must have `wrap[A] : $F^A \Rightarrow FreeC^{F,A}$` or $F^\bullet \rightsquigarrow FreeC^{F,\bullet}$
 - ▶ For all $M^\bullet : C$, given $F^\bullet \rightsquigarrow M^\bullet$, must have `run : $FreeC^{F,\bullet} \rightsquigarrow M^\bullet$`
 - ▶ The laws of typeclass C must hold after interpreting into an $M^\bullet : C$
 - ▶ Given any `t : $F^\bullet \rightsquigarrow G^\bullet$` , must have `fmap(t) : $FreeC^{F,\bullet} \rightsquigarrow FreeC^{G,\bullet}$`

Worked example III: free functor I

- The `Functor` type class has one method, `fmap`: $(Z \Rightarrow A) \Rightarrow F^Z \Rightarrow F^A$
- The tree encoding of a free functor over F^\bullet needs two case classes:

```
sealed trait FF[F[_], A]
case class Wrap[F[_], A](fa: F[A]) extends FF[F, A]
case class Fmap[F[_], A, Z](f: Z  $\Rightarrow$  A)(ffz: FF[F, Z]) extends FF[F, A]
```

- The constructor `Fmap` has an extra type parameter Z , which is “hidden”

Consider a simple example of this:

```
sealed trait Q[A]; case class QZ[A, Z](a: A, z: Z) extends Q[A]
```

- Need to use specific type Z when constructing a value of `Q[A]`, e.g.,

```
val q: Q[Int] = QZ[Int, String](123, "abc")
```

- ▶ The type Z is hidden inside $q : Q^{\text{Int}}$; all we know is that Z “exists”
- Type notation for this: $Q^A \equiv \exists Z. A \times Z$
 - ▶ The existential quantifier applies to the “hidden” type parameter
 - ▶ The constructor `QZ` has type $\exists Z. (A \times Z \Rightarrow Q^A)$
 - ▶ It is not $\forall Z$ because a specific Z is used when building up a value
 - ▶ The code does not show $\exists Z$ explicitly! We need to keep track of that

Worked example III: free functor II

- Tree encoding of **FF** has type $\text{FF}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv F^A + \exists Z. \text{FF}^{F^\bullet, Z} \times (Z \Rightarrow A)$
- Derivation of the reduced encoding:
 - ▶ A value of type $\text{FF}^{F^\bullet, A}$ must be of the form

$$\exists Z_1. \exists Z_2 \dots F^A \times (Z_1 \Rightarrow A) \times (Z_2 \Rightarrow Z_1) \times \dots$$

- ▶ The functions $Z_1 \Rightarrow A$, $Z_2 \Rightarrow Z_1$, etc., must be composed associatively
 - ▶ The equivalent type is $\exists Z. F^A \times (Z \Rightarrow A)$
- Reduced encoding: $\text{FreeF}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv \exists Z. F^Z \times (Z \Rightarrow A)$
 - ▶ Substituted F^Z instead of $\text{FreeF}^{F^\bullet, Z}$ and eliminated the case F^A
 - ▶ The reduced encoding is non-recursive
 - ▶ Requires a proof that this encoding is equivalent to the tree encoding
 - ▶ If F^\bullet is already a functor, can show $F^A \cong \exists Z. F^Z \times (Z \Rightarrow A)$
- Church encoding (starting from the tree encoding):
 $\text{FreeF}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv \forall P^\bullet. (\forall C. (F^C + \exists Z. P^Z \times (Z \Rightarrow C)) \rightsquigarrow P^C) \Rightarrow P^A$
 - ▶ The structure of the type expression: $\forall P^\bullet. (\forall C. (\dots)^C \rightsquigarrow P^C) \Rightarrow P^A$
 - ★ Cannot move $\forall C$ or $\exists Z$ to the outside of the type expression!

Encoding with an existential type: how it works

Show that $P^A \equiv \exists Z. Z \times (Z \Rightarrow A) \cong A$

```
sealed trait P[A]; case class PZ[A, Z](z: Z, f: Z  $\Rightarrow$  A) extends P[A]
```

- How to construct a value of type P^A for a given A ?
 - ▶ Have a function $Z \Rightarrow A$ and a Z , construct $Z \times (Z \Rightarrow A)$
 - ▶ Particular case: $Z \equiv A$, have $a : A$ and build $a \times \text{id}^{A \Rightarrow A}$

```
def a2p[A](a: A): P[A] = PZ[A, A](a, identity)
```

- Cannot extract Z out of P^A – the type Z is hidden
- Can extract A out of P^A – do not need to know Z

```
def p2a[A]: P[A]  $\Rightarrow$  A = { case PZ(z, f)  $\Rightarrow$  f(z) }
```

- Cannot transform P^A into anything else other than A
- A value of type P^A is observable only via `p2a`
 - ▶ Therefore the functions `a2p` and `p2a` are “observational” inverses (i.e. we need to use `p2a` in order to compare values of type P^A)

If F^\bullet is a functor then $Q^A \equiv \exists Z. F^Z \times (Z \Rightarrow A) \cong F^A$

- A value of Q^A can be observed only by extracting an F^A from it
- Can define `f2q` and `q2f` and show that they are observational inverses

Recipe for encoding free type constructor typeclasses

- To build a “free typeclass C over F^\bullet ” as a type constructor P^\bullet
 - ▶ The typeclass C can be functor, contrafunctor, monad, etc.
- Assume that C has methods m_1, m_2, \dots , with type signatures $m_1 : Q_1^{P^\bullet, A} \Rightarrow P^A, m_2 : Q_2^{P^\bullet, A} \Rightarrow P^A$, etc., where Q_i are known
- The tree encoded FC^A is a disjunction defined recursively by

$$FC^A \equiv F^A + Q_1^{FC^\bullet, A} + Q_2^{FC^\bullet, A} + \dots$$

```
sealed trait FC[A]; case class Wrap[A](fa: F[A]) extends FC[A]
case class Q1[A](...) extends FC[A]
case class Q2[A](...) extends FC[A]; ...
```

- Any type parameters within Q_i are then existentially quantified
- `run` maps $F^\bullet \rightsquigarrow M^\bullet$ in the disjunction and recursively for other parts
- Derive a reduced encoding via reasoning about possible values of FC^A and by taking into account the laws of the typeclass C
- A Church encoding can use the tree encoding or the reduced encoding

What typeclasses cannot be encoded in this way?

- Any typeclass with a method *not ultimately returning* a value of P^A
- Example: a typeclass with methods $pt : A \Rightarrow P^A$ and $ex : P^A \Rightarrow A$

Worked examples IV: free contrafunctor

- Method contramap : $C^A \times (B \Rightarrow A) \Rightarrow C^B$
- Tree encoding: $\text{FreeCF}^{F^\bullet, B} \equiv F^B + \exists A. \text{FreeCF}^{F^\bullet, A} \times (B \Rightarrow A)$
- Reduced encoding: $\text{FreeCF}^{F^\bullet, B} \equiv \exists A. F^A \times (B \Rightarrow A)$
 - ▶ The reduced encoding is non-recursive
 - ▶ Example: $F^A \equiv A$, “interpret” into the contrafunctor $C^A \equiv A \Rightarrow \text{String}$

```
def prefixLog[A](p: A): A ⇒ String = a ⇒ p.toString + a.toString
```

- If F^\bullet is already a contrafunctor then $\text{FreeCF}^{F^\bullet, A} \cong F^A$

Worked examples V: free pointed functor

Over an arbitrary type constructor F^\bullet :

- Pointed functor methods $\text{pt} : A \Rightarrow P^A$ and $\text{map} : P^A \times (A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow P^B$
- Tree encoding: $\text{FreeP}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv A + F^A + \exists Z. \text{FreeP}^{F^\bullet, Z} \times (Z \Rightarrow A)$
- Reduced encoding: $\text{FreeP}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv A + \exists Z. F^Z \times (Z \Rightarrow A)$
- This reuses the free functor as $\text{FreeP}^{F^\bullet, A} = A + \text{FreeF}^{F^\bullet, A}$

If the type constructor F^\bullet is *already* a functor, $\text{FreeF}^{F^\bullet, A} \cong F^A$ and so:

- Free pointed functor over a functor F^\bullet is simplified: $A + F^A$
- If F^\bullet is already a pointed functor, need not use the free construction
 - ▶ If we do, we will have $\text{FreeP}^{F^\bullet, A} \not\cong F^A$
 - ▶ only functors and contrafunctors do not change under “free”

Worked examples VI: free filterable functor

- Methods:

$$\text{map} : F^A \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow F^B$$

$$\text{mapOpt} : F^A \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow 1 + B) \Rightarrow F^B$$

- We can recover `map` from `mapOpt`, so we keep only `mapOpt`
- Tree encoding: $\text{FreeFi}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv F^A + \exists Z. \text{FreeFi}^{F^\bullet, Z} \times (Z \Rightarrow 1 + A)$
- Reduced encoding: $\text{FreeFi}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv \exists Z. F^Z \times (Z \Rightarrow 1 + A)$, non-recursive
- If F^\bullet is already a functor, can simplify: $\text{FreeFi}^{F^\bullet, A} = F^{1+A}$
 - ▶ Free filterable over a filterable functor F^\bullet is $F^{1+A} \not\equiv F^A$

Worked examples VII: free monad

- Methods:

$$\text{pure} : A \Rightarrow F^A$$

$$\text{flatMap} : F^A \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow F^B) \Rightarrow F^B$$

- Can recover `map` from `flatMap` and `pure`, so we keep only `flatMap`
- Tree encoding: $\text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv F^A + A + \exists Z. \text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, Z} \times (Z \Rightarrow \text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, A})$
- Derive a reduced encoding:
 - ▶ can simplify $A \times (A \Rightarrow \text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, B}) \cong \text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, B}$
 - ▶ use associativity to replace $\text{FreeM}^A \times (A \Rightarrow \text{FreeM}^B) \times (B \Rightarrow \text{FreeM}^C)$ by $\text{FreeM}^A \times (A \Rightarrow \text{FreeM}^B \times (B \Rightarrow \text{FreeM}^C))$
 - ▶ therefore we can replace $\exists Z. \text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, Z} \times \dots$ by $\exists Z. F^Z \times \dots$
- Reduced encoding: $\text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv A + \exists Z. F^Z \times (Z \Rightarrow \text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, A})$
- Free monad over a functor F^\bullet is still recursive:

$$\text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv A + F^{\text{FreeM}^{F^\bullet, A}}$$

- ▶ Free monad $\text{FreeM}^{M^\bullet, \bullet}$ over a monad M^\bullet is not the same as M^\bullet
- Free monad over a pointed functor F^\bullet is

Worked examples VIII: free applicative

- Methods:

$$\text{pure} : A \Rightarrow F^A$$

$$\text{ap} : F^A \Rightarrow F^{A \Rightarrow B} \Rightarrow F^B$$

We can recover `map` from `ap` and `pure`, so we keep only `ap`

- Tree encoding:

$$\text{FreeAp}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv F^A + A + \exists Z. \text{FreeAp}^{F^\bullet, Z} \times \text{FreeAp}^{F^\bullet, Z \Rightarrow A}$$

- Reduced encoding: $\text{FreeAp}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv A + \exists Z. F^Z \times \text{FreeAp}^{F^\bullet, Z \Rightarrow A}$
- Free applicative over a functor F^\bullet :

$$\text{FreeAp}^{F^\bullet, A} \equiv A + ???$$

- $\text{FreeAp}^{F^\bullet, \bullet}$ over an applicative functor F^\bullet is not the same as F^\bullet
- $\text{FreeAp}^{F^\bullet, \bullet}$ over a pointed functor F^\bullet is $\text{FreeAp}^{F^\bullet, A} = ???$

Laws for free constructions

- Laws hold after “running”
- Free constructions are “universal” DSL programs

Exercises

- 1 Implement a free semigroup generated by a type Z in the tree encoding and in the reduced encoding. Show that the semigroup laws hold for the reduced encoding but not for the tree encoding before interpreting into a lawful semigroup S .
- 2 Consider a free monoid generated by a type Z when Z is already a monoid. Show that the resulting type is not equivalent to Z .
- 3 Assuming that F^\bullet is a functor, define $Q^A \equiv \exists Z. F^Z \times (Z \Rightarrow A)$ and implement $\text{f2q}: F^A \Rightarrow Q^A$ and $\text{q2f}: Q^A \Rightarrow F^A$. Show that these functions are natural transformations, and that they are inverses of each other “observationally”, i.e. after applying q2f in order to compare values of Q^A .
- 4 Implement a “free pointed filterable” typeclass (combining pointed and filterable) over a type constructor F^\bullet . Start from the tree encoding and derive a reduced encoding. Find a simplified encoding for the case when F^\bullet is already a functor.