Due Friday, October 3, 2014

No template file is provided for this homework. Download the Ring.hs and Parser.hs files from the website, and make your HW05.hs Haskell file with your name, any sources you consulted, and any other relevant comments (just like in previous assignments). Then, say

```
module HW05 where import Ring import Parser
```

and off you go. Do make sure to include this module header, as it makes grading much easier for us.

Rings

A *ring* is a mathematical structure obeying certain laws. The Wikipedia page at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ring_(mathematics) is a great introduction. To help frame the concept, it is helpful to know that the integers form a ring.

A ring has a carrier set R (such as the integers), an addition operation, and a multiplication operation. In this document, we write the addition operation with + and the multiplication operation with \times . The operations obey the following laws:

- 1. + is associative. That is, (a + b) + c = a + (b + c), for all a, b, and c in R.
- 2. There exists a special element $0 \in R$ such that 0 + a = a for all $a \in R$. 0 is the *additive identity*.
- 3. For every element $a \in R$, there exists an element -a such that -a + a = 0. -a is the *additive inverse* of a.
- 4. + is commutative. That is, a + b = b + a for all $a, b \in R$.
- 5. · is associative. That is, $(a \cdot b) \cdot c = a \cdot (b \cdot c)$ for all $a, b, c \in R$.
- 6. There exists a special element $1 \in R$ such that $1 \cdot a = a$ and $a \cdot 1 = a$ for all $a \in R$. 1 is the *multiplicative identity*.
- 7. · distributes over +. That is $a \cdot (b + c) = (a \cdot b) + (a \cdot c)$ and $(b + c) \cdot a = (b \cdot a) + (c \cdot a)$ for all $a, b, c \in R$.

Note that a ring does *not* require a multiplicative inverse nor does it require \cdot to be commutative. (A ring with a multiplicative inverse for every non-0 element and with a commutative \cdot is called a *field*, but that's a story for another day.)

The Ring class

We can represent a ring in Haskell using a typeclass. Unfortunately, we can't represent the laws (that would require dependent types, which is also a story for another day), but we can represent the operations, as follows:

```
class Ring a where
 addId :: a
addInv :: a -> a
                     -- additive identity
                     -- additive inverse
                     -- multiplicative identity
 mulId :: a
 add :: a -> a -> a
                     -- addition
 mul :: a -> a -- multiplication
```

The idea here is that a is analogous to *R*, the set of elements of the ring. To help make this concrete, here is the Ring instance for integers:

```
instance Ring Integer where
  addId = 0
  addInv = negate
  mulId = 1
  add = (+)
  mul = (*)
```

(Those last two lines use operators without applying them to arguments. You can think of it almost as a section with no operands supplied. The first of the lines is equivalent to, for example, add x y = x + y.)

This instance declaration asserts that the integers form a ring with the given operations and identities.

Now that we have a Ring class, we can write operations that are generic with respect to which ring we are operating over. For examples of other rings, see the bottom of the Wikipedia page, or keep reading.

Parsing

One operation we would like to be able to write once for all rings is parsing expressions. Any ring supports the idea of expressions like

a + (b * c) + d, and so we should be able to write one parser (that is, function that converts from a string to a ring object) to produce them all.

Parsing is a little tricky, and we're not quite ready to write parsers yet for homework, so I've provided a parser in the Parser.hs module. You're welcome to read the module, but no attempt has been made to make this code readable to relative newcomers to Haskell it's rather idiomatic advanced Haskell, though.

There's just one problem, though. The parser needs to be able to deal with so-called literals: the a, b, c, and d above. For example, if your ring is the integers, literals would look like 3 or -2. If your ring is 2×2 matrices, though, literals would look more like [[1,2][8,-2]].

How to make the parser generic over different literal forms? Use a typeclass!

class Parsable a where

```
-- | If successful, 'parse' returns the thing parsed along with the
-- "leftover" string, containing all of the input string except what
-- was parsed
parse :: String -> Maybe (a, String)
```

The parse method looks at a string and tries to extract a specific element. If it can do so, it returns the element extracted and the remainder of the string. This way, parsing can continue. For example, we might define the Parsable instance for Bool this way:

```
instance Parsable Bool where
  parse str = case stripPrefix "True" str of
    Just trueRest -> Just (True, trueRest)
                  -> case stripPrefix "False" str of
      Just falseRest -> Just (False, falseRest)
                     -> Nothing
      Nothing
```

This uses the stripPrefix function from Data.List. That function tries to strip the given prefix (the first argument) from the given list (the second argument). If that list begins with the desired prefix, the prefix is stripped and the remaining list is returned. Otherwise, stripPrefix returns Nothing. The code above first tries to strip "True". If it succeeds, then parse succeeds, returning True and the leftover string. Then, it tries the same for "False".

But, Haskell provides a more idiomatic way of writing this:

```
instance Parsable Bool where
 parse str
   | Just rest <- stripPrefix "True" str = Just (True, rest)
```

```
| Just rest <- stripPrefix "False" str = Just (False, rest)
| otherwise
                                       = Nothina
```

This version uses a feature called pattern guards, which allow pattern matching in a guard (as introduced by a |). The expression to the right of the <- is matched against the pattern to the left of the <-. If that match succeeds, the guard is successful and the expression to the right of the = is evaluated. Otherwise, we move down to the next guard. You can mix pattern guards and normal Boolean guards freely.

Even better than that version is this one:

```
instance Parsable Bool where
 parse = listToMaybe . reads
```

This last version uses reads, a datatype parser provided as part of Haskell. This will work for any type that is a member of the Read type class, such as Bool or Integer. Feel free to look up these functions online to learn more.

The upshot of all of this is that you will have to define Parsable instances for any type that you want to be parsed.

Forging your own Rings

Exercise 1 Homeworks are starting to get more complicated! Though we haven't covered any Haskell testing framework yet (HUnit is probably the simplest), it's time to start testing your code. For this assignment, every exercise should be accompanied by a few definitions that show us that your definitions work. For example, to show that the definitions for Integer work, I could have these:

```
intParsingWorks :: Bool
intParsingWorks = (parse "3" == Just (3 :: Integer, "")) &&
                  (parseRing "1 + 2 * 5" == Just (11 :: Integer)) &&
                  (addId == (0 :: Integer))
```

Note that I needed to add type signatures to my numbers to let GHC know that I wanted to talk about Integer — which has a Ring instance — and not about other number types, like Int or Double, which do not have Ring instances.

Now, I can just check that intParsingWorks is True in GHCi.

Make sure to include comments explaining how to use your testing definitions!

Exercise 2 Modular arithmetic forms a ring. We will be thinking of the integers modulo 5. This ring has 5 elements: $R = \{0,1,2,3,4\}$. Addition is like normal integer addition, but it wraps around. So, 3+4=2 and 1+4=0. Multiplication is like normal integer multiplication, but it, too, wraps around. Note that Haskell's mod function is very handy here!

```
data Mod5 = MkMod Integer
  deriving (Show, Eq)
```

with Ring and Parsable instances. (Your Parsable instance should parse just like Integer's.)

Test your instances!

Define a datatype

Exercise 3 Matrix arithmetic forms a ring. Write a datatype Mat2x2 (you choose the representation) and Ring and Parsable instances. Your parser must be able to read something like [[1,2][3,4]] as a 2×2 matrix. It does not need to allow for the posssibility of spaces. Writing this idiomatically in Haskell is hard, so we will be more forgiving about style in the matrix parser.

Test your instances!

Exercise 4 Boolean arithmetic forms a ring. Boolean-and (conjunction) is the multiplication operation, but Boolean-or is not the addition operation. What is? (There aren't too many choices here!) Write Ring and Parsable instances for Bool.

Test your instances!

One Ring to Rule Them All

Now that we can parse rings of all shapes and sizes, we want to start taking advantage of the ring laws. To do this, we will parse ring expressions into a custom datatype designed for manipulating ring expressions:

```
data RingExpr a = Lit a
                | AddId
                | AddInv (RingExpr a)
                | MulId
                | Add (RingExpr a) (RingExpr a)
                | Mul (RingExpr a) (RingExpr a)
  deriving (Show, Eq)
```

instance Ring (RingExpr a) where

```
addId = AddId
addInv = AddInv
mulId = MulId

add = Add
mul = Mul

instance Parsable a => Parsable (RingExpr a) where
parse = fmap (first Lit) . parse

-- to understand this last function, here are types for 'fmap' and 'first':
-- fmap :: (a -> b) -> Maybe a -> Maybe b
-- first :: (a -> b) -> (a, c) -> (b, c)
```

A RingExpr a holds ring expressions over a given ring a. (So, RingExpr Integer stores ring expressions over integers.) Because we have Ring and Parsable instances for RingExpr a, we can parse these expressions using our trusty parseRing function. Yay!

Having built an expression, we can then evaluate it using the underlying ring:

```
-- | Evaluate a 'RingExpr a' using the ring algebra of 'a'.

eval :: Ring a => RingExpr a -> a

eval (Lit a) = a

eval AddId = addId

eval (AddInv x) = addInv (eval x)

eval MulId = mulId

eval (Add x y) = add (eval x) (eval y)

eval (Mul x y) = mul (eval x) (eval y)
```

Why bother with RingExpr at all? Because we can use it to *simplify* ring expressions according to the ring laws. Provided that Ring instances really obey the laws, these simplifications won't change the value retrieved by evaluating the ring expression.

As an example (bogus) simplification, we can write a function that swaps all additive identities with multiplicative identities. This surely changes the value of the expression, but it demonstrates the idea of traversing a RingExpr a and performing a transformation:

```
swapIdentities :: RingExpr a -> RingExpr a
swapIdentities AddId = MulId
swapIdentities MulId = AddId
-- need other cases to do this *everywhere* in the expression:
swapIdentities (Lit a) = Lit a
swapIdentities (AddInv x) = AddInv (swapIdentities x)
```

```
swapIdentities (Add \times y) = Add (swapIdentities \times) (swapIdentities y)
swapIdentities (Mul x y) = Mul (swapIdentities x) (swapIdentities y)
```

Note the need for the cases that do not match against AddId or Mulld. These are necessary because other forms of expression might contain AddId or MulId internally.

Exercise 5 Write distribute that distributes any use of multiplication over addition. Make sure to handle both left-distribution and right-distribution.

Test your function!

Exercise 6 Write squashMulId that detects whenever you are multiplying (on either side) by the multiplicative identity, and remove the multiplication. To get this working over parsed expressions is a little tricky, because the parser does not produce MulId. For example, in a RingExpr Integer, the multiplicative identity would look like Lit 0. Bonus brownie points¹ if you avoid using eval.

Test your function!

Exercise 7 (Optional) The distribute and squashMulId functions are quite similar, in that they traverse over the whole expression to make changes to specific nodes. Generalize this notion, so that the two functions can concentrate on just the bit that they need to transform.

¹ These are not *real* points, but it would make us happy!