

Reading for next class

- Learn You a Haskell
 - Chapter 8
 - Chapter 11

CS 252:

Advanced Programming Language Principles



Algebraic Data
Types, Kinds,
& Typeclasses

Prof. Tom Austin

San José State University

What happens when we run this code?

```
public class Maybe {  
    public static String reverse(String s) {  
        return new StringBuilder(s).reverse();  
    }  
  
    public static void main(String[] args) {  
        String rev = reverse("Racecar");  
        System.out.println(rev);  
    }  
}
```

Compiler error

```
$ javac Maybe.java
```

```
Maybe.java:3: error: incompatible types:  
StringBuilder cannot be converted to String  
    return new StringBuilder(s).reverse();  
                                   ^
```

```
1 error
```

We needed a String but tried
to return a StringBuilder.

What happens with *this* code?

```
public class Maybe {  
    public static String reverse(String s) {  
        return ""  
            + new StringBuilder(s).reverse();  
    }  
  
    public static void main(String[] args) {  
        String rev = reverse("Racecar");  
        System.out.println(rev);  
    }  
}
```

Success!

```
$ javac Maybe.java
```

```
$ java Maybe
```

```
racecar
```

```
$
```

The types match, so:

1. the code compiles
2. run-time errors are avoided

Except...

```
public class Maybe {  
    public static String reverse(String s) {  
        return ""  
            + new StringBuilder(s).reverse();  
    }  
  
    public static void main(String[] args) {  
        String rev = reverse(null);  
        System.out.println(rev);  
    }  
}
```

Run-time error

```
$ javac Maybe.java
```

```
$ java Maybe
```

```
Exception in thread "main" java.lang.NullPointerException  
    at  
java.lang.StringBuilder.<init>(StringBuilder.java:112)  
    at Maybe.reverse(Maybe.java:3)  
    at Maybe.main(Maybe.java:8)
```

Types are supposed to
prevent run-time errors.
Why did they fail here?

Null Pointer Exceptions

- Why does Java allow `null`?
- Can we get the same flexibility in Haskell?
- Can we keep type safety?

The Maybe Type

- The option type
- Used when
 - a function might not return a value
 - a caller might not pass in an argument
- ```
data Maybe a = Nothing
 | Just a
```

# Maybe examples

(in-class)

```
divide :: Int -> Int -> Maybe Int
divide x 0 = Nothing
divide x y = Just $ x `div` y
```

```
test :: Int -> Int
test d = case 1 `divide` d of
 Just n -> n
 Nothing -> error "Can't divide by zero"
```

```
main = do
 putStrLn $ show $ test 9
 putStrLn $ show $ test 0
```

```
import qualified Data.Map as Map
m = Map.empty
m' = Map.insert "a" 42 m
case (Map.lookup "a" m') of
 Just i -> putStrLn $ show i
 Nothing -> error "Key not found"
```

Maybe is an *algebraic data type (ADT)*

An ADT is a *composite* data type;  
a type made up of other types.

Can we create our own ADTs?

data keyword  
lets us define a  
new type.

A type for trees...

```
data Tree =
 Empty
 | Node Tree Tree String
deriving (Show)
```

This works for trees of  
Strings, but what if we  
wanted a tree of Ints?

## A tree type using type parameters

```
data Tree k =
 Empty
 | Node (Tree k) (Tree k) k
deriving (Show)
```

**k** is a *type parameter*



## Types of trees

What is the type of `Tree`? And of `Tree Int`?

*Trick question: types don't have types.*

So what is the type of `Node`?

```
*Main> :t Node
```

```
Node :: Tree k -> Tree k
 -> k -> Tree k
```

## Higher-order functions review

```
*Main> :t (++)
```

```
(++) :: [a] -> [a] -> [a]
```

++ takes a list of a's and returns...

a function that takes a list of a's and  
returns...

a list of a's.

Type of a value constructor

```
*Main> :t Node
```

```
Node :: Tree k -> Tree k
 -> k -> Tree k
```

We can partially apply Node

## A leaf function

```
> leaf = Node Empty Empty
```

Now we can define a tree as:

```
> Node (leaf 3) (leaf 7) 5
```

instead of:

```
> Node (Node Empty Empty 3)
```

```
> (Node Empty Empty 7) 5
```

## Kinds

What is the type of `Tree` again?

Trick question.

**WAT.**

So what is the *kind* of `Tree`?

```
*Main> :kind Tree
```

```
Tree :: * -> *
```



*A kind* is the "type of a type".

## Kinds continued

- Primitive types have a kind of " $*$ "

```
*Main> :k String
```

```
String :: *
```

```
*Main> :k (Int->String)
```

```
(Int->String) :: *
```

- Types with type parameters have more elaborate kinds:

```
*Main> :k Maybe
```

```
Maybe :: * -> *
```

```
*Main> :k Map
```

```
Map :: * -> * -> *
```

```
*Main> :k (Map String)
```

```
(Map String) :: * -> *
```

## Typeclasses

- Similar to interfaces in Java
  - Like a contract
  - Implementation details can be included
- No relation to classes in object-oriented languages.



# Eq typeclass

```
class Eq a where
```

```
 (==) :: a -> a -> Bool
```

```
 (/=) :: a -> a -> Bool
```

```
x == y = not (x /= y)
```

```
x /= y = not (x == y)
```

## Adding Eq functionality to Maybe

```
instance Eq (Maybe m) where
 Just x == Just y = x == y
 Nothing == Nothing = True
 _ == _ = False
```

This does not quite work... We don't know that `x` and `y` can be compared with `Eq`.

## Adding Eq functionality to Maybe

```
instance (Eq m) => Eq (Maybe m)
where
```

```
 Just x == Just y = x == y
```

```
 Nothing == Nothing = True
```

```
 _ == _ = False
```

(Eq m) => specifies a *class constraint*. In other words, m must support Eq functionality.

## Type and kind with constraints

```
Prelude> :t 3
```

```
3 :: Num a => a
```

```
Prelude> :k Num
```

```
Num :: * -> Constraint
```