



# CIS 1904: Haskell

## Algebraic Datatypes

# Logistics

- HW 02 due yesterday
- HW 03 will be released tonight

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}
```

Elements of a record have variable order and are tagged.

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}
```

↑ keyword that tells Haskell we're defining a type

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}
```

↑ keyword that tells Haskell we're defining a type

`type` is also a keyword, but it is for defining *type synonyms*.

```
type PennID' = PennID
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}
```

    ^ name of our new type

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}  
                  ^ data constructor
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}  
                  ^ data constructor
```

Note: for single-constructor types, it's common in Haskell to use the same name for the type itself and the constructor.

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}  
                           ^ field/element
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}  
                           ^ field/element type
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}
```

```
PennID {idNum=12345678, year=2026, name="Real Person"} :: PennID
```

```
PennID {year=2028, name="Human Being", idNum=00000000} :: PennID
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Records

```
data PennID = PennID {name :: String, year :: Int, idNum :: Int}
```

We can *destruct* a record with pattern matching.

```
foo :: PennID -> Int
foo (PennID {idNum=id, year=y, name=s}) = ...
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Tuples

```
data IntStringPair = IntStringPair Int String
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Tuples

```
data IntStringPair = IntStringPair Int String
```

```
foo :: IntStringPair -> Int
```

```
foo (IntStringPair x s) = ...
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Product type: values have one value of each of the listed types

- Tuples: elements are in fixed order and not tagged
  - e.g. `IntStringPair 6 "xyz"`
- Records: elements are in any order and tagged
  - e.g. `PennID {id = 00000000, year=2028, name="A"}`

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Sum type: values can be any **one** of the listed types

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Sum type: values can be any **one** of the listed types

```
union grade {  
    int percent;  
    char letter;  
};
```

\* C example because Haskell does not allow these

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Sum type: values can be any **one** of the listed types

```
union grade {  
    int percent;  
    char letter;  
};
```

```
union grade x;  
x.letter = 'A';  
x.percent + 5;
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Sum type: values can be any **one** of the listed types

```
union temp {  
    int celsius;  
    int fahrenheit;  
};  
  
union temp x;  
x.fahrenheit = 32;  
printf( "Temp in Celsius: %d\n", x.celsius);
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Sum type: values can be any **one** of the listed types

- Tagged unions (aka variants)

```
data Temperature  
  = Celsius Int  
  | Fahrenheit Int
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Sum type: values can be any **one** of the listed types

- Tagged unions (aka variants)

```
data Temperature  
  = Celsius Int  
  | Fahrenheit Int
```

**Celsius** and **Fahrenheit** are data constructors.

We destruct this type by pattern matching, so we always know what case we're in.

# Algebraic Datatypes

Main idea: we can combine types to make other types

Sum type: values can be any **one** of the listed types

- Tagged unions (aka variants)

```
data Temperature  
  = Celsius Int  
  | Fahrenheit Int
```

```
whichOne :: Temperature -> String  
whichOne (Celsius x) = "Celsius"  
whichOne (Fahrenheit x) = "Fahrenheit"
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
= Point  
| Line Int  
| Rectangle Int Int
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
= Point  
| Line Int  
| Rectangle Int Int
```

$$1 + |\text{Int}| + |\text{Int}| \times |\text{Int}|$$

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
  = Point  
  | Line Int  
  | Rectangle Int Int
```

Our three constructors are the *only* way to build something of this type.  
Even functions have to use these internally.

This is how pattern matching on all the constructors can be exhaustive.

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
= Point  
| Line Int  
| Rectangle Int Int
```

What is the type of `Rectangle`?

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
= Point  
| Line Int  
| Rectangle Int Int
```

What is the type of `Rectangle`?

`Int -> Int -> GeometricObject`

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
  = Point  
  | Line Int  
  | Rectangle Int Int
```

What is the type of `Rectangle`?

`Int -> Int -> GeometricObject`

Constructors in Haskell are first-class values, just like functions.

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
= Point  
| Line Int  
| Rectangle Int Int
```

Why is this both a product and a sum type?

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
  = Point  
  | Line Int  
  | Rectangle Int Int
```

A sum type is when we might have *any* of the listed types.

A product type is when we have one of *each* of the listed types.

Here we have elements of both!

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
= Point  
| Line Int  
| Rectangle Int Int
```

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject  
= Point  
| Line Int  
| Rectangle Int Int
```

This type has several constructors, i.e., it can represent several different varieties of structure.

# Algebraic Datatypes

We can combine sum and product types.

```
data GeometricObject
  = Point
  | Line Int
  | Rectangle Int Int
```

The last option contains 2 `Ints`, like a tuple might, so we have a product.

# Algebraic Datatypes

Why are they called **algebraic** datatypes?

```
data GeometricObject
  = Point
    +
  | Line Int
    +
  | Rectangle Int Int
```

A sum type is when we might have any of the listed types.

This is like a disjoint union  $\cup$  in math.

# Algebraic Datatypes

Why are they called **algebraic** datatypes?

```
data GeometricObject  
= Point  
| Line Int  
| Rectangle (Int × Int)
```

A product type is when we have one of each of the listed types.

This is like a Cartesian product  $\times$  in math.

# Algebraic Datatypes

Why are they called **algebraic** datatypes?

Sum types  $\approx + \approx$  logical OR

Product types  $\approx \times \approx$  logical AND

# Algebraic Datatypes

Why are they called **algebraic** datatypes?

Sum types  $\approx +$

Product types  $\approx \times$

0?

1?

# Algebraic Datatypes

Why are they called **algebraic** datatypes?

Sum types  $\approx +$

Product types  $\approx \times$

0  $\approx$  Empty

1  $\approx$  Unit

data Empty

data Unit = Unit

# Algebraic Datatypes

Why are they called **algebraic** datatypes?

```
data GeometricObject  
  = Point  
  | Line Int  
  | Rectangle Int Int
```

How many `GeometricObjects` are there, if we say `|Int|` is the number of `Ints`?

# Algebraic Datatypes

Why are they called **algebraic** datatypes?

```
data GeometricObject  
  = Point  
  | Line Int  
  | Rectangle Int Int
```

$$|\text{GeometricObject}| = 1 + |\text{Int}| + |\text{Int}| \times |\text{Int}|$$

# Pattern Matching

```
data GeometricObject  
= Point  
| Line Int  
| Rectangle Int Int  
  
dimension :: GeometricObject → Int
```

# Pattern Matching

```
data GeometricObject
  = Point
  | Line Int
  | Rectangle Int Int

dimension :: GeometricObject → Int
dimension Point = 0
dimension (Line _) = 1
dimension (Rectangle _ _) = 2
```

# Pattern Matching

```
data GeometricObject
  = Point
  | Line Int
  | Rectangle Int Int

dimension :: GeometricObject → Int
dimension s = case s of
  Point → 0
  Line _ → 1
  Rectangle _ _ → 2
```

# Pattern Matching

```
data GeometricObject
  = Point
  | Line Int
  | Rectangle Int Int

bothPoint :: GeometricObject -> Bool
bothPoint s1 s2 = case (s1, s2) of
  (Point, Point) -> True
  _ -> False
```

# Pattern Matching

```
data GeometricObject
  = Point
  | Line Int
  | Rectangle Int Int

dims :: GeometricObject → [Int]
dims Point = []
dims (Line len) = [len]
dims (Rectangle len width) = [len, width]
```

# Pattern Matching

```
data GeometricObject
  = Point
  | Line Int
  | Rectangle Int Int

dimsPair :: GeometricObject → (GeometricObject, [Int])
dimsPair Point = (Point, [])
dimsPair s@(Line len) = (s, [len])
dimsPair s@(Rectangle len width) = (s, [len, width])
```

# Pattern Matching

```
data Pair = Pair Int Int
```

```
data GeometricObject  
  = Point  
  | Line Int  
  | Rectangle Pair
```

```
getDimensions :: GeometricObject -> (GeometricObject, [Int])
```

```
getDimensions Point = (Point, [])
```

```
getDimensions s@(Line len) = (s, [len])
```

```
getDimensions s@(Rectangle (Pair len width)) = (s, [len, width])
```

# Pattern Matching

```
x = 0

isPoint :: GeometricObject -> Bool
isPoint Point = True
isPoint (Line x) = True
isPoint (Rectangle x x) = True
isPoint _ = False
```

This is called *variable shadowing*, because the later binding sites overshadow the previous ones.

# Pattern Matching

```
x = 0

isPoint :: GeometricObject -> Bool
isPoint Point = True
isPoint (Line x) = True
isPoint (Rectangle x x) = True
isPoint _ = False
```

The Rectangle case gives a compilation error – we can only name one of the arguments x, to avoid ambiguity

# Pattern Matching

```
isSquare :: GeometricObject -> Bool  
isSquare (Rectangle x y) | x == y = True  
isSquare _ = False
```

# Expression Problem

```
data Shape
  = Rectangle Int Int
  | Circle Int

area :: Shape -> Double
area (Rectangle x y) = ...
area (Circle x) = ...
```

```
interface Shape
  double area();
  int perimeter();

class Rectangle implements Shape
  int x, y;
  double area() { ... }

class Circle implements Shape
  int r;
  double area() { ... }
```

# Expression Problem

```
data Shape
  = Rectangle Int Int
  | Circle Int

area :: Shape -> Double
area (Rectangle x y) = ...
area (Circle x) = ...
```

```
interface Shape
  double area();

class Rectangle implements Shape
  int x, y;
  double area() { ... }

class Circle implements Shape
  int r;
  double area() { ... }
```

Which is easier to add a new function for?  
Which is easier to add a new shape for?

# Expression Problem

```
data Shape  
  = Rectangle Int Int  
  | Circle Int
```

```
area :: Shape -> Double  
area (Rectangle x y) = ...  
area (Circle x) = ...
```

```
perimeter = Shape -> Double  
perimeter (Rectangle x y) = ...  
perimeter (Circle x) = ...
```

```
interface Shape  
  double area();  
double perimeter();
```

```
class Rectangle implements Shape  
  int x, y;  
  double area() { ... }  
double perimeter();
```

```
class Circle implements Shape  
  int r;  
  double area() { ... }  
double perimeter();
```

# Expression Problem

```
data Shape
  = Rectangle Int Int
  | Circle Int
  | Triangle Int Int
```

```
area :: Shape -> Double
area (Rectangle x y) = ...
area (Circle x) = ...
area (Triangle x y) = ...
```

```
perimeter = Shape -> Double
perimeter (Rectangle x y) = ...
perimeter (Circle x) = ...
perimeter (Triangle x y) = ...
```

```
interface Shape
  double area();
  double perimeter();

class Rectangle implements Shape
  int x, y;
  double area() { ... }
  double perimeter();

class Circle implements Shape
  int r;
  double area() { ... }
  double perimeter();

class Triangle implements Shape
  int x, y;
  double area() { ... }
  double perimeter();
```

# Exercises

# Higher-order functions

Recall: functions in Haskell are *first-class*

- They can be passed around as inputs to other functions
- They can be returned as outputs of other functions

# Higher-order functions

Recall: functions in Haskell are *first-class*

- They can be passed around as inputs to other functions
- They can be returned as outputs of other functions

A function that takes in OR returns another function is called *higher-order*.

# Higher-order functions

Examples:

- `map :: (Int -> Int) -> [Int] -> [Int]`
- `filter :: (Int -> Bool) -> [Int] -> [Int]`

These take in functions and, if partially applied, return functions.

# Higher-order functions

Example:

```
compose :: (Int -> Int) -> (Int -> Int) -> Int -> Int  
compose f g = \x -> f (g x)
```

$\lambda x \rightarrow$  syntax is used for anonymous functions, like `fun x =>` in OCaml

# Higher-order functions

Example:

```
compose :: (Int -> Int) -> (Int -> Int) -> Int -> Int  
compose f g = f . g
```

The standard library provides function composition, written as `(.)` .

# Higher-order functions

Composition helps write code that is:

- Concise
- Understandable
- In keeping with the “wholemeal” programming style, which operates on entire data structures at once

```
foo :: String -> String
foo s = length (filter (== 'c') (toUpper s))
```

# Higher-order functions

Composition helps write code that is:

- Concise
- Understandable
- In keeping with the “wholemeal” programming style, which operates on entire data structures at once

```
foo :: String -> String
```

```
foo s = length (filter (== 'c') (toUpper s))
```

```
foo = length . filter (== 'C') . toUpper
```

# Higher-order functions

Composition helps write code that is:

- Concise
- Understandable
- In keeping with the “wholemeal” programming style

```
foo :: String -> String
```

```
foo s = length (filter (== 'C') (toUpper s))
```

```
foo = length . filter (== 'C') . toUpper
```

# Partial application

```
add :: Int -> Int -> Int  
add x y = x + y
```

All functions in Haskell take one argument\*!

# Partial application

```
add :: Int -> Int -> Int  
add x y = x + y
```

All functions in Haskell take one argument\*!

```
add :: Int -> (Int -> Int)  
add 0 :: Int -> Int
```

# Partial application

```
add :: Int -> Int -> Int  
add x y = x + y
```

All functions in Haskell take one argument\*!

```
add :: Int -> (Int -> Int)
```

```
add 0 :: Int -> Int
```

Note: `(Int -> Int) -> Int` is **not** the same as `Int -> Int -> Int`.  
`->` is *right-associative*.

# Partial application

`->` is right-associative.

`Int -> Int -> Int` is the same as `Int -> (Int -> Int)`

Function *application* is left-associative.

`add 0 1` is the same as `(add 0) 1`

# Partial application

Note: Haskell lets us write anonymous functions like `\x y z -> ...`

This is just syntactic sugar for `\x -> (\y -> (\z -> ...))`.

Similarly, `add x y = ...` is just syntactic sugar for `add = \x -> (\y -> ...)` .

# Currying

```
add :: (Int, Int) -> Int  
add (x,y) = x + y
```

```
add :: Int -> Int -> Int  
add x y = x + y
```

These are equivalent! We call going from the first to the second *currying*, after Haskell Curry, and the reverse *uncurrying*.

Currying makes partial application easier.

# Partial application

When writing functions, consider:

Which argument are you most likely to want to partially apply with?

`filter f xs` – we often want to filter multiple lists using the same criterion

`filter xs f` – we rarely want to filter the same original list using multiple criteria

# Eta reduction

Eta reduction: removing unnecessary function abstractions.

$\lambda x \rightarrow f x$  is equivalent to  $f$

# Eta reduction

Eta reduction: removing unnecessary function abstractions.

$\lambda x \rightarrow f x$  is equivalent to  $f$

```
foo :: String -> String  
foo xs = map toUpper xs
```

# Eta reduction

Eta reduction: removing unnecessary function abstractions.

$\lambda x \rightarrow f x$  is equivalent to  $f$

```
foo :: String -> String  
foo xs = map toUpper xs
```

```
foo = \xs -> map toUpper xs
```

# Eta reduction

Eta reduction: removing unnecessary function abstractions.

$\lambda x \rightarrow f x$  is equivalent to  $f$

```
foo :: String -> String  
foo xs = map toUpper xs
```

```
foo = \xs -> map toUpper xs
```

```
foo = map toUpper
```

# Prefix Operators

`add :: Int -> Int -> Int`

- `add 0 1` – used as a prefix
- `0 `add` 1` – used as an infix

# Infix Operators

`(+) :: Int -> Int -> Int`

- `(+) 0 1` – used as a prefix
- `0 + 1` – used as an infix

Haskell lets us use *operator sections*, i.e., partially apply these on either side:

- `map (+ 1) xs`
- `filter (0 <) xs`

# Operator sections

`div :: Int -> Int -> Int`

`(-) :: Int -> Int -> Int`

`(>) :: Int -> Int -> Bool`

`(0 -)` – argument is on the left, so we know it's the first argument

`(> 100)` – argument is on the right, so we know it's the second argument

`div 8` – no sides to distinguish; we have to interpret it as the first argument