Advanced Functional Programming

04 - ~~Monads~~ Warm Fuzzy Things

Wouter Swierstra & Trevor L. McDonell

Utrecht University

In this lecture

- A number of useful programming patterns.
- We will see a similarity between seemingly different concepts.

The `Maybe` type

```haskell
data Maybe a = Nothing
             | Just a
```

The `Maybe` datatype is often used to encode failure or an exceptional value:

```haskell
find :: (a → Bool) → [a] → Maybe a
lookup :: Eq a ⇒ a → [(a,b)] → Maybe b
```

Encoding exceptions using `Maybe`

Assume that we have a (Zipper-like) data structure with the following operations:

```
up, down, right :: Loc → Maybe Loc
update :: (Int → Int) → Loc → Loc
```

Given a location `l1`, we want to move up, right, down, and update the resulting position with using `update (+1)` …

Each of the steps can fail.

Encoding exceptions using `Maybe` (contd.)

The straightforward implementation calls each function, checking the result before continuing.

```
case up l1 of
  Nothing → Nothing
  Just l2 → case right l2 of
    Nothing → Nothing
    Just l3 → case down l3 of
      Nothing → Nothing
      Just l4 → Just (update (+1) l4)
```

Encoding exceptions using `Maybe` (contd.)

The straightforward implementation calls each function, checking the result before continuing.

```
case up l1 of
  Nothing → Nothing
  Just l2 → case right l2 of
    Nothing → Nothing
    Just l3 → case down l3 of
      Nothing → Nothing
      Just l4 → Just (update (+1) l4)
```

There's a lot of code duplication here!

Let's try to refactor out the common pattern...

Refactoring

```
case up l1 of
  Nothing → Nothing
  Just l2 → case right l2 of
    Nothing → Nothing
    Just l3 → case down l3 of
      Nothing → Nothing
      Just l4 → Just (update (+1) l4)
```

We would like to:

- call a function that may fail;
- return `Nothing` when the call fails;
- continue somehow when the call succeeds.
- and lift a final result `update (+1) l4` into a `Maybe`.

Capturing this pattern

We need to define an operator that takes two arguments:

- call a function that may fail:

```
Maybe a
```

- continue somehow when the call succeeds:

```
a → Maybe b.
```

Capturing this pattern

We need to define an operator that takes two arguments:

- call a function that may fail:

`Maybe a`

- continue somehow when the call succeeds:

`a → Maybe b`.

```
(>>=) :: Maybe a → (a → Maybe b) → Maybe b
f >>= g = case f of
  Nothing → Nothing
  Just x → g x
```

Returning results

Once we have computed the desired result, `update (+1) l4`, it is easy to turn it into a value of type `Maybe Loc`.

Although it's not very useful just yet, we can define the following function:

```
return :: a → Maybe a
return x = Just x
```

Refactoring our code

```
case up l1 of
  Nothing → Nothing
  Just l2 → case right l2 of
    Nothing → Nothing
    Just l3 → case down l3 of
      Nothing → Nothing
      Just l4 → Just (update (+1) l4)
```

Refactoring our code

```
up l1 >>= \l2 →
  case right l2 of
    Nothing → Nothing
    Just l3 → case down l3 of
      Nothing → Nothing
      Just l4 → Just (update (+1) l4)
```

Refactoring our code

```
up l1 >>= \l2 →
right l2 >>= \l3 →
  case down l3 of
    Nothing → Nothing
    Just l4 → Just (update (+1) l4)
```

Refactoring our code

```
up l1 >>= \l2 →
right l2 >>= \l3 →
down l3 >>= \l4 →
Just (update (+1) l4)
```

Refactoring our code

```
up l1 >>= \l2 →
right l2 >>= \l3 →
down l3 >>= \l4 →
return (update (+1) l4)
```

Refactoring our code

```
up l1 >>= \l2 ->
right l2 >>= \l3 ->
down l3 >>= \l4 ->
return (update (+1) l4)
```

We can simplify this even further to:

```
up l1 >>= right >>= down >>= return . update (+1)
```

Imperative look-and-feel

Compare the following Haskell code:

```
up l1 >>= \l2 →
right l2 >>= \l3 →
down l3 >>= \l4 →
return (update (+1) l4)
```

with this ‘imperative’ code:

```
l2 := up l1;
l3 := right l2;
l4 := down l3;
return (update (+1) l4);
```

Imperative look-and-feel

In the imperative code, failure is an implicit side-effect;

In the Haskell version, we track the possibility of failure using `Maybe` and ‘hide’ the implementation with the sequencing operator.

A variation: `Either`

Compare the datatypes

```haskell
data Either a b = Left a | Right b
```

```haskell
data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
```

The datatype `Maybe` can encode exceptional function results (i.e., failure), but no information can be associated with `Nothing`. We cannot dinstinguish different kinds of errors.

Using `Either`, we can use `Left` to encode errors, and `Right` to encode successful results.

Example

```haskell
type Error = String

fac :: Int → Either Error Int
fac 0 = Right 1
fac n
  | n > 0
  = case fac (n - 1) of
      Left e  → Left e
      Right r → Right (n * r)
  | otherwise
  = Left "fac: negative argument"
```

Structure of sequencing looks similar to the sequencing for `Maybe`.

Sequencing and returning for `Either`

We can define variations of the operatons for `Maybe`:

```
(>>=) :: Either Error a → (a → Either Error b) → Either Error b
f >>= g = case f of
  Left e  → Left e
  Right x → g x

return :: a → Either Error a
return x = Right x
```

Refactoring our `fac` function

The function can now be written as:

```
fac :: Int → Either Error Int
fac 0 = return 1
fac n
  | n > 0     = fac (n - 1) >>= \r → return (n * r)
  | otherwise = Left “fac: negative argument”
```

Simulating exceptions

We can abstract completely from the definition of the underlying `Either` type if we define functions to throw and catch errors.

```
throwError :: Error → Either Error a
throwError e = Left e

catchError :: Either Error a
           → (Error → a)
           → a
catchError f handler = case f of
  Left e  → handler e
  Right x → x
```

State

Maintaining state explicitly

- We pass state to a function as an argument.
- The function modifies the state and produces it as a result.
- If the function does anything except modifying the state, we must return a tuple (or a special-purpose datatype with multiple fields).

This motivates the following type definition:

```
type State s a = s → (a, s)
```

Using state

There are many situations where maintaining state is useful:

- using a random number generator – like we saw for QuickCheck

```
type Random a = State StdGen a
```

- using a counter to generate unique labels

```
type Counter a = State Int a
```

Using state – continued

- maintaining the complete current configuration of an application (an interpreter, a game, ...) using a user-defined datatype

```
data ProgramState = ...

type Program a = State ProgramState a
```

- caching information locally, which can later be flushed to an external data source, such as a database or file.

Encoding state passing

```haskell
data Tree a = Leaf a
            | Node (Tree a) (Tree a)

relabel :: Tree a → State Int (Tree Int)
relabel (Leaf x)   = \s → (Leaf s, s + 1)
relabel (Node l r) = \s →
  let (l',s')  = relabel l s
      (r',s'') = relabel r s'
   in (Node l' r', s'')
```

Again, we'll define two functions:

- a way to sequence the state from one call to the next;
- a way to produce a final results.

Sequence and return for state

```haskell
(>>=) :: State s a → (a → State s b) → State s b
f >>= g = \s → let (x,s') = f s
                in g x s'

return :: a → State s a
return x = \s → (x,s)
```

Refactoring our code

```haskell
relabel :: Tree a → State Int (Tree Int)
relabel (Leaf x)   = \s → (Leaf s, s + 1)
relabel (Node l r) = \s →
  let (l',s')  = relabel l s
      (r',s'') = relabel r s'
   in (Node l' r', s'')
```

```haskell
(>>=) :: State s a → (a → State s b) → State s b
f >>= g = \s → let (x,s') = f s
                in g x s'
```

Let’s try to refactor the code, using our sequencing operator.

Refactoring our code

```
relabel :: Tree a → State Int (Tree Int)
relabel (Leaf x)    = \s → (Leaf s, s + 1)
relabel (Node l r) =
  relabel l >>= \l' → \s' →
  let (r',s'') = relabel r s'
   in (Node l' r', s'')

(>>=) :: State s a → (a → State s b) → State s b
f >>= g = \s → let (x,s') = f s
                in g x s'
```

Instead of threading the state explicitly, we can use >>=!

Refactoring our code

```haskell
relabel :: Tree a → State Int (Tree Int)
relabel (Leaf x)   = \s → (Leaf s, s + 1)
relabel (Node l r) =
  relabel l >>= \l' →
  relabel r >>= \r' → \s'' →
  (Node l' r', s'')

return :: a → State s a
return x = \s → (x,s)
```

Now we observe that the final step is not modifying the state.

Refactoring our code

```haskell
relabel :: Tree a → State Int (Tree Int)
relabel (Leaf x)    = \s → (Leaf s, s + 1)
relabel (Node l r) =
  relabel l >>= \l' →
  relabel r >>= \r' →
  return (Node l' r')

return :: a → State s a
return x = \s → (x,s)
```

Comparison with imperative version

In Haskell:

```
relabel l >>= \l' →
relabel r >>= \r' →
return (Node l' r')
```

Imperative pseudocode:

```
l' := relabel l;
r' := relabel r;
return (Node l' r');
```

Comparison with imperative version

- In most imperative languages, the occurrence of memory updates is an implicit side effect.
- Haskell is more explicit because we use the `State` type and the appropriate sequencing operation.

“Primitive” operations for state handling

We can completely hide the implementation of `State` if we provide the following two operations as an interface:

```
get :: State s s
get = \s → (s, s)

put :: s → State s ()
put s = \_ → ((), s)
```

Using this we can define the following helper function for our example:

```
fresh :: State Int ()
fresh = get >>= \s → put (s + 1)
```

Actually, Haskell's `Control.Monad.State` module uses a slightly different implementation:

```
newtype State s a = State { runState :: s → (a, s) }
```

This definition is equivalent to the definition we saw previously.

Lists

Encoding multiple results and nondeterminism

Get the length of all words in a list of multi-line texts:

```
map length
  (concat
    (map words
      (concat (map lines txts))))
```

- Easier to understand with a list comprehension:

```
[ length w | t <- txts, l <- lines t, w <- words l ]
```

Sequencing again

We can also define sequencing and embedding, i.e., `(>>=)` and `return` for lists:

```
(>>=) :: [a] → (a → [b]) → [b]
xs >>= f = concat (map f xs)

return :: a → [a]
return x = [x]
```

Using bind and return for lists

Once again, we can refactor code to use bind, turning:

```
map length (concat (map words (concat (map lines txts))))
```

into:

```
txts >>= \t →
lines t >>= l →
words l >>= w →
return (length w)
```

Comparison with imperative solution

- Again, we have a similarity to imperative code.
- In the imperative language, we have implicit nondeterminism (one or all of the options are chosen).
- In Haskell, we are explicit by using the list datatype and explicit sequencing using `(>>=)`.

Intermediate Summary

At least three types with `(>>=)` and `return`:

- for `Maybe`, `(>>=)` sequences operations that may trigger exceptions and shortcuts evaluation once an exception is encountered; `return` embeds a function that never throws an exception;
- for `State`, `(>>=)` sequences operations that may modify some state and threads the state through the operations; `return` embeds a function that never modifies the state;
- for `[]`, `(>>=)` sequences operations that may have multiple results and executes subsequent operations for each of the previous results; `return` embeds a function that only ever has one result.

There is a common interface here!

The Monad class

Monad class

```
class Monad m where
  return :: a → m a
  (>>=)  :: m a → (a → m b) → m b
```

- The name “monad” is borrowed from category theory.
- A monad is an algebraic structure similar to a monoid.
- Monads were first studied in the semantics of programming languages by Moggi; later they were applied to functional programming languages by Wadler.

Instances

```haskell
instance Monad Maybe where
  ...

instance (Error e) ⇒ Monad (Either e) where
  ...

instance Monad [] where
  ...

newtype State s a = State { runState :: s → (a, s) }
instance Monad (State s) where
  ...
```

Excursion: type constructors

- The class `Monad` ranges not over ordinary types, but over parameterized types.
- There are types of types, called *kinds*.
- Types of kind $*$ are inhabited by values. Examples: `Bool`, `Int`, `Char`.
- Types of kind $* \rightarrow *$ have one parameter of kind $*$. The `Monad` class ranges over such types. Examples: `[]`, `Maybe`.
- Applying a type constructor of kind $* \rightarrow *$ to a type of kind $*$ yields a type of kind $*$. Examples: `[Int]`, `Maybe Char`.
- The kind of `State` is $* \rightarrow * \rightarrow *$. For any type `s`, `State s` is of kind $* \rightarrow *$ and can thus be an instance of class `Monad`.

Excursion: functors

Monads are not the only 'higher-order' abstraction: structures that allow mapping have their own class.

```
class Functor f where
  fmap :: (a → b) → f a → f b
```

- All containers, in particular all trees can be made an instance of functor.
- Every monad is a functor morally (`liftM`).
- Not all type constructors are functors; not all functors are monads…

Monad laws

- Every instance of the monad class should have the following properties:
- `return` is the unit of `(>>=)`

```
return a >>= f   ==   f a
m >>= return     ==   m
```

- associativity of `(>>=)`

```
(m >>= f) >>= g  ==  m >>= (\x -> f x >>= g)
```

Monad laws for `Maybe`

To prove the monad laws for `Maybe` we need to show for any `f :: a → Maybe b`, and for any `m :: Maybe a`:

```
Just x >>= f  =  f x
```

and

```
m >>= return  =  m
```

Both are straightforward exercises.

Monad laws for `Maybe`

To prove the monad laws for `Maybe` we need to show for any `f :: a → Maybe b`, and for any `m :: Maybe a`:

```
Just x >>= f  ==  f x
```

and

```
m >>= return  ==  m
```

Both are straightforward exercises.

Similarly, associativity of >>= requires a longer, but no more complex proof.

Bind or join

We have presented monads by defining the following interface:

```
(>>=)  :: m a → (a → m b) → m b
return :: a → m a
```

We could also have chosen the following, equivalent interface:

```
join   :: m (m a) → m a
return :: a → m a
```

It is a good exercise to try to define `>>=` in terms of `join` and visa versa (`m` also needs to be a functor).

Monads are “monoids”

Additional monad operations

Class `Monad` contains an additional method, but with a default implementation:

```
class Monad m where
  ...
  (>>) :: m a → m b → m b
  m >> n = m >>= \_ → n
```

The presence of `(>>)` can be justified for efficiency reason.

There also used to be a method `fail` which is used when desugaring do-notation, but that has been moved to a different class `MonadFail`.

do notation

Haskell offers special syntax for programming with monads. Rather than write:

```
mf >>= \f →
mg >>= \g →
 ...
```

You can also write:

```
do
  f <- mf
  g <- mg
   ...
```

You can also use `let` bindings within `do` blocks to name expressions (non-monadic computations).

Monadic application

```
ap :: Monad m ⇒ m (a → b) → m a → m b
ap mf mx = do
  f <- mf
  x <- mx
  return (f x)
```

Or without `do` notation:

```
ap mf mx = mf >>= \f’ →
           mx >>= \x’ →
           return (f x)
```

More on `do` notation

- Use it, it is usually more concise.
- Never forget that it is just syntactic sugar. Use `(>>=)` and `(>>)` directly when it is more convenient.
- Remember that `return` is just a normal function:
  - Not every `do`-block ends with a `return`.
  - `return` can be used in the middle of a `do`-block, and it doesn't "jump" anywhere.
- Not every monad computation has to be in a `do`-block. In particular `do e` is the same as `e`.
- On the other hand, you may have to "repeat" the `do` in some places, for instance in the branches of an `if`.

The `IO` monad

Another type with actions that require sequencing.

The `IO` monad is special in several ways:

- `IO` is a primitive type, and `(>>=)` and `return` for `IO` are primitive functions,
- there is no (politically correct) function `runIO :: IO a → a`, whereas for most other monads there is a corresponding function,
- values of `IO a` denote side-effecting programs that can be executed by the run-time system.

Note that the specialty of `IO` has really not much to do with being a monad.

IO, internally

```
> :i IO
newtype IO a
  = GHC.Types.IO
    (GHC.Prim.State# GHC.Prim.RealWorld
    -> (# GHC.Prim.State# GHC.Prim.RealWorld
       , a #))
        -- Defined in ‘GHC.Types’
instance Monad IO -- Defined in ‘GHC.Base’
...
```

Internally, GHC models `IO` as a state monad having the “real world” as state!

The role of `IO` in Haskell

More and more features have been integrated into `IO`, for instance:

- classic file and terminal IO

  `putStr, hPutStr`

- references

  `newIORef, readIORef, writeIORef`

- access to the system

  `getArgs, getEnvironment, getClockTime`

- exceptions

  `throwIO, catch`

- concurrency

  `forkIO`

`IO` examples

Stdout output

```
> putStr "Hi"
Hi
> do putChar 'H' ; putChar 'i' ; putChar '!'
Hi!
```

`IO` **examples**

File IO

```
> do  h <- openFile “TMP” WriteMode; hPutStrLn h “Hi”
> :q
Leaving GHCi
$ cat TMP
Hi
```

`IO` **examples**

Side-effect: variables

```
do v <- newIORef “text”
   modifyIoRef v (\t -> t ++ “ and more text”)
   w <- readIORef v
   print w
```

Results in

text and more text

The role of `IO` in Haskell (contd.)

- Because of its special status, the `IO` monad provides a safe and convenient way to express all these constructs in Haskell. Haskell's purity (referential transparency) is not compromised, and equational reasoning can be used to reason about `IO` programs.
- A program that involves `IO` in its type can do everything. The absence of `IO` tells us a lot, but its presence does not allow us to judge what kind of `IO` is performed.
- It would be nice to have more fine-grained control on the effects a program performs.
- For some, but not all effects in `IO`, we can use or build specialized monads.

Lifting functions to monads

```haskell
liftM :: Monad m ⇒ (a → b) → m a → m b
liftM f m = do  x <- m; return (f x)

liftM2 :: Monad m ⇒ (a → b → c) → m a → m b → m c
liftM2 f m1 m2 = do  x1 <- m1;
                     x2 <- m2;
                     return (f x1 x2)
```

Lifting functions to monads

```
liftM :: Monad m ⇒ (a → b) → m a → m b
liftM f m = do  x <- m; return (f x)

liftM2 :: Monad m ⇒ (a → b → c) → m a → m b → m c
liftM2 f m1 m2 = do  x1 <- m1;
                     x2 <- m2;
                     return (f x1 x2)
```

Question: What is `liftM (+1) [1..5]`?

Lifting functions to monads

```haskell
liftM :: Monad m ⇒ (a → b) → m a → m b
liftM f m = do  x <- m; return (f x)

liftM2 :: Monad m ⇒ (a → b → c) → m a → m b → m c
liftM2 f m1 m2 = do  x1 <- m1;
                     x2 <- m2;
                     return (f x1 x2)
```

Question: What is `liftM (+1) [1 .. 5]`?

Answer: Same as `map (+1) [1 .. 5]`. The function `liftM` generalizes `map` to arbitrary monads.

Monadic map

```
mapM :: Monad m ⇒ (a → m b) → [a] → m [b]
mapM f []     = return []
mapM f (x:xs) = liftM2 (:) (f x) (mapM f xs)

mapM_ :: Monad m ⇒ (a → m b) → [a] → m () >
mapM_ f []     = return ()
mapM_ f (x:xs) = f x >> mapM_ f xs
```

Sequencing monadic actions

```haskell
sequence :: Monad m ⇒ [m a] → m [a]
sequence = foldr (liftM2(:)) (return [])

sequence_:: Monad m ⇒ [m a] → m ()
sequence_ = foldr (>>) (return ())
```

Monadic fold

```haskell
foldM :: Monad m ⇒ (a → b → m a) → a → [b] → m a
foldM op e []      = return e
foldM op e (x:xs) = do
  r <- op e x
  foldM f r xs
```

More monadic operations

Browse `Control.Monad`:

```
filterM     :: Monad m ⇒ (a → m Bool) → [a] → m [a]
replicateM  :: Monad m ⇒ Int → m a → m [a]
replicateM_ :: Monad m ⇒ Int → m a → m ()
join        :: Monad m ⇒ m (m a) → m a
when        :: Monad m ⇒ Bool → m () → m ()
unless      :: Monad m ⇒ Bool → m () → m ()
forever     :: Monad m ⇒ m a → m ()
```

...and more!

Next lecture

- Applicative functors – an abstraction similar to monads.
- You may want to have a look at the paper *Applicative Programming with Effects* by Conor McBride and Ross Paterson.