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Lesson 29

• Monads in Haskell
• The IO Monad
Pros of Functional Programming

- Functional programming is beautiful:
  - Concise and powerful abstractions
    - higher-order functions, algebraic data types, parametric polymorphism, principled overloading, ...
  - Close correspondence with mathematics
    - Semantics of a code function is the mathematical function
    - Equational reasoning: if $x = y$, then $f \times = f \times$
    - Independence of order-of-evaluation (Confluence, aka Church-Rosser)

![Evaluation Order Diagram](image-url)

The compiler can choose the best sequential or parallel evaluation order.
Problems...

• But to be *useful* as well as *beautiful*, a language must be able to manage “impure features”:
  – Input/Output
  – Imperative update
  – Error recovery (eg, timeout, divide by zero, etc.)
  – Foreign-language interfaces
  – Concurrency control

The whole point of a running a program is to interact with the external environment and affect it
The Direct Approach

• Just add imperative constructs “the usual way”
  – I/O via “functions” with side effects:
    
    ```
    putchar ‘x’ + putchar ‘y’
    ```
  – Imperative operations via assignable reference cells:
    
    ```
    z = ref 0; z := !z + 1;
    f(z);
    w = !z (* What is the value of w? *)
    ```
  – Error recovery via exceptions
  – Foreign language procedures mapped to “functions”
  – Concurrency via operating system threads

• Can work if language determines evaluation order
  – Ocaml, Standard ML are good examples of this approach
But what if we are “lazy”?  

In a lazy functional language, like Haskell, the order of evaluation is deliberately undefined, so the “direct approach” will not work.

• Example:  
  
  \[ \text{res} = \text{putchar} \ 'x' + \text{putchar} \ 'y' \]
  
  – Output depends upon the evaluation order of (+).

• Example:  
  
  \[ \text{ls} = [\text{putchar} \ 'x', \text{putchar} \ 'y'] \]
  
  – Output depends on how list is used
  
  – If only used in \text{length} \ 1s, nothing will be printed because \text{length} does not evaluate elements of list
Fundamental question

• Is it possible to regard pure Haskell as the basic programming paradigm, and add imperative features without changing the meaning of pure Haskell expressions?

• Yes! Using the concept of **monad**
  – Formally defined as a type constructor class
  – Each **monadic type constructor** defines certain **monadic values** (sometimes called **actions**) and how to compose them sequentially
The **Maybe** type constructor

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

-- example
sqrt :: Int -> Maybe Real
```

- A value of type **Maybe a** is a possibly undefined value of type **a**
- A function **f :: a -> Maybe b** is a partial function from **a** to **b**
Composing partial function

father :: Person -> Maybe Person -- partial function
mother :: Person -> Maybe Person -- (lookup in a DB)

maternalGrandfather :: Person -> Maybe Person
maternalGrandfather p =
  case mother p of
    Nothing -> Nothing
    Just mom -> father mom

bothGrandfathers :: Person -> Maybe (Person, Person)
bothGrandfathers p =
  case father p of
    Nothing -> Nothing
    Just dad ->
      case father dad of
        Nothing -> Nothing
        Just gf1 ->
          case mother p of
            Nothing -> Nothing
            Just mom ->
              case father mom of
                Nothing -> Nothing
                Just gf2 ->
                  Just (gf1, gf2)
                  -- found second grandfather
The **Monad** type class and the **Maybe** monad

class Monad m where
  
  return :: a -> m a
  
  (>>=) :: m a -> (a -> m b) -> m b -- "bind"

  ... -- + something more

• m is a type constructor

• m a is the type of **monadic values**

instance Monad Maybe where
  
  return :: a -> Maybe a
  return x = Just x

  (>>=) :: Maybe a -> (a -> Maybe b) -> Maybe b
  y >>= g = case y of
    Nothing -> Nothing
    Just x -> g x

• **bind (>>=)** shows how to “propagate” undefinedness
Use of **bind** of the **Maybe** monad to compose partial functions

father :: Person -> Maybe Person  -- partial function
mother :: Person -> Maybe Person  -- (lookup in a DB)

maternalGrandfather :: Person -> Maybe Person
maternalGrandfather p =
  case mother p of
    Nothing -> Nothing
    Just mom -> father mom

maternalGrandfather p = mother p >>= father

bothGrandfathers p =
  father p >>=
    (dad -> father dad >>=
      (gf1 -> mother p >>=
        (mom -> father mom >>=
          (gf2 -> return (gf1, gf2)))))
Alternative, imperative-style syntax: \textbf{do}

\begin{verbatim}
bothGrandfathers p =
  father p >>=
     ( \( \text{dad} \rightarrow \text{father dad} \) >>=
       ( \( \text{gf1} \rightarrow \text{mother p} \) >>=
         ( \( \text{mom} \rightarrow \text{father mom} \) >>=
           ( \( \text{gf2} \rightarrow \text{return (gf1,gf2) } \) )))

bothGrandfathers p = do {
  dad <- father p;
  gf1 <- father dad;
  mom <- mother p;
  gf2 <- father mom;
  return (gf1, gf2);
}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
bothGrandfathers p = do {
  dad <- father p;
  gf1 <- father dad;
  mom <- mother p;
  gf2 <- father mom;
  return (gf1, gf2)
}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{do} syntax is just syntactic sugar for \( >>= \)
\end{itemize}
## Some Haskell Monads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monad</th>
<th>Imperative semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Exception (Anonymous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Exception (with error description)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Global state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Input/output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[] (lists)</td>
<td>Non-determinism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Logger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding Monads as containers

class Monad m where -- definition of Monad type class
    return :: a -> m a
    (>>=) :: m a -> (a -> m b) -> m b -- "bind"
    ...

• The monadic constructor can be seen as a **container**: let’s see this for **lists**

• Getting **bind** from more basic operations

map :: (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b] -- seen. “fmap” for Functors
return :: a -> [a] -- container with single element
return x = [x]

concat :: [[a]] -> [a] -- flattens two-level containers

  Example: concat [[1,2],[[]],[4]] = [1,2,4]

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

Exercise: define map and concat using bind and return
Understanding Monads as computations

```haskell
class Monad m where -- definition of Monad type class
  return :: a -> m a
  (>>=)  :: m a -> (a -> m b) -> m b -- "bind"
  (>>)   :: m a -> m b -> m b -- "then"
...
```

- A value of type `m a` is a computation returning a value of type `a`
- For any value, there is a computation which “does nothing” and produces that result. This is given by function `return`
- Given two computations `x` and `y`, one can form the computation `x >> y` which intuitively “runs” `x`, throws away its result, then runs `y` returning its result
- Given computation `x`, we can use its result to decide what to do next. Given `f: a -> m b`, computation `x >>= f` runs `x`, then applies `f` to its result, and runs the resulting computation.

Note that we can define then using bind:
```haskell
x >>= y = x >>= (\_ -> y)
```
Understanding Monads as computations (2)

class Monad m where -- definition of Monad type class
  return :: a -> m a
  (>>=) :: m a -> (a -> m b) -> m b -- "bind"
  (>>) :: m a -> m b -> m b -- "then"

... -- + something more + a few axioms

• return, bind and then define basic ways to compose computations
• They are used in Haskell libraries to define more complex composition operators and control structures (sequence, for-each loops, ...)
• If a type constructor defining a library of computations is monadic, one gets automatically benefit of such libraries

Example: MAYBE
• \( f: a \rightarrow \text{Maybe } b \) is a partial function
• bind applies a partial function to a possibly undefined value, propagating undefinedness

Example: LISTS
• \( f: a \rightarrow [b] \) is a non-deterministic function
• bind applies a non-deterministic function to a list of values, collecting all possible results

Example: Parsing, handling errors, IO, backtracking....
Problem

The term “side effect” itself is misleading

A functional program defines a pure function, with no side effects

The whole point of running a program is to have some side effect
Before Monads

• Streams
  – Program sends stream of requests to OS, receives stream of responses

• Continuations
  – User supplies continuations to I/O routines to specify how to process results

• World-Passing
  – The “State of the World” is passed around and updated, like other data structures
  – Problem: how to guarantee single-threaded access to the world

• Haskell 1.0 Report adopted Stream model
  – Stream and Continuation models were discovered to be inter-definable
Stream Model: Basic Idea

- Move “side effects” outside of functional program
- Haskell `main :: String -> String`

Wrapper Program, written in some other language

- Gets more complicated ...
  - But what if you need to read more than one file? Or delete files? Or communicate over a socket? ...
Stream Model

• Enrich argument and return type of `main` to include all input and output events.

```haskell
main :: [Response] -> [Request]
data Request = ReadFile Filename
  | WriteFile FileName String
  | …
data Response = RequestFailed
  | ReadOK String
  | WriteOk
  | Success  | …
```

• Wrapper program interprets requests and adds responses to input.

• Move side effects outside of functional program
Stream Model: \texttt{main::[Response] \rightarrow [Request]}

- Problem: Laziness allows program to generate requests prior to processing any responses.
- Hard to extend
  - New I/O operations require adding new constructors to Request and Response types, modifying wrapper
- Does not associate Request with Response
  - easy to get “out-of-step,” which can lead to deadlock
- Not composable
  - no easy way to combine two “main” programs
- ... and other problems!!!
Monadic I/O: The Key Ideas

• **IO** is a type constructor, instance of **Monad**
• A value of type (**IO** \( t \)) is a computation or “action” that, when performed, may do some input/output before delivering a result of type \( t \)
• **return** returns the value without making I/O
• **then** (\( \gg \)) [and also **bind** (\( \gg= \))] composes two actions sequentially into a larger action
• The only way to perform an action is to call it at some point, directly or indirectly, from **Main.main**.
A value of type \((\text{IO } t)\) is an “action.” When performed, it may do some input/output before delivering a result of type \(t\).

\[
\text{type } \text{IO } t = \text{World } \rightarrow (t, \text{World})
\]

- An action is a first-class value
- **Evaluating** an action has no effect; **performing** the action has the effect
Simple I/O actions

getChar :: IO Char
putChar :: Char -> IO ()
main :: IO ()
main = putChar 'x'

Main program is an action of type IO ()
The Bind Combinator ( >>= )

\[( >>= ) \colon \text{IO}\ a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow \text{IO}\ b) \rightarrow \text{IO}\ b\]

- We have connected two actions to make a new, bigger action.

\[
\text{getChar} \colon \text{IO}\ \text{Char} \\
\text{putChar} \colon \text{Char} \rightarrow \text{IO}\ ()
\]

\[
\text{echo} = \text{getChar} \gg\gg \text{putChar}
\]
The \((\ggg\ggg)\) Combinator

\[(\ggg\ggg) :: IO a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow IO b) \rightarrow IO b\]

- Operator is called **bind** because it binds the result of the left-hand action in the action on the right.
- Performing compound action \(a \ggg \ggg b\):
  - performs action \(a\), to yield value \(r\)
  - applies function \(\lambda x \rightarrow b\) to \(r\)
  - performs the resulting action \(b\{x \leftarrow r\}\)
  - returns the resulting value \(v\)
The (>>>) Combinator

• The “then” combinator (>>>) does sequencing when there is no value to pass:

\[
(>>>) :: \text{IO}\ a \rightarrow \text{IO}\ b \rightarrow \text{IO}\ b
\]

-- defined from bind

\[
(>=>) :: \text{IO}\ a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow \text{IO}\ b) \rightarrow \text{IO}\ b
\]

\[
m >> n = m >>\ (= \_ \rightarrow n)
\]

\[
\text{echoDup} :: \text{IO}\ ()
\]

\[
\text{echoDup} = \text{getChar} \gg\gg= \text{\backslash}c \rightarrow \text{putChar}\ c >> \text{putChar}\ c
\]

\[
\text{echoTwice} :: \text{IO}\ ()
\]

\[
\text{echoTwice} = \text{echo} \gg\gg\ \text{echo}
\]
The return Combinator

• The action (return v) does no IO and immediately returns v:

\[
\text{return} :: \text{a} \rightarrow \text{IO a}
\]

getTwoChars :: IO (Char,Char)
getTwoChars = getChar >>= \c1 \rightarrow getChar >>= \c2 \rightarrow return (c1,c2)
The “do” Notation

• The “do” notation adds syntactic sugar to make monadic code easier to read.

```haskell
-- Plain Syntax
getTwoChars :: IO (Char, Char)
getTwoChars = getChar >>= \c1 ->
  getChar >>= \c2 ->
  return (c1, c2)
```

```haskell
-- Do Notation
getTwoCharsDo :: IO (Char, Char)
getTwoCharsDo = do { c1 <- getChar ;
  c2 <- getChar ;
  return (c1, c2) }
```

• Do syntax designed to look imperative.
Desugaring “do” Notation

• The “do” notation only adds syntactic sugar:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{do } \{ \ x \ \} & = x \\
\text{do } \{ \ x; \ \text{stmts} \ \} & = x \gg \text{do } \{ \ \text{stmts} \ \} \\
\text{do } \{ \ v<-x; \ \text{stmts} \ \} & = x \gg \Rightarrow \ \lambda v \rightarrow \text{do } \{ \ \text{stmts} \ \} \\
\text{do } \{ \text{let } ds; \ \text{stmts} \ \} & = \text{let } ds \text{ in } \text{do } \{ \ \text{stmts} \ \}
\end{align*}
\]

The scope of variables bound in a generator is the rest of the “do” expression.

• The following are equivalent:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{do } \{ \ x1 <- pl; \ldots; xn <- pn; \ q \ \} \\
\text{do } x1 <- pl; \ldots; xn <- pn; \ q
\end{align*}
\]
Bigger Example

• The \texttt{getLine} function reads a line of input:

\begin{verbatim}
getRow :: IO [Char]
getRow = do { c <- getChar ;
    if c == '\n' then
        return []
    else
        do { cs <- getRow;
            return (c:cs) }}
\end{verbatim}

Note the “regular” code mixed with the monadic operations and the nested “do” expression.
Control Structures on Monads

- Exploiting the monadic combinators, we can define control structures that work for any monad

\[
\text{repeatN} \ 0 \ x = \text{return} \ () \\
\text{repeatN} \ n \ x = x >> \text{repeatN} \ (n-1) \ x \\
\text{repeatN} :: (\text{Num} \ a, \text{Monad} \ m, \text{Eq} \ a) \Rightarrow a \to m a1 \to m ()
\]

Main> \text{repeatN} 5 \ (\text{putChar} 'h')

\[
\text{for} \ [] \quad \text{fa} = \text{return} \ () \\
\text{for} \ (x:xs) \ \text{fa} = \text{fa} \ x \ >> \text{for} \ xs \ \text{fa} \\
\text{for} :: \text{Monad} \ m \Rightarrow [t] \to (t \to m a) \to m ()
\]

Main> \text{for} \ [1..10] \ (\lambda x \to \text{putStr} \ (\text{show} \ x))
Sequencing

A list of IO actions.

An IO action returning a list.

sequence :: [IO a] -> IO [a]
sequence [] = return []
sequence (a:as) = do { r <- a;
    rs <- sequence as;
    return (r:rs) }
sequence :: Monad m => [m a] -> m [a]

• Example use:

Main> sequence [getChar, getChar, getChar]

Slogan: First-class actions let programmers write application-specific control structures.
IO Provides Access to Files

• The IO Monad provides a large collection of operations for interacting with the “World.”

• For example, it provides a direct analogy to the Standard C library functions for files:

```haskell
openFile :: FilePath -> IOMode -> IO Handle
hPutStr :: Handle -> String -> IO ()
hGetLine :: Handle -> IO String
hClose :: Handle -> IO ()
```
References

• The IO operations let us write programs that do I/O in a strictly sequential, imperative fashion.

• Idea: We can leverage the sequential nature of the IO monad to do other imperative things!

```haskell
data IORef a  -- Abstract type
newIORef    :: a -> IO (IORef a)
readIORef   :: IORef a -> IO a
writeIORef  :: IORef a -> a -> IO ()
```

• A value of type IORef a is a reference to a mutable cell holding a value of type a.
Example Using References

```haskell
import Data.IORef -- import reference functions
-- Compute the sum of the first n integers
count :: Int -> IO Int
count n = do
  { r <- newIORef 0;
    addToN r 1 }
where
  addToN :: IORef Int -> Int -> IO Int
  addToN r i | i > n = readIORef r
    | otherwise = do
    { v <- readIORef r
      ; writeIORef r (v + i)
      ; addToN r (i+1)}
```

But this is terrible! Contrast with: sum [1..n]. Claims to need side effects, but doesn’t really.
Example Using References

```haskell
import Data.IORef -- import reference functions
-- Compute the sum of the first n integers
count :: Int -> IO Int
count n = do
  r <- newIORef 0;
  addToN r 1
where
  addToN :: IORef Int -> Int -> IO Int
  addToN r i | i > n = readIORef r
               | otherwise = do
                v <- readIORef r
                writeIORef r (v + i)
                addToN r (i+1)
```

Just because you can write C code in Haskell, doesn’t mean you should!
The IO Monad as ADT

return :: a -> IO a
(>>=) :: IO a -> (a -> IO b) -> IO b

getChar :: IO Char
putChar :: Char -> IO ()
... more operations on characters ...
openFile :: [Char] -> IOMode -> IO Handle
... more operations on files ...
newIORef :: a -> IO (IORef a)
... more operations on references ...

• All operations return an IO action, but only `bind` (>>=) takes one as an argument.
• **Bind** is the only operation that combines IO actions, which forces sequentiality.
• In pure Haskell, there is no way to transform a value of type `IO a` into a value of type `a`
• There are unsafe primitives for this
Implementation

• GHC uses “world-passing semantics” for the IO monad

\[
\text{type } \text{IO } t = \text{World } \rightarrow (t, \text{World})
\]

• It represents the “world” by an un-forgable token of type \text{World}, and implements \text{bind} and \text{return} as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{return} & : a \rightarrow \text{IO } a \\
\text{return } a & = \backslash w \rightarrow (a, w) \\
(\gg=) & : \text{IO } a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow \text{IO } b) \rightarrow \text{IO } b \\
(\gg=) & m \ k = \backslash w \rightarrow \text{case } m \ w \ \text{of} \ (r, w') \rightarrow k \ r \ w'
\end{align*}
\]

• Using this form, the compiler can do its normal optimizations. The dependence on the world ensures the resulting code will still be single-threaded.

• The code generator then converts the code to modify the world “in-place.”
Summary

• A complete Haskell program is a single IO action called `main`. Inside IO, code is single-threaded.
• Big IO actions are built by gluing together smaller ones with `bind` (``` >>= ```) and by converting pure code into actions with `return`.
• IO actions are first-class.
  – They can be passed to functions, returned from functions, and stored in data structures.
  – So it is easy to define new “glue” combinators.
• The IO Monad allows Haskell to be pure while efficiently supporting side effects.
• The type system separates the pure from the effectful code.
Comparison

• In languages like ML or Java, the fact that the language is in the IO monad is baked in to the language. There is no need to mark anything in the type system because it is everywhere.

• In Haskell, the programmer can choose when to live in the IO monad and when to live in the realm of pure functional programming.

• So it is not Haskell that lacks imperative features, but rather the other languages that lack the ability to have a statically distinguishable pure subset.
Monad Laws

1) \text{return } x \gg= f = f x
2) m \gg = \text{return} = m
3) (x \gg= f) \gg= g = x \gg= (\lambda v \rightarrow f v \gg= g)

• In do-notation:

1) do \{ w <- \text{return } v; f w \} = do \{ f v \}

2) do \{ v <- x; \text{return } v \} = do \{ x \}

3) do \{ x <- m1; y <- do \{ x <- m1; y <- m2; m3 \}; m3 \} = do \{ y <- do \{ x <- m1; m2 \}; m3 \}

\text{x not in free vars of m3}
Derived Laws for (>>>) and done

\[
(\ggg) \, :: \, \text{IO} \, a \, \rightarrow \, \text{IO} \, b \, \rightarrow \, \text{IO} \, b \\
m \ggg n = m \gggg (\_ \rightarrow n)
\]

done :: \text{IO} ()

done = return ()

done \ggg m = m
m \ggg \text{done} = m
m1 \ggg (m2 \ggg m3) = (m1 \ggg m2) \ggg m3