

# Generic Programming with Multiple Parameters

José Pedro Magalhães

Functional and Logic Programming 2014

5 June 2014

- ▶ Generic programming: an abstraction technique to reduce code duplication
- ▶ Generic programs operate on “representation types”; a small set of types used to encode all other user-defined datatypes
- ▶ Conversion functions mediate the isomorphism between a datatype and its generic representation
- ▶ There are several generic programming libraries, with different functionality, ease of use, etc.
- ▶ This talk is about generalising one particular popular generic programming library in Haskell

# Algebraic datatypes



What is the *shape* of algebraic datatypes?

# Algebraic datatypes



What is the *shape* of algebraic datatypes?

**data** *List*  $\alpha$  = *Nil* | *Cons*  $\alpha$  (*List*  $\alpha$ )

**data**  $[\alpha]$  = [] |  $\alpha$  :  $[\alpha]$

# Algebraic datatypes



What is the *shape* of algebraic datatypes?

**data** *List*  $\alpha$  = *Nil* | *Cons*  $\alpha$  (*List*  $\alpha$ )

**data**  $[\alpha]$  = [] |  $\alpha$  :  $[\alpha]$

**data** *Maybe*  $\alpha$  = *Nothing* | *Just*  $\alpha$

# Algebraic datatypes



What is the *shape* of algebraic datatypes?

**data** *List*  $\alpha = Nil \mid Cons \alpha (List \alpha)$

**data**  $[\alpha] = [] \mid \alpha : [\alpha]$

**data** *Maybe*  $\alpha = Nothing \mid Just \alpha$

**data**  $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha, \beta)$

# Algebraic datatypes



What is the *shape* of algebraic datatypes?

**data** *List*  $\alpha = Nil \mid Cons \alpha (List \alpha)$

**data**  $[\alpha] = [] \mid \alpha : [\alpha]$

**data** *Maybe*  $\alpha = Nothing \mid Just \alpha$

**data**  $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha, \beta)$

**data** *RTree*  $\alpha = RTree \alpha [RTree \alpha]$

What is the *shape* of algebraic datatypes?

**data** *List*  $\alpha = Nil \mid Cons \ \alpha \ (List \ \alpha)$

**data**  $[\alpha] = [] \mid \alpha : \ [\alpha]$

**data** *Maybe*  $\alpha = Nothing \mid Just \ \alpha$

**data**  $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha, \beta)$

**data** *RTree*  $\alpha = RTree \ \alpha \ [RTree \ \alpha]$

A value of an algebraic datatype is a *choice* between a *tuple* of *arguments*.



With generic programming, we model the shape of algebraic datatypes in a single representation:

**kind** *Univ* =

*U*  
| *P*  
| *K* ★  
| *R* (★ → ★)  
| *Univ* :+: *Univ*  
  
| *Univ* :×: *Univ*  
| ★ → ★ :@: *Univ*

With generic programming, we model the shape of algebraic datatypes in a single representation:

```
kind Univ =
  U           -- constructor with no arguments
| P           -- parameter
| K *         -- base type (constant)
| R (* → *)  -- recursion
| Univ :+: Univ -- choice

| Univ :×: Univ -- tuples
| * → * :@: Univ -- application
```

With generic programming, we model the shape of algebraic datatypes in a single representation:

<b>kind</b> <i>Univ</i> =	<b>data</b> <i>In</i> ( <i>v</i> :: <i>Univ</i> ) ( $\rho$ :: $\star$ ) :: $\star$ <b>where</b>
<i>U</i>	<i>U</i> <sub>1</sub> :: <i>In U</i> $\rho$
<i>P</i>	<i>Par</i> <sub>1</sub> :: $\rho \rightarrow \text{In } P \rho$
<i>K</i> $\star$	<i>K</i> <sub>1</sub> :: $\alpha \rightarrow \text{In } (K \alpha) \rho$
<i>R</i> ( $\star \rightarrow \star$ )	<i>Rec</i> <sub>1</sub> :: $\phi \rho \rightarrow \text{In } (R \phi) \rho$
<i>Univ</i> :+: <i>Univ</i>	<i>L</i> <sub>1</sub> :: $\text{In } \phi \rho \rightarrow \text{In } (\phi :+: \psi) \rho$
<i>Univ</i> : $\times$ : <i>Univ</i>	<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> :: $\text{In } \psi \rho \rightarrow \text{In } (\phi :+: \psi) \rho$
$\star \rightarrow \star$ :@: <i>Univ</i>	(: $\times$ :) :: $\text{In } \phi \rho \rightarrow \text{In } \psi \rho \rightarrow \text{In } (\phi : \times : \psi) \rho$
	<i>App</i> <sub>1</sub> :: $\phi (\text{In } \psi \rho) \rightarrow \text{In } (\phi : @ : \psi) \rho$

The class *Generic* groups the types that can be handled generically:

**class** *Generic* ( $\alpha :: \star$ ) **where**

*Rep*  $\alpha :: \text{Univ}$

*Par*  $\alpha :: \star$

*from*  $:: \alpha \rightarrow \text{In} (\text{Rep } \alpha) (\text{Par } \alpha)$

*to*  $:: \text{In} (\text{Rep } \alpha) (\text{Par } \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$

The class *Generic* groups the types that can be handled generically:

```
class Generic ( $\alpha :: \star$ ) where  
  Rep  $\alpha :: Univ$   
  Par  $\alpha :: \star$   
  
  from ::  $\alpha \rightarrow In (Rep\ \alpha) (Par\ \alpha)$   
  to   ::  $In (Rep\ \alpha) (Par\ \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$ 
```

As an example, we show the encoding of lists:

```
instance Generic [ $\alpha$ ] where  
  Rep [ $\alpha$ ] =  $U \text{:+: } P \text{:}\times\text{: } R []$   
  Par [ $\alpha$ ] =  $\alpha$   
  
  from []      =  $L_1 U_1$   
  from ( $h : t$ ) =  $R_1 (Par_1\ h \text{:}\times\text{: } Rec_1\ t)$   
  
  to ( $L_1 U_1$ )      =  $[]$   
  to ( $R_1 (Par_1\ h \text{:}\times\text{: } Rec_1\ t)$ ) =  $h : t$ 
```

This code is derived automatically by the compiler.

A slightly more complicated encoding is that of rose (or multiway) trees:

```
data RTree  $\alpha$  = RTree  $\alpha$  [ RTree  $\alpha$  ]
```

```
instance Generic (RTree  $\alpha$ ) where
```

```
Rep (RTree  $\alpha$ ) = P  $\times$ : ([]  $\text{:@}$ : R RTree)
```

```
Par (RTree  $\alpha$ ) =  $\alpha$ 
```

```
from (RTree  $x$  xs) = Par1  $x$   $\times$ : App1 (fmap Rec1 xs)
```

```
to ...
```

# Generic map (one parameter) I



The class *Functor* implements mapping over container types in Haskell:

```
class Functor ( $\phi :: \star \rightarrow \star$ ) where  
  fmap :: ( $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ )  $\rightarrow \phi \alpha \rightarrow \phi \beta$ 
```

# Generic map (one parameter) I



The class *Functor* implements mapping over container types in Haskell:

```
class Functor ( $\phi :: \star \rightarrow \star$ ) where  
  fmap :: ( $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ )  $\rightarrow \phi \alpha \rightarrow \phi \beta$ 
```

We could now define an instance for lists:

```
instance Functor [] where  
  fmap f []      = []  
  fmap f (h : t) = f h : fmap f t
```



# Generic map (one parameter) I



The class *Functor* implements mapping over container types in Haskell:

```
class Functor ( $\phi :: \star \rightarrow \star$ ) where  
  fmap :: ( $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ )  $\rightarrow \phi \alpha \rightarrow \phi \beta$ 
```

We could now define an instance for lists:

```
instance Functor [] where  
  fmap f [] = []  
  fmap f (h : t) = f h : fmap f t
```

And another one for *RTree*...

```
instance Functor RTree where  
  fmap f (RTree a ts) = RTree (f a) (fmap (fmap f) ts)
```

# Generic map (one parameter) II



... but fortunately we don't have to. Map is a generic function, so we can give a single definition that will operate on all *Generic* types.

For that we need to define how to map over the representation types. We use a type class for this:

```
class FunctorR (v :: Univ) where  
  fmapR :: (α → β) → In v α → In v β
```

# Generic map (one parameter) III



And now we give instances for each of the representation types:

**instance** *Functor<sub>R</sub> U* **where**

$$fmap_R - U_1 = U_1$$

**instance** *Functor<sub>R</sub> (K α)* **where**

$$fmap_R - (K_1 x) = K_1 x$$

**instance** (*Functor<sub>R</sub> φ, Functor<sub>R</sub> ψ*)  $\Rightarrow$  *Functor<sub>R</sub> (φ :+: ψ)* **where**

$$fmap_R f (L_1 x) = L_1 (fmap_R f x)$$

$$fmap_R f (R_1 x) = R_1 (fmap_R f x)$$

**instance** (*Functor<sub>R</sub> φ, Functor<sub>R</sub> ψ*)  $\Rightarrow$  *Functor<sub>R</sub> (φ :×: ψ)* **where**

$$fmap_R f (x :×: y) = fmap_R f x :×: fmap_R f y$$

# Generic map (one parameter) IV



These are the most interesting cases:

**instance** *Functor<sub>R</sub> P* **where**

$$\text{fmap}_R f (\text{Par}_1 x) = \text{Par}_1 (f x)$$

**instance** (*Functor  $\phi$* )  $\Rightarrow$  *Functor<sub>R</sub> (R  $\phi$ )* **where**

$$\text{fmap}_R f (\text{Rec}_1 x) = \text{Rec}_1 (\text{fmap } f x)$$

**instance** (*Functor  $\phi$ , Functor<sub>R</sub>  $v$* )  $\Rightarrow$  *Functor<sub>R</sub> ( $\phi$  :@:  $v$ )* **where**

$$\text{fmap}_R f (\text{App}_1 x) = \text{App}_1 (\text{fmap } (\text{fmap}_R f) x)$$

# Generic map (one parameter) IV



These are the most interesting cases:

**instance** *Functor<sub>R</sub> P* **where**

$fmap_R f (Par_1 x) = Par_1 (f x)$

**instance** (*Functor φ*)  $\Rightarrow$  *Functor<sub>R</sub> (R φ)* **where**

$fmap_R f (Rec_1 x) = Rec_1 (fmap f x)$

**instance** (*Functor φ, Functor<sub>R</sub> v*)  $\Rightarrow$  *Functor<sub>R</sub> (φ :@: v)* **where**

$fmap_R f (App_1 x) = App_1 (fmap (fmap_R f) x)$

Defining instances for *Generic* types is now very easy:

**instance** *Functor []* **where**  $fmap f = to \circ fmap_R f \circ from$

**instance** *Functor RTree* **where**  $fmap f = to \circ fmap_R f \circ from$

# Generic map (one parameter) IV



These are the most interesting cases:

**instance** *Functor<sub>R</sub> P* **where**

*fmap<sub>R</sub> f (Par<sub>1</sub> x) = Par<sub>1</sub> (f x)*

**instance** (*Functor φ*) ⇒ *Functor<sub>R</sub> (R φ)* **where**

*fmap<sub>R</sub> f (Rec<sub>1</sub> x) = Rec<sub>1</sub> (fmap f x)*

**instance** (*Functor φ, Functor<sub>R</sub> v*) ⇒ *Functor<sub>R</sub> (φ :@: v)* **where**

*fmap<sub>R</sub> f (App<sub>1</sub> x) = App<sub>1</sub> (fmap (fmap<sub>R</sub> f) x)*

Defining instances for *Generic* types is now very easy:

**instance** *Functor []*

**instance** *Functor RTree*

(And even easier if we use `-XDefaultSignatures`.)

# Map over multiple parameters



All is good so far, but what if I want to define the following map?

```
data WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$  = Leaf  $\alpha$ 
    | Fork (WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$ ) (WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$ )
    | WithWeight (WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$ )  $\omega$ 
```

```
mapWTree :: ( $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha'$ )  $\rightarrow$  ( $\omega \rightarrow \omega'$ )  $\rightarrow$  WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$   $\rightarrow$  WTree  $\alpha'$   $\omega'$ 
mapWTree f g (Leaf a)           = Leaf (f a)
mapWTree f g (Fork l r)       = Fork (mapWTree f g l)
                                         (mapWTree f g r)
mapWTree f g (WithWeight t w) = WithWeight (mapWTree f g t)
                                         (g w)
```

# Map over multiple parameters



All is good so far, but what if I want to define the following map?

```
data WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$  = Leaf  $\alpha$ 
                | Fork (WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$ ) (WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$ )
                | WithWeight (WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$ )  $\omega$ 
```

```
mapWTree :: ( $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha'$ )  $\rightarrow$  ( $\omega \rightarrow \omega'$ )  $\rightarrow$  WTree  $\alpha$   $\omega$   $\rightarrow$  WTree  $\alpha'$   $\omega'$ 
mapWTree f g (Leaf a)           = Leaf (f a)
mapWTree f g (Fork l r)         = Fork (mapWTree f g l)
                                (mapWTree f g r)
mapWTree f g (WithWeight t w) = WithWeight (mapWTree f g t)
                                           (g w)
```

With GHC generics, all we can get is a map over the  $\omega$  parameter.



# Generic map over multiple parameters I



The focus of this work is to generalise generics in GHC to support generic functions over multiple parameters.

# Generic map over multiple parameters I



The focus of this work is to generalise generics in GHC to support generic functions over multiple parameters.

With this generalisation, we can write a generic map *gmap* over multiple parameters:

```
instance GMap WTree '[ $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha'$ ,  $\omega \rightarrow \omega'$ ]  
mapWTree f g  $\simeq$  gmap (HCons f (HCons g HNil))
```

# Generic map over multiple parameters I



The focus of this work is to generalise generics in GHC to support generic functions over multiple parameters.

With this generalisation, we can write a generic map *gmap* over multiple parameters:

```
instance GMap WTree '[ $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha'$ ,  $\omega \rightarrow \omega'$ ]  
mapWTree f g  $\simeq$  gmap (HCons f (HCons g HNil))
```

```
instance GMap (,) '[ $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha'$ ,  $\beta \rightarrow \beta'$ ]  
example :: (Int, Float)  
example = gmap (HCons (+1) (HCons (+1.1) HNil)) (0, 0.0)
```

The first step is to generalise the universe to include support for multiple parameters:

```
kind Univ =
  U
  | F Field
  | Univ :+: Univ
  | Univ :×: Univ

kind Field =
  K ★
  | P Nat
  | ∀κ.κ :@: [Field]

data In (v :: Univ) (ρ :: [★]) :: ★ where
  U :: In U ρ
  F :: InField v ρ → In (F v) ρ
  L :: In α ρ → In (α :+: β) ρ
  R :: In β ρ → In (α :+: β) ρ
  (:×:) :: In α ρ → In β ρ → In (α :×: β) ρ

data InField (v :: Field) (ρ :: [★]) :: ★ where
  K :: α → InField (K α) ρ
  P :: ρ !: ν → InField (P ν) ρ
  A :: AppFields σ χ ρ → InField (σ :@: χ) ρ
```

# Generalising GHC Generics II



Some auxiliary type-level computations:

**kind**  $Nat = Ze \mid Su \ Nat$

$(\rho :: [\star]) \text{!}:: (\nu :: Nat) \text{!}:: \star$

$(\alpha \text{!}:: \rho) \text{!}:: Ze = \alpha$

$(\alpha \text{!}:: \rho) \text{!}:: (Su \ \nu) = \rho \text{!}:: \nu$

Some auxiliary type-level computations:

**kind**  $Nat = Ze \mid Su \ Nat$

$(\rho :: [\star]) \text{!}!: (\nu :: Nat) :: \star$

$(\alpha \text{' } \rho) \text{!}!: Ze = \alpha$

$(\alpha \text{' } \rho) \text{!}!: (Su \ \nu) = \rho \text{!}!: \nu$

$AppFields \ \sigma \ \chi \ \rho = \sigma \text{:}\$ \ ExpFld \ \chi \ \rho$

$(\sigma :: \kappa) \text{:}\$ \ (\rho :: [\star]) :: \star$

$\sigma \text{:}\$ \ '[] = \sigma$

$\sigma \text{:}\$ \ (\alpha \text{' } \beta) = (\sigma \ \alpha) \text{:}\$ \ \beta$

$ExpFld \ (\chi :: [Field]) \ (\rho :: [\star]) :: [\star]$

$ExpFld \ '[] \ \rho = '[]$

$ExpFld \ ((K \ \alpha) \text{' } \chi) \ \rho = \alpha \text{' } \rho \quad ExpFld \ \chi \ \rho$

$ExpFld \ ((P \ \nu) \text{' } \chi) \ \rho = (\rho \text{!}!: \nu) \text{' } \rho \quad ExpFld \ \chi \ \rho$

$ExpFld \ ((\sigma \text{:}\@ \ \omega) \text{' } \chi) \ \rho = (\sigma \text{:}\$ \ ExpFld \ \omega \ \rho) \text{' } ExpFld \ \chi \ \rho$

# Generalising GHC Generics III



We adapt the *Generic* class to encode the parameters as a type-level list:

```
class Generic ( $\alpha :: \star$ ) where  
  Rep  $\alpha :: \text{Univ}$   
  Pars  $\alpha :: [\star]$   
  from ::  $\alpha \rightarrow \text{In } (\text{Rep } \alpha) (\text{Pars } \alpha)$   
  to    ::  $\text{In } (\text{Rep } \alpha) (\text{Pars } \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$ 
```

# Generalising GHC Generics III



We adapt the *Generic* class to encode the parameters as a type-level list:

```
class Generic ( $\alpha :: \star$ ) where  
  Rep  $\alpha :: \text{Univ}$   
  Pars  $\alpha :: [\star]$   
  from ::  $\alpha \rightarrow \text{In } (\text{Rep } \alpha) (\text{Pars } \alpha)$   
  to    ::  $\text{In } (\text{Rep } \alpha) (\text{Pars } \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$ 
```

Here is the instance for lists:

```
instance Generic [ $\alpha$ ] where  
  Rep [ $\alpha$ ] =  $U \text{ :+: } F (P \ 0) \text{ :x: } F ([] \text{ :@: } '[P \ 0])$   
  Pars [ $\alpha$ ] =  $'[\alpha]$   
  from []      =  $L \ U$   
  from ( $h : t$ ) =  $R (F (P \ h) \text{ :x: } F (A \ t))$ 
```



But now we can also encode datatypes with multiple parameters:

```
instance Generic ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) where  
  Rep ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) =  $F$  ( $P$  0) : $\times$ :  $F$  ( $P$  1)  
  Pars ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ) = '[ $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ]  
  from ( $a$ ,  $b$ ) =  $F$  ( $P$   $a$ ) : $\times$ :  $F$  ( $P$   $b$ )
```

```
data  $D$   $\alpha$   $\beta$  =  $D$   $\beta$  [( $\alpha$ , Int)]  
instance Generic ( $D$   $\alpha$   $\beta$ ) where  
  Rep ( $D$   $\alpha$   $\beta$ ) =  $F$  ( $P$  1) : $\times$ :  $F$  ([ ] : $@$ : '[( $,$ ) : $@$ : '[ $P$  0,  $K$  Int]])  
  Pars ( $D$   $\alpha$   $\beta$ ) = '[ $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ]  
  from ( $D$   $a$   $b$ ) =  $F$  ( $P$   $a$ ) : $\times$ :  $F$  ( $A$   $b$ )
```

# Generic map over multiple parameters II



Since we can now map an arbitrary number of functions, we need arbitrary-length tuples (heterogenous collections):

```
data HList ( $\rho :: [★]$ ) where  
  HNil   :: HList '[]  
  HCons ::  $\alpha \rightarrow \textit{HList } \beta \rightarrow \textit{HList } (\alpha ': \beta)$ 
```

We can then express the user-facing class for the generalised map:

```
class GMap ( $\sigma :: \kappa$ ) ( $\tau :: [★]$ ) |  $\tau \rightarrow \kappa$  where  
  gmap :: HList  $\tau \rightarrow \sigma \text{ :\$} \textit{Doms } \tau \rightarrow \sigma \text{ :\$} \textit{Codoms } \tau$ 
```

# Limitation to kind $\star$ parameters



Consider the following datatype:

**data**  $GTree_1 \phi \alpha = GTree_1 \alpha (\phi (GTree_1 \phi \alpha))$

We would like to obtain the following map for it:

$$\begin{aligned} gmap1 &:: (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow (\forall \alpha \beta. (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \phi \alpha \rightarrow \psi \beta) \\ &\quad \rightarrow GTree_1 \phi \alpha \rightarrow GTree_1 \psi \beta \\ gmap1 \ f \ g \ (GTree_1 \ x \ y) &= GTree_1 \ (f \ x) \ (g \ (gmap1 \ f \ g) \ y) \end{aligned}$$

But this is not yet possible with our approach.

- ▶ We've seen how to encode a generic representation that supports abstraction over multiple parameters (of kind  $\star$ );
- ▶ We've defined a generalised map;
- ▶ Other generalised functions are now possible, e.g. folding, traversing, and zipping;
- ▶ We hope to implement support for multiple parameters in GHC soon.

- ▶ We've seen how to encode a generic representation that supports abstraction over multiple parameters (of kind  $\star$ );
- ▶ We've defined a generalised map;
- ▶ Other generalised functions are now possible, e.g. folding, traversing, and zipping;
- ▶ We hope to implement support for multiple parameters in GHC soon.

Thank you for your time!