



Episode 60 (8 November 2017)

Conditional contexts

Mark Hopkins

CBA

 [@antiselfdual](https://twitter.com/antiselfdual) |  [mjhopkins](https://github.com/mjhopkins) | mjhopkins.github.io

Problem

I've got a generic (polymorphic) method

```
def method[A](a: A)
```

but I want to do something different
when `A` has some *additional property*.

Additional property = instance of some type class

Examples

numeric stability

```
def sum[N](l: List[N])(implicit num: Numeric[N]): N =  
  l.foldLeft(num.zero)(num.plus)
```

Doesn't have behave well for floating point numbers
(numerical stability issues).

Want to use a different algorithm when `N` represents a floating point
number

e.g. the *Kahan summation algorithm*

distinct elements in a list

if all you can do is test for equality, $O(n^2)$

if you can sort, $O(n \log n)$

Well actually...

- linking two events
- query planning based on presence or absence of an index
- different kinds of printing
e.g. mask out parts of sensitive data.
- ...

If the *different property* was encoded as a super-class,
we could just **type-test**:

```
def method[A](a: A) = a match {  
  case x: SomeClass => doSomethingSpecial(x)  
  case _             => defaultCase(a)  
}
```

What's the type class equivalent to this?

N.B. Good reasons for encoding as type classes rather than inheritance.

- don't need to change original code
- flexible
- can make different choices in different contexts
- datatype generic programming
e.g. instances automatically created for classes
with certain structure

I can "test" if an instance exists

```
implicitly[SomeTypeClass[A]]
```

```
def implicitly[T](implicit t: T): T = t
```

But this fails at compile-time if `A` doesn't have an instance for `SomeTypeClass` .

We want to move this to a (safe) run-time check instead.

What we want

replace

```
implicitly[T]: T
```

with

```
maybeImplicitly[T]: Option[T]
```

Workaround

Two separate methods

```
// N.B. Don't use for floating point!!!!!! Bad!!!  
def sum[N: Numeric]  
// N.B. Don't use for Int - too slow!  
def sumFP[N: Fractional]
```

- fragile
- original problem still exists - still have to choose



Haskell

Haskell! ❤️❤️❤️❤️❤️❤️

A general purpose pure functional programming language.

<https://www.haskell.org/>

Mike Izbicki has written a package called `ifcxt` .

constraint level if statements

put if statements within type constraints

`ifcxt` proposes an extension to Haskell's type system to allow constraints to include if statements.

This lets us write faster, more generic code

<https://hackage.haskell.org/package/ifcxt>

Constraints and type classes

```
class Show a where  
  show :: a -> String
```

```
λ> :kind Show  
Show :: * -> Constraint
```

```
λ> :kind Show Int  
Show Int :: Constraint
```

```
λ> :t show  
show :: Show a => a -> String
```

```
λ> show 4  
"4"
```



```
{-# LANGUAGE ConstraintKinds    #-}  
{-# LANGUAGE FlexibleContexts   #-}  
{-# LANGUAGE FlexibleInstances #-}  
{-# LANGUAGE Rank2Types        #-}  
{-# LANGUAGE TemplateHaskell   #-}
```

Implementation

Template Haskell!

First of all, user has to explicitly ask for `IfCxt` instances for the type classes they want

```
mkIfCxtInstances ''Ord
mkIfCxtInstances ''Show
mkIfCxtInstances ''Typeable
```

There's an overlappable instance that always says "no"

```
instance {-# OVERLAPPABLE #-} IfCxt cxt where ifCxt _ t f = f
```

TH will produce the overlapping "yes" instances as relevant.

Pseudocode of simplified algorithm

```
mkIfCxtInstances n:  
  if n not a type class, abort.  
  for each instance i of n:  
    if there's already an instance of IfCxt (n i), do nothing.  
    else make a new one.
```

THE END.

Complications:

- instances may have their own contexts (preconditions).
- could be recursive.

e.g. from

```
Show a => Show [a]
```

we should be able to derive

```
IfCxt (Show a) => IfCxt(Show [a])
```

Code

<https://github.com/mikeizbicki/ifcxt>

Let's port this to Scala



Template Haskell

⇒ Scala macros

Explicitly asking for instances to be created

⇒ implicit materializer

Complications

⇒ *do they even make sense for Scala??*

out-of-scope for now

Code

<https://github.com/mjhopkins/ifcxt-scala>

See [IfCxtMacros.scala](#) and [IfCxt.scala](#).

STOP!

Could there be an easier way?*

After all, "constraints" are just values in Scala...

* Thanks to Laurence Rouesnel for pointing this out!

Version 2

```
trait IfCxt[T] {  
  def ifCxt[A](t: T => A, f: A): A =  
    maybeCxt map t getOrElse f  
  def maybeCxt: Option[T]  
}  
  
object IfCxt {  
  implicit def instance[T](implicit c: T = null): IfCxt[T] =  
    new IfCxt[T] {  
      def maybeCxt = Option(c)  
    }  
}
```

This works! 😊

"Nulls? default parameters? Urgh!"



Version 3

```
sealed trait IfCxt[T] {
  def ifCxt[A](t: T => A, f: A): A =
    maybeCxt map t getOrElse f
  def maybeCxt: Option[T]
}

trait LowPriorityIfCxt {
  implicit def absent[T] =
    new IfCxt[T] {
      def maybeCxt = None
    }
}

object IfCxt extends LowPriorityIfCxt {
  implicit def present[T](implicit c: T) =
    new IfCxt[T] {
      def maybeCxt = Some(c)
    }
}
```

This works too. 😊

Hang on...

Can we make this even simpler?

```
def maybeImplicitly[T](implicit t: T = null) = Option(t)
```

```
scala> maybeImplicitly[Show[Int]]  
      map (_ show 3) getOrElse "Can't show"  
res0: String = 3
```

```
scala> maybeImplicitly[Show[Int => Int]]  
      map (_ show (_ + 1)) getOrElse "Can't show"  
res1: String = Can't show
```


This doesn't work

```
def maybeImplicitly[T](implicit t: T = null) = Option(t)

def show[A](a: A) =
  maybeImplicitly[Show[A]] map (_ show a) getOrElse "Can't show"
```

show will always return "Can't show" .



Summary

We've successfully lifted `Option` to the type class level.

Limitations

The Haskell `ifcxt` package can handle instances with contexts

e.g. deriving

```
IfCxt (Show a) => IfCxt(Show [a]) from Show a => Show [a]
```

Not done in Scala.

Scala vs Haskell

It seems in this case that Scala has some advantages over Haskell

END