



EDAF95/EDAN40: Functional Programming On Laziness

Jacek Malec

Dept. of Computer Science, Lund University, Sweden

April 24th, 2024



Topic of today: evaluation, strictness, laziness

References:

- Hutton, 2nd ed., Chapter 15
- https://www.haskell.org/haskellwiki/Haskell/Lazy_evaluation
- https://www.haskell.org/haskellwiki/Lazy_vs._non-strict
- <http://stackoverflow.com/questions/265392/why-is-lazy-evaluation-useful>



What is evaluation?

Finding out a value:

$$\left(\int_0^y x dx\right)(2 + 3)$$



What is evaluation?

Finding out a value:

$$\left(\int_0^y x dx\right)(2 + 3)$$

Value of an expression:

$$f(a) = b$$



What is evaluation?

$$\int x dx = \frac{x^2}{2}$$

$$\int_0^y x dx = \frac{y^2}{2} - \frac{0^2}{2} = \frac{y^2}{2}$$

$$\left(\int_0^y x dx\right)(2+3) = \left(\frac{y^2}{2}\right)(2+3) = \frac{(2+3)^2}{2} = \frac{5^2}{2} = \frac{25}{2} = 12,5$$

$$\left(\int_0^y x dx\right)(2+3) = \left(\int_0^y x dx\right)5 = \left(\int_0^5 x dx\right) = \frac{5^2}{2} = 12,5$$



Evaluation order

```
inc :: Int -> Int
inc n = n + 1
```



Evaluation order

```
inc :: Int -> Int
```

```
inc n = n + 1
```

```
inc (2 * 3)
```

```
inc 6
```

```
(2 * 3) + 1
```

```
6 + 1
```

```
6 + 1
```

```
7
```



Evaluation order

Some imperative language

```
n = 0
```

```
y = n + (n = 1)
```




Evaluation order

Some imperative language

$n = 0$

$y = n + (n = 1)$

$n + (n = 1)$

$0 + (n = 1)$

$n + 1$

$0 + 1$

$1 + 1$

1

2



Reduction

Reducible expression: *redex*

Function application to an argument

```
mult :: (Int, Int) -> Int
```

```
mult (x, y) = x * y
```

```
mult (1 + 2, 2 + 3)
```

Three redexes!



Reduction

Reducible expression: *redex*

Function application to an argument

```
mult :: (Int, Int) -> Int
```

```
mult (x, y) = x * y
```

```
mult (1 + 2, 2 + 3)
```

Three redexes!

```
(1 + 2) * (2 + 3)
```

```
mult (3, 2 + 3)
```

```
mult (1 + 2, 5)
```

Choice -> leads to evaluation *strategies*



Evaluation strategies

- 1 innermost redex first (usually left-to-right) *call by value*

```
mult (1 + 2, 2 + 3)
```

```
mult (3, 2 + 3)
```

```
mult (3, 5)
```

```
3 * 5
```

```
15
```

- 2 outermost redex first (usually left-to-right) *call by name*

```
mult (1 + 2, 2 + 3)
```

```
(1 + 2) * (2 + 3)
```

```
3 * (2 + 3)
```

```
3 * 5
```

```
15
```



Lambda expressions

Curried mult:

```
mult :: Int -> Int -> Int
mult x = \y -> x * y
```

Innermost evaluation:

```
mult (1 + 2) (2 + 3)
mult 3 (2 + 3)
(\y -> 3 * y) (2 + 3)
(\y -> 3 * y) 5
3 * 5
15
```

In Haskell: **Do not reduce inside lambdas!**



Termination

```
inf :: Int
inf = 1 + inf
```

Now, irrespectively of evaluation strategy:

```
inf
1 + inf
1 + (1 + inf)
1 + (1 + (1 + inf))
...
```

Does not terminate!



Termination

But consider:

```
fst :: (a, b) -> a
```

```
fst (x, y) = x
```

If we apply some f to $(0, \text{inf})$, then for call by value:

```
fst (0, inf)
```

```
fst (0, 1 + inf)
```

```
fst (0, 1 + (1 + inf))
```

```
fst (0, 1 + (1 + (1 + inf)))
```

```
...
```



Termination

But consider:

```
fst :: (a, b) -> a
```

```
fst (x, y) = x
```

If we apply some f to $(0, \text{inf})$, then for call by value:

```
fst (0, inf)
```

```
fst (0, 1 + inf)
```

```
fst (0, 1 + (1 + inf))
```

```
fst (0, 1 + (1 + (1 + inf)))
```

```
...
```

while for call by name:

```
fst (0, inf)
```

```
0
```




Number of reductions

```
square :: Int -> Int
square n = n * n
```

Call-by-value strategy:

```
square (1 + 2)
square 3
3 * 3
9
```



Number of reductions

```
square :: Int -> Int
square n = n * n
```

Call-by-name strategy:

```
square (1 + 2)
(1 + 2) * (1 + 2)
3 * (1 + 2)
3 * 3
9
```

Call-by-name may evaluate an argument more than once!



Number of reductions

Solution: pointers!

square (1 + 2)

p * p p -> (1 + 2)

p * p p -> 3

9

Sharing

call-by-name + sharing = *lazy evaluation*



Infinite structures

```
ones :: [Int]
ones = 1 : ones
```

evaluating ones:

```
ones
1 : ones
1 : (1 : ones)
1 : (1 : (1 : ones))
...
```

Now consider `head ones`:

```
head (x : _) = x
```

Call-by-value does not terminate. Call-by-name does!



Modular programming

Separation of *control* and *data*

Be careful:

```
filter (<= 6) [1..]
```

will not stop, while

```
takewhile (<= 6) [1..]
```

will!

```
primes :: [Integer]
```

```
primes = sieve [2..]
```

```
sieve :: [Int] -> [Int]
```

```
sieve (p:xs) = p : sieve [x | x <- xs, x `mod` p /= 0]
```



Strict application

```
f $! x
```

```
f $ x
```

`$!` enforces evaluation of **top-level** of `x` (WHNF)

```
square $! (1 + 2)
```

```
square $! 3
```

```
square 3
```

```
3 * 3
```

```
9
```



Strict application

We get three possibilities for two arguments of a curried function:

`(f $! x) y` `-- forces evaluation of x`

`(f x) $! y` `-- forces evaluation of y`

`(f $! x) $! y` `-- forces evaluation of both x and y`

Strict evaluation saves space (sometimes)



Strict vs. non-strict

- Property of the *semantics* of the language
- Related to *reductions* (evaluations) of expressions
 - top-down
 - bottom-up
- If something evaluates to *bottom* (an error or endless loop) then
 - strict languages will always find the bottom value
 - non-strict languages not need to!



Laziness

Property of an implementation!

Evaluate an expression only when its value is needed.

Common implementation technique for non-strict languages.

Not generally amenable to parallelisation.

Alternative: *lenient* (or optimistic) evaluation; somewhere between lazy and strict — more promising for parallelisation.



Normal forms

- NF (RNF) – normal form (reduced normal form)
- HNF – head normal form
- WHNF – weak head normal form


Describe the amount of evaluation performed:

- NF – evaluated
- WHNF – evaluated only up to the outermost constructor

Check <http://stackoverflow.com/questions/6872898/haskell-what-is-weak-head-normal-form>



Normal forms



/Taken from Haskell Wikibook/



Normal forms

Example:

```
replicate = \ n x -> case n of
  0 -> []
  n -> x : replicate (n - 1) x
```

Let us evaluate `replicate 3`

- WHNF: `x -> case 3 of 0 -> []; n -> x : replicate (n - 1) x`
- HNF: `x -> x : replicate (3 - 1) x`
- NF: `x -> x : x : x : []`



Laziness again

Haskell is not completely lazy!

E.g. pattern matching (a very common situation in any non-trivial piece of code) drives evaluation



Consequences of laziness

- purity (although there exist impure lazy languages, e.g., R)
- space leaks
- short-circuiting operators by default
- infinite data structures
- efficient pipelining
- dynamic programming “for free” (Assignment N2)



Space leaks (or foldl vs. foldl')

```

foldl (+) 0 (1:2:3:[])
  == foldl (+) (0 + 1)           (2:3:[])
  == foldl (+) ((0 + 1) + 2)    (3:[])
  == foldl (+) (((0 + 1) + 2) + 3) []
  ==                          (((0 + 1) + 2) + 3)
  
```

Thunks stored until needed.

How can we force evaluation?

`seq :: a -> b -> b`

```

foldl' f a [] = a
foldl' f a (x:xs) = let a' = f a x
                    in a' 'seq' foldl' f a' xs
  
```

or

```

foldl' f a (x:xs) = ((foldl' f) $! (f a x)) xs
  
```



Short-circuiting

- In strict languages: a special-case mechanism wired into language standards
- in lazy languages: the default

```
(&&) :: Bool -> Bool -> Bool
```

```
True  && x = x
```

```
False && _ = False
```