# Typeclasses for Kotlin

Alexander Kuklev 01,2 (a@kuklev.com)

## 1 Interfaces and typeclasses

In object-oriented programming, interfaces serve as contracts that define a set of member functions that a class must implement. It works well if we only need functions that require only one argument of the said type. Whenever we need a binary operator on a type, we do this:

```
public interface Comparable<in T> {
   public operator fun compareTo(other : T) : Ternary
}
class String : Comparable<String> { ... }
```

We use somewhat problematic recursive inheritance for mimicking self types and represent highly symmetric binary operators (such as x + y and x = y) asymmetrically as methods of the left operand. Moreover, there is no way to express that List<T> implements Comparable whenever T does or to abstract the map function for collections. Typeclasses solve these issues:

```
data class Comparable<this T>(val compare : (T, T)-> Ternary)
class String {
    ...
    companion object : Comparable { x, y -> ... }
}
```

Here Comparable is not an ancestor of String itself but of its companion object. Instead of ugly a.compareTo(b), we have a nice symmetric String.compare(a, b). We use the this to mark the "self type" parameter of Comparable to be able to write

```
fun <T : Comparable> List<T>.sorted() : List<T>
```

as if it were an ancestor of the type T itself rather than a requirement for T to have a companion object (also called T) extending Comparable<T>. Such definitions are called structure-polymorphic.

Using this machinery we can express alternative instances and "conditional inheritance":

class Functorial<self F : out \* -> \*> {
 fun <T, R> F<T>.map(transform : (T)-> R) : F<R>
 contracts { ... }

```
}
class List<T> : Functorial { ... }
```

Kotlin's approach to operators has to be adjusted accordingly, so operators can be placed inside companion objects, e.g. Int.plus(a, b) instead of a.plus(b).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Radboud University Nijmegen, Software Science <sup>2</sup>JetBrains Research

### 2 Call-site field renaming and fake type members

Type classes are perfectly suited to express mathematical structures, e.g.

For better syntactical support of mathematical structures, we can allow renaming their fields on the call site:

```
fun <M : Monoid(::plus)> foo(m : M) = m + m
fun <M : Monoid(::times)> bar(m : M) = m * m
```

Some mathematical structures involve more than one type, in which case the fake type member notation is highly convenient:

```
fun <C : Category> baz(x : C.0b, f : C.Mor) // same as: fun <0b, Mor : MorIn<0b>> baz(C : Category<0b, Mor>, x : 0b, f : Mor)
```

### 3 Using this as field a modifier

Kotlin supports implementing interfaces by delegation class Foo: Bar by baz. In some cases, we want to implement an interface Bar by delegating to constructor parameter val baz: Bar.

Similar to its usage in type parameters, we can enable this as a field modifier for this purpose:

This way, RetractibleFunction<X, Y> implements the interface  $(X) \rightarrow Y$  by delegating to invoke.

#### 4 Conclusion and outlook

We should assess and thoroughly discuss with Ross Tate how type classes compare to shape interfaces, how they interact with type inference/out ference and whether they can introduce type checking undecideability or any other kind of problems.