

# Monad P3 : Existential Types (1C)

---

Copyright (c) 2016 - 2020 Young W. Lim.

Permission is granted to copy, distribute and/or modify this document under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License, Version 1.2 or any later version published by the Free Software Foundation; with no Invariant Sections, no Front-Cover Texts, and no Back-Cover Texts. A copy of the license is included in the section entitled "GNU Free Documentation License".

Please send corrections (or suggestions) to [youngwlim@hotmail.com](mailto:youngwlim@hotmail.com).

This document was produced by using LibreOffice.

# Based on

---

Haskell in 5 steps

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Haskell\\_in\\_5\\_steps](https://wiki.haskell.org/Haskell_in_5_steps)

# Ad hoc polymorphism (overloading)

The **literals** **1**, **2**, etc. are often used to represent both fixed and arbitrary precision integers.

**Numeric operators** such as **+** are often defined to work on many different kinds of numbers.

the **equality operator** (**==** in Haskell) usually works on numbers and many other (but not all) types.

the **overloaded behaviors** are

different for each type

in fact sometimes **undefined**, or **error**

**type classes** provide a **structured way** to control **ad hoc polymorphism**, or **overloading**.

In the **parametric polymorphism**  
the type truly does **not matter**

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/classes.html>

# Type class and polymorphism

**parametric polymorphism** is useful in  
defining families of types  
by **universally quantifying** over all types.

Sometimes, however, it is necessary  
to quantify over some smaller set of types,  
eg. those types whose elements can be compared for equality.

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/classes.html>

# Type class and parametric polymorphism

**type classes** can be seen as providing a **structured way**  
to **quantify** over a constrained set of types

the **parametric polymorphism** can be viewed  
as a kind of **overloading** too!

**ad hoc polymorphism**

an **overloading** occurs implicitly over all types

**parametric polymorphism**

a **type class** for a constrained set of types

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/classes.html>

# Parametric polymorphism

Parametric polymorphism refers to when the type of a value contains one or more (unconstrained) type variables, so that the value may adopt any type that results from substituting those variables with concrete types.

In Haskell, this means any type in which a type variable, denoted by a name in a type beginning with a lowercase letter, appears without constraints (i.e. does not appear to the left of a  $\Rightarrow$ ). In Java and some similar languages, generics (roughly speaking) fill this role.

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>

# Parametric polymorphism

For example, the function `id :: a -> a` contains an unconstrained type variable `a` in its type, and so can be used in a context requiring `Char -> Char` or `Integer -> Integer` or `(Bool -> Maybe Bool) -> (Bool -> Maybe Bool)` or any of a literally infinite list of other possibilities. Likewise, the empty list `[] :: [a]` belongs to every list type, and the polymorphic function `map :: (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b]` may operate on any function type.

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>



# Parametric polymorphism

Note, however, that if a single type variable appears multiple times, it must take the same type everywhere it appears, so e.g. the result type of `id` must be the same as the argument type, and the input and output types of the function given to `map` must match up with the list types.

Since a parametrically polymorphic value does not "know" anything about the unconstrained type variables, it must behave the same regardless of its type. This is a somewhat limiting but extremely useful property known as parametricity

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>

# Ad hoc polymorphism (1)

Ad-hoc polymorphism refers to when a value is able to adopt any one of several types because it, or a value it uses, has been given a separate definition for each of those types.

the + operator essentially does something entirely different when applied to floating-point values as compared to when applied to integers

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>

# Ad hoc polymorphism (2)

in languages like C it is restricted to only built-in functions and types. Other languages like C++ allow programmers to provide their own overloading, supplying multiple definitions of a single function, to be disambiguated by the types of the arguments. In Haskell, this is achieved via the system of type classes and class instances.

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>

# Ad hoc polymorphism (3)

Despite the similarity of the name, Haskell's type classes are quite different from the classes of most object-oriented languages.

They have more in common with interfaces, in that they specify a series of methods or values by their type signature, to be implemented by an instance declaration.

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>

# Ad hoc polymorphism (4)

So, for example, if my type can be compared for equality (most types can, but some, particularly function types, cannot) then I can give an instance declaration of the Eq class.

All I have to do is specify the behaviour of the == operator on my type, and I gain the ability to use all sorts of functions defined using that operator, e.g.  
checking if a value of my type is present in a list,  
or looking up a corresponding value in a list of pairs.

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>

# Ad hoc polymorphism (5)

Unlike the overloading in some languages, overloading in Haskell is not limited to functions

- minBound is an example of an overloaded value, so that when used as a Char it will have value '\NUL' while as an Int it might be -2147483648.

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>

# Ad hoc polymorphism (6)

Haskell even allows class instances to be defined for types which are themselves polymorphic (either ad-hoc or parametrically). So for example, an instance can be defined of Eq that says "if a has an equality operation, then [a] has one".

Then, of course, [[a]] will automatically also have an instance, and so complex compound types can have instances built for them out of the instances of their components.

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>

# Ad hoc polymorphism (7)

You can recognise the presence of ad-hoc polymorphism by looking for constrained type variables: that is, variables that appear to the left of  $\Rightarrow$ , like in `elem :: (Eq a) => a -> [a] -> Bool`.

Note that `lookup :: (Eq a) => a -> [(a,b)] -> Maybe b` exhibits both parametric (in `b`) and ad-hoc (in `a`) polymorphism.

<https://wiki.haskell.org/Polymorphism>



# Type class and parametric polymorphism

Parametric polymorphism	ad hoc polymorphism
Type variables (a, b, etc)	Type classes (Eq, Num, etc)
Universal	Existential?
Compile time	Runtime (also)
C++ templates	Classical
Java generics	(ordinary OO)

<http://sm-haskell-users-group.github.io/pdfs/Ben%20Deane%20-%20Parametric%20Polymorphism.pdf>

# Polymorphic data types and functions

```
data Maybe a = Nothing | Just a
data List a = Nil | Cons a (List a)
data Either a b = Left a | Right b
```

```
reverse :: [a] -> [a]
```

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

```
id :: a -> a
```

<http://sm-haskell-users-group.github.io/pdfs/Ben%20Deane%20-%20Parametric%20Polymorphism.pdf>

# Polymorphic Types

**types** that are universally quantified in some way over all types.

**polymorphic type expressions** essentially describe families of types.

For example, **(forall a) [a]** is the family of types consisting of, for every **type a**, the **type of lists of a**.

- lists of integers (e.g. **[1,2,3]**),
- lists of characters (**['a','b','c']**),
- even lists of lists of integers, etc.,

(Note, however, that **[2,'b']** is not a valid example, since there is *no single type* that contains both 2 and 'b'.)

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>

# Polymorphic Types

**Identifiers** such as **a** above are called **type variables**, and are uncapitalized to distinguish them from specific types such as **Int**.

since Haskell has only universally quantified types, there is no need to explicitly write out the symbol for **universal quantification**, and thus we simply write **[a]** in the example above.

In other words, all **type variables** are implicitly universally quantified

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>

# Polymorphic Types

**Lists** are a commonly used data structure in functional languages, and are a good vehicle for explaining the principles of polymorphism.

The list `[1,2,3]` in Haskell is actually shorthand for the list `1:(2:(3:[]))`, where `[]` is the **empty list** and `:` is the **infix operator** that adds its first argument to the front of its second argument (a list).

Since `:` is right associative, we can also write this list as `1:2:3:[]`.

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>

# Polymorphic Types

```
length      :: [a] -> Integer
length []   = 0
length (x:xs) = 1 + length xs

length [1,2,3] => 3
length ['a','b','c'] => 3
length [[1],[2],[3]] => 3
```

an example of a polymorphic function.

It can be applied to a list containing elements of any type,  
for example `[Integer]`, `[Char]`, or `[[Integer]]`.

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>

# Polymorphic Types

```
length      :: [a] -> Integer
length []   = 0
length (x:xs) = 1 + length xs
```

The left-hand sides of the equations contain patterns such as `[]` and `x:xs`.

In a function application these patterns are matched against actual parameters in a fairly intuitive way

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>

# Polymorphic Types

```
length      :: [a] -> Integer
length []   = 0
length (x:xs) = 1 + length xs
```

[] only matches the empty list,  
x:xs will successfully match any list with at least one element,  
binding x to the first element and xs to the rest of the list

If the match succeeds,  
the right-hand side is evaluated  
and returned as the result of the application.

If it fails, the next equation is tried,  
and if all equations fail, an error results.

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>



# Polymorphic Types

Function head returns the first element of a list,  
function tail returns all but the first.

**head**                :: [a] -> a

**head (x:xs)**        = x

**tail**                :: [a] -> [a]

**tail (x:xs)**        = xs

Unlike length, these functions are not defined  
for all possible values of their argument.

A runtime error occurs when these functions  
are applied to an empty list.

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>

# Polymorphic Types

With polymorphic types, we find that some types are in a sense strictly more general than others in the sense that the set of values they define is larger.

For example, the type **[a]** is more general than **[Char]**. In other words, the latter type can be derived from the former by a suitable substitution for **a**.

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>

# Polymorphic Types

With regard to this **generalization ordering**,  
Haskell's type system possesses two important properties:

First, every well-typed expression is guaranteed  
to have a **unique principal type** (explained below),

and second, the **principal type** can be inferred automatically.

In comparison to a monomorphically typed language such as C,  
the reader will find that polymorphism improves expressiveness,  
and **type inference** lessens the burden of types on the programmer.

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>

# Polymorphic Types

An expression's or function's **principal type** is the least general type that, intuitively, "contains all instances of the expression".

For example, the principal type of head is  $[a] \rightarrow a$ ;  $[b] \rightarrow a$ ,  $a \rightarrow a$ , or even  $a$  are correct types, but too general, whereas something like  $[\text{Integer}] \rightarrow \text{Integer}$  is too specific.

The existence of unique principal types is the hallmark feature of the **Hindley-Milner type system**, which forms the basis of the type systems of Haskell, ML, Miranda, ("Miranda" is a trademark of Research Software, Ltd.) and several other (mostly functional) languages.

<https://www.haskell.org/tutorial/goodies.html>

# Explicitly Quantifying Type Variables

to explicitly bring fresh **type variables** into **scope**.

Example: **Explicitly quantifying** the **type variables**

**map** :: forall a b. (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b]

for any combination of types **a** and **b**

choose **a = Int** and **b = String**

then it's valid to say that map has the type

**(Int -> String) -> [Int] -> [String]**

Here we are **instantiating** the general type of **map**  
to a more specific type.

[https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Haskell/Existentially\\_quantified\\_types](https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Haskell/Existentially_quantified_types)

# Implicit forall

any introduction of a **lowercase type parameter** implicitly begins with a **forall** keyword,

Example: Two equivalent type statements

```
id :: a -> a
```

```
id :: forall a . a -> a
```

We can apply additional constraints on the quantified **type variables**

[https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Haskell/Existentially\\_quantified\\_types](https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Haskell/Existentially_quantified_types)

# Existential Types

Normally when creating a new type using **type**, **newtype**, **data**, etc., every **type variable** that appears on the right-hand side must also appear on the left-hand side.

```
newtype ST s a = ST (State# s -> (# State# s, a #))
```

**Existential types** are a way of escaping

Existential types can be used for several different purposes. But what they do is to **hide** a **type variable** on the right-hand side.

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential\\_type](https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type)

# Type Variable Example – (1) error

Normally, any type variable appearing on the right must also appear on the left:

```
data Worker x y = Worker {buffer :: b, input :: x, output :: y}
```

This is an **error**, since the **type** of the **buffer** isn't specified on the right (it's a type variable rather than a type) but also isn't specified on the left (there's no **'b'** in the left part).

In Haskell98, you would have to write

```
data Worker b x y = Worker {buffer :: b, input :: x, output :: y}
```

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential\\_type](https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type)



# Type Variable Example – (2) explicit type signature

However, suppose that a **Worker** can use any type 'b' so long as it belongs to some particular class.

Then every **function** that uses a Worker will have a type like

```
foo :: (Buffer b) => Worker b Int Int
```

In particular, failing to write an **explicit type signature** `(Buffer b)` will invoke the dreaded monomorphism restriction.

Using **existential types**, we can avoid this:

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential\\_type](https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type)

# Type Variable Example – (3) existential type

```
data Worker x y = forall b. Buffer b =>
    Worker {buffer :: b, input :: x, output :: y}
```

```
foo :: Worker Int Int
```

The **type** of the **buffer** (**Buffer**) now does not appear in the **Worker** type at all.

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential\\_type](https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type)

# Type Variable Example – (4) characteristics

```
data Worker x y = forall b. Buffer b =>
    Worker {buffer :: b, input :: x, output :: y}
foo :: Worker Int Int
```

- it is now impossible for a function to demand a **Worker** having a specific type of **buffer**.
- the **type** of **foo** can now be derived automatically without needing an explicit type signature.  
(No monomorphism restriction.)

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential\\_type](https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type)

# Type Variable Example – (4) characteristics

```
data Worker x y = forall b. Buffer b =>  
    Worker {buffer :: b, input :: x, output :: y}  
foo :: Worker Int Int
```

- since code now has no idea  
what **type** the buffer function returns,  
you are more limited in what you can do to it.

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential\\_type](https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type)

# Hiding a type

In general, when you use a **'hidden'** type in this way, you will usually want that **type** to belong to a **specific class**, or you will want to **pass some functions** along that can work on that type.

Otherwise you'll have some value belonging to a **random unknown type**, and you won't be able to do anything to it!

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential\\_type](https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type)

# Conversion to less a specific type

Note: You can use **existential types** to **convert a more specific type** into a **less specific one**.

There is no way to perform the reverse conversion!

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential\\_type](https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type)

# A heterogeneous list example

This illustrates **creating a heterogeneous list**,  
all of whose members implement "**Show**",  
and progressing through that list to show these items:

```
data Obj = forall a. (Show a) => Obj a
```

```
xs :: [Obj]
```

```
xs = [Obj 1, Obj "foo", Obj 'c']
```

```
doShow :: [Obj] -> String
```

```
doShow [] = ""
```

```
doShow ((Obj x):xs) = show x ++ doShow xs
```

With output: `doShow xs ==> "1\"foo\"'c'"`

[https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential\\_type](https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type)

---

## References

- [1] <ftp://ftp.geoinfo.tuwien.ac.at/navratil/HaskellTutorial.pdf>
- [2] <https://www.umiacs.umd.edu/~hal/docs/daume02yaht.pdf>