Monad P3 : Existential Types (1C)

1

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.

This document was produced by using LibreOffice.

2

Haskell in 5 steps

https://wiki.haskell.org/Haskell_in_5_steps

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 <u>type</u> truly does <u>**not**</u> **matter**

(Eq a) => Type class Ad hoc polymorphism

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

Quantification

parametric polymorphism is useful in defining <u>families of types</u> by universally quantifying over <u>all types</u> .	elem :: <mark>a</mark> -> [<mark>a</mark>] -> Bool
Sometimes, however, it is necessary to <u>quantify</u> over some <u>smaller set of types</u> , eg. those types whose elements can be compared for equality. ad hoc polymorphism	elem :: (Eq a) => a -> [a] -> Bool

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 <u>constrained set of types</u>	
the parametric polymorphism can be viewed as a kind of overloading too!	
parametric polymorphism an overloading occurs <u>implicitly</u> over all types	elem :: <mark>a</mark> -> [a] ->
ad hoc polymorphism a type class for a <u>constrained set of types</u>	elem :: (Eq a) => a

Bool

a -> [a] -> Bool

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

Parametric polymorphism (1) definition

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

elem :: a -> [a] -> Bool

Parametric polymorphism (2) unconstrained type variable

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

elem :: a -> [a] -> Bool

Parametric polymorphism (3) examples

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.

Parametric polymorphism (4) multiple appearance

Note, however, that if a single **type variable** appears <u>multiple times</u>, it must take <u>the same type</u> 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.

id :: a -> a map :: (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b]

Parametric polymorphism (5) parametricity

Since a parametrically polymorphic value does <u>not</u> "<u>know</u>" anything about the **unconstrained type variables**, it must <u>behave the same regardless of its type</u>.

This is a somewhat limiting but extremely useful property known as **parametricity** id :: a -> a map :: (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b]

Ad hoc polymorphism (1)

Ad-hoc polymorphism refers to

when a **value** is able to adopt any one of <u>several **types**</u> because it, or a value it uses, has been given a <u>separate definition</u> for each of <u>those **types**</u>.

the **+ operator** essentially does something entirely different when applied to <u>floating-point values</u> as compared to when applied to <u>integers</u> elem :: (Eq a) => a -> [a] -> Bool

Ad hoc polymorphism (2)

in languages like C, **polymorphism** 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 <u>disambiguated</u> by the **types** of the **arguments**

In Haskell, this is achieved via the system of **type classes** and **class instances**.

Ad hoc polymorphism (3)

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

They have more in common with **interfaces**, in that they <u>specify</u> a series of **methods** or **values** by their **type signature**, to be <u>implemented</u> by an **instance declaration**. class Eq a where (==) :: a -> a -> Bool

instance Eq Integer where

x == y = x `integerEq` y

instance Eq Float where x == y = x `floatEq` y

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 **== 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. class Eq a where (==) :: a -> a -> Bool

instance Eq Integer where

x == y = x `integerEq` y

instance Eq Float where x == y = x `floatEq` y

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, as a Char, it will have value '\NUL' as an Int it might be -2147483648

Ad hoc polymorphism (6)

Haskell even allows **class instances** to be <u>defined</u> 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.

Ad hoc polymorphism (7)

data List a = Nil Cons a (List a	a)	
instance Eq a => Eq (List a) wh	nere	
(Cons a b) == (Cons c d)	=	(a == c) && (b == d)
Nil == Nil	=	True
==	=	False

https://stackoverflow.com/questions/30520219/how-to-define-eq-instance-of-list-without-gadts-or-datatype-contexts

Ad hoc polymorphism (8)

You can recognise the presence of **ad-hoc polymorphism** by looking for **constrained type variables**: that is, variables that appear <u>to the left of =></u>, 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**.

Parametric and ad hoc polymorphism

Type variablesType calsses(a, b, etc)(Eq, Num, etc)UniversalExistential?Compile timeRuntime (also)
(a, b, etc)(Eq, Num, etc)UniversalExistential?Compile timeRuntime (also)
UniversalExistential?Compile timeRuntime (also)
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

types that are <u>universally quantified</u> in some way <u>over all types</u>. **polymorphic type expressions** essentially describe <u>families of types</u>.

For example, **(forall a) [a]** is the <u>family of types</u> 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 <u>not</u> a valid example, since there is *no single type* that contains both 2 and 'b'.)

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

since Haskell has <u>only universally quantified</u> **types**, there is no need to <u>explicitly</u> 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

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 <u>right associative</u>, we can also write this list as **1:2:3:[]**.

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]].

length:: [a] -> Integerlength []= 0length (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

length:: [a] -> Integerlength []= 0length (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.

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.

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

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

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.

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

For example, the principal type of head is **[a]->a**; **[b]->a**, **a->a**, or even **a** are correct types, but too general, whereas something like **[Integer]->Integer** is too specific. The existence of <u>unique</u> **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.

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 <u>general</u> type of **map** to a more <u>specific</u> type.

https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Haskell/Existentially_quantified_types

Implicit forall

any introduction of a **lowercase type parameter** <u>implicitly</u> begins with a **forall** keyword,

Example: Two equivalent type statements

id :: a -> a

id :: forall a . a -> a

We can apply <u>additional</u> **constraints** on the quantified **type variables**

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 <u>hide</u> a **type variable** on the <u>right-hand side</u>.

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 <u>right</u> (it's a type variable rather than a type) but also isn't specified on the <u>left</u> (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**}

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:

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 <u>not appear</u> in the **Worker** type at all.

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

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 <u>no idea</u>

what **type** the buffer function <u>returns</u>,

you are more limited in what you can do to it.

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!

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!

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'"
```

References

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