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.

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

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

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)	
instance Eq a => Eq (List a) w	vhere	
(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 variables (a, b, etc)	Type calsses
(a, b, etc)	i jpe caleece
	(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 <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'.)

Type variables - universally quantified

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

List

Lists are a commonly used data structure in functional languages, and are a good tool 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:[]**.

Polymorphic function example

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

Patterns in functions

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 <u>matched</u> against **actual parameters** in a fairly intuitive way

Matching patterns

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

[] only matches the empty list,

x:xs will successfully match any <u>list with at least one element</u>, 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 <u>returned</u> as the result of the application.

If it fails, the next equation is tried,

and if all equations fail, an error results.

Not all possible cases – runtime errors

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 <u>not</u> defined for all possible values of their argument. A **runtime error** occurs when these functions

are applied to an empty list.

General types

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

the type **[a]** is <u>more general</u> than **[Char]**.

type **[Char]** can be <u>derived</u> from **[a]** by a suitable <u>substitution</u> for **a**.

Principal type

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

- every well-typed expression is guaranteed to have a unique principal type (explained below),
- 2. the **principal type** can be <u>inferred</u> <u>automatically</u>.

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

Unique principal types

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

Explicitly Quantifying Type Variables

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

Hiding a type variable on the RHS

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>.

https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type

Type Variable Example – (1) error

Normally, any type variable appearing <u>on the right</u> must also appear <u>on the left</u>:

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

This is an **error**, since the **type b** of the **buffer** Is <u>not specified</u> on the <u>right</u> (**b** is a **type variable** rather than a **type**) but also is <u>not specified</u> 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}

https://wiki.haskell.org/Existential_type

Type Variable Example – (2) explicit type signature

However, suppose that a **Worker** can use any type **b** <u>so long as</u> it belongs to some <u>particular</u> **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

Type Variable Example – (3) existential type

Using 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.	
Explicit type signature :	
data Worker b x y = Worker {buffer :: b , input :: x , output :: y }	
foo :: (Buffer b) => Worker b Int Int	

Type Variable Example – (4) characteristics

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

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

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 <u>more specific</u> type into a <u>less specific</u> one.

constrained type variables

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'"
```

Existentials in terms of forall (1)

```
It is also possible to <u>express existentials</u> with RankNTypes
as type expressions <u>directly</u> (without a data declaration)
forall r. (forall a. Show a => a -> r) -> r
(the leading forall r. is optional
unless the expression is part of another expression).
the equivalent type Obj :
data Obj = forall a. (Show a) => Obj a
```

Existentials in terms of forall (2)

The conversions are:

```
fromObj :: Obj -> forall r. (forall a. Show a => a -> r) -> r
fromObj (Obj x) k = k x
```

```
toObj :: (forall r. (forall a. Show a => a -> r) -> r) -> Obj
toObj f = f Obj
```

Existentials

Existential types, or 'existentials' for short, are a way of 'squashing' <u>a group of types</u> into one, <u>single type</u>.

Existentials are part of GHC's type system extensions. They aren't part of Haskell98, and as such you'll have to either compile any code that contains them with an extra command-line parameter of **-XExistentialQuantification**, or put **{-# LANGUAGE ExistentialQuantification #-}** at the top of your sources that use existentials.

Example: A polymorphic function map :: (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b]

Example: Explicitly quantifying the type variables map :: forall a b. (a -> b) -> [a] -> [b]

instantiating the general type of map to a more specific type
a = Int and b = String
(Int -> String) -> [Int] -> [String]

Example: Two equivalent type statements

id :: a -> a

id :: forall a . a -> a

Suppose we have a group of values. We don't know if they are all the same type, but we do know they are all members of some class (and, by extension, that all the values have a certain property).

It might be useful to throw all these values into a list. We can't do this normally because lists elements <u>must</u> be of the same type (homogeneous with respect to types).

However, **existential types** allow us to <u>loosen</u> this requirement by defining a **type hider** or **type box**:

Heterogeneous list example

Example: Constructing a heterogeneous list data ShowBox = forall s. Show s => SB s heteroList :: [ShowBox]

heteroList = [SB (), SB 5, SB True]

calling the constructor on three values of <u>different types</u>, [SB (), SB 5, SB True], to place them all into a single list so we must somehow have the same type for each one.

Use the **forall** in the constructor

SB :: forall s. Show s => s -> ShowBox.

data ShowBox = forall s. Show s => SB s heteroList :: [ShowBox] heteroList = [SB (), SB 5, SB True]

If we were now writing a function

to which we intend to pass heteroList,

we <u>couldn't</u> apply a function such as not to the values inside the **SB** because their type might not be Bool.

But we do know something about each of the elements:

they can be converted to a string via show.

In fact, that's pretty much the only thing we know about them.

instance Show ShowBox where

show (SB s) = show s -- (*) see the comment in the text below

```
f :: [ShowBox] -> IO ()
f xs = mapM_ print xs
```

main = f heteroList

Example: Using our heterogeneous list instance Show ShowBox where show (SB s) = show s -- (*) see the comment in the text below f :: [ShowBox] -> IO () f xs = mapM_ print xs main = f heteroList Example: Types of the functions involved print :: Show s => s -> IO () -- print x = putStrLn (show x) mapM_ :: (a -> m b) -> [a] -> m () mapM_ print :: Show s => [s] -> IO ()

One way to think about forall is to consider **types** as <u>a set of possible **values**</u>.

Bool is the set {**True**, **False**, \bot } (remember that bottom, \bot , is a member of every type!),

Integer is the set of integers (and bottom),

String is the set of all possible strings (and bottom), and so on.

forall a. a

forall serves as a way to assert a **commonality** or **intersection** of the <u>specified types</u> (i.e. sets of values).

forall a. a is the intersection of <u>all types</u>.
This subset turns out to be the set {⊥},
since it is an implicit value in <u>every type</u>.
that is, [the type whose only available value is bottom]

However, since every Haskell type includes bottom, {⊥},
this quantification in fact stipulates <u>all Haskell types</u>.
But the <u>only permissible operations</u> on it are
those available to [a type whose only available value is bottom]



forall a. a

The list, **[forall a. a]**, is the **type of a list** whose **elements** all have the type **forall a. a**, i.e. **a list of bottoms**.

The list, [forall a. Show a => a], is the type of a list whose elements all have the type forall a. Show a => a. The Show class constraint requires the possible types to also be a member of the class, Show. However, \perp is still the only value common to all these types, so this too is <u>a list of bottoms</u>.

forall a. a

The list, [forall a. Num a => a], requires each element

to be <u>a member of the class</u>, Num.

Consequently, the possible values include

numeric literals, which have the specific type,

forall a. Num a => a, as well as bottom.

forall a. [a] is the type of the list whose elements all have the same type a.Since we cannot presume any particular type at all, this too is <u>a list of bottoms</u>.

We see that most **intersections over types** just lead to **bottoms** because **types** generally don't have **any values in common** and so presumptions cannot be made about a **union of their values**.

a heterogeneous list using a '**type hider**'.

This **'type hider**' **functions** as a **wrapper type** which guarantees certain facilities by implying a **predicate** or **constraint** on the permissible types.

the purpose of **forall** is to impose type constraint on the permissible types within a **type declaration** and thereby guaranteeing certain facilities with such types.

Example: An existential datatype

```
data T = forall a. MkT a
```

Example: This defines a polymorphic constructor, or a family of constructors for T

MkT :: forall a. (a -> T)

Example: Pattern matching on our existential constructor foo (MkT x) = ... -- what is the type of x?

Example: Constructing the hetereogeneous list heteroList = [MkT 5, MkT (), MkT True, MkT map]

```
Example: A new existential data type, with a class constraint

data T' = forall a. Show a => MkT' a

Example: Using our new heterogenous setup

heteroList' = [MkT' 5, MkT' (), MkT' True, MkT' "Sartre"]

main = mapM_ (\(MkT' x) -> print x) heteroList'

{- prints:

5

()

True

"Sartre"

-}
```

Example: The runST function runST :: forall a. (forall s. ST s a) -> a

Example: Bad ST code let v = runST (newSTRef True) in runST (readSTRef v)

Example: Briefer bad ST code ... runST (newSTRef True) ...

Example: The compiler's typechecking stage newSTRef True :: forall s. ST s (STRef s Bool) runST :: forall a. (forall s. ST s a) -> a together, (forall s. ST s (STRef s Bool)) -> STRef s Bool

Example: A type mismatch!

together, (forall s'. ST s' (STRef s' Bool)) -> STRef s Bool

Example: Identity function

id :: forall a. a -> a

id a = a

Example: Polymorphic value

x :: forall a. Num a => a

x = 0

Example: Existential type

```
data ShowBox = forall s. Show s => SB s
```

Example: Sum type

data ShowBox = SBUnit | SBInt Int | SBBool Bool | SBIntList [Int] | ...

```
{-# LANGUAGE ExistentialQuantification, RankNTypes #-}
```

```
newtype Pair a b = Pair (forall c. (a -> b -> c) -> c)
```

```
makePair :: a -> b -> Pair a b
```

```
makePair a b = Pair $ \f -> f a b
```

```
λ> :set -XExistentialQuantification
λ> :set -XRankNTypes
λ> newtype Pair a b = Pair {runPair :: forall c. (a -> b -> c) -> c}
λ> makePair a b = Pair $ \f -> f a b
λ> pair = makePair "a" 'b'
λ> :t pair
pair :: Pair [Char] Char
λ> runPair pair (\x y -> x)
"a"
```

λ> runPair pair (\x y -> y)

'b'

forall - quantifier

Quantifier in predicate calculus Type quantifier polymorphic types To encode a type in type isomorphism

forall - quantifier

bar :: forall a. ((a -> a) -> (Char, Bool))

If I call **bar**, I can simply pick any type a that I like, and I can pass it a function from type **a** to type **a**. For example, I can pass the function (+1) or the function reverse. You can think of the forall as saying "I get to pick the type now". (The technical word for picking the type is **instantiating**.)

forall - quantifier

foo :: (forall a. a -> a) -> (Char,Bool)

The restrictions on calling **foo** are much more stringent: the argument to **foo** must be a **polymorphic function**. With that type, the only functions I can pass to foo are **id** or a function that always diverges or errors, like **undefined**. The reason is that with **foo**, the **forall** is to the left of the arrow, so as the caller of **foo** I don't get to pick what a is rather it's the implementation of **foo** that gets to pick what **a** is. Because **forall** is to the left of the arrow, rather than above the arrow as in **bar**, the **instantiation** takes place in the **body** of the function

rather than at the **call** site.

Three different usages for forall

Basically, there are 3 different common uses for the forall keyword (or at least so it seems), and each has its own Haskell extension:

ScopedTypeVariables

specify types for code inside **where** clauses

RankNTypes/Rank2Types,

The type is labeled "Rank-N" where N is the number of **foralls** which are <u>nested</u> and <u>cannot</u> be <u>merged</u> with a previous one.

ExistentialQuantification

Scoped Type Variables

helps one specify types for code inside where clauses.

It makes the **b** in **val** :: **b** the same one as

the **b** in foob :: forall **a b**. (b -> b) -> b -> (a -> b) -> Maybe a -> b.

A confusing point:

when you <u>omit</u> the **forall** from a type it is actually still <u>implicitly</u> there. (normally these languages omit the **forall** from polymorphic types).

This claim is correct, but it refers to the other uses of **forall**, and not to the **ScopedTypeVariables** use.

Rank-N-Types (1)

Normal Haskell '98 types are considered **Rank-1 types**. A Haskell '98 type signature such as **a** -> **b** -> **a** implies that the type variables are **universally quantified** like so: forall **a b**. **a** -> **b** -> **a** forall can be floated out of the right-hand side of -> forall **a**. **a** -> (forall **b**. **b** -> **a**)

is also a **Rank-1 type** because it is <u>equivalent</u> to the previous signature.

Rank-N-Types (2)

However, a **forall** appearing within the **left-hand side** of (->) cannot be moved up, and therefore forms another level or rank.

The type is labeled "**Rank-N**" where N is the number of **foralls** which are nested and cannot be merged with a previous one. (forall a. a -> a) -> (forall b. b -> b)

is a Rank-2 type because the latter forall can be moved to the start but the former one cannot.

Therefore, there are two levels of universal quantification.

Rank-N-Types (3)

Rank-N type reconstruction is undecidable in general, and some explicit type annotations are required in their presence.

Rank-2 or Rank-N types may be specifically enabled by the language extensions {-# LANGUAGE Rank2Types #-} or {-# LANGUAGE RankNTypes #-}.

Rank-N-Types (4)

In order to unpack an existential type, you need a polymorphic function that works on any type that could be stored in the existential.

This leads to a natural relation between higher-rank types and existentials; and an encoding of existentials in terms of higher rank types in continuation-passing style.

Rank-N-Types

Let's start with that

mayb :: b -> (a -> b) -> Maybe a -> b

is equivalent to

mayb :: forall a b. b -> (a -> b) -> Maybe a -> b

except for when ScopedTypeVariables is enabled.

This means that it works for every **a** and **b**.

```
ghci> let putInList x = [x]
ghci> liftTup putInList (5, "Blah")
([5], ["Blah"])
```

```
the type of this liftTup?
```

```
liftTup :: (forall x. x -> f x) -> (a, b) -> (f a, f b)
```

Code 1:

. . .

```
ghci> let liftTup liftFunc (a, b) = (liftFunc a, liftFunc b)
ghci> liftTup (\x -> [x]) (5, "Hello")
No instance for (Num [Char])
```

```
ghci> :t liftTup
liftTup :: (t -> t1) -> (t, t) -> (t1, t1)
```

Code 2:

-- test.hs

liftTup :: (x -> f x) -> (a, b) -> (f a, f b)

```
liftTup liftFunc (t, v) = (liftFunc t, liftFunc v)
```

ghci> :l test.hs

...

Couldnt match expected type 'x' against inferred type 'b'

Hmm. so here GHC doesn't let us apply **liftFunc** on **v** because **v** :: **b** and **liftFunc** wants an **x**. We really want our function to get a function that accepts any possible x!

Code 2:

-- test.hs

liftTup :: (x -> f x) -> (a, b) -> (f a, f b)

```
liftTup liftFunc (t, v) = (liftFunc t, liftFunc v)
```

ghci> :l test.hs

...

Couldnt match expected type 'x' against inferred type 'b'

Hmm. so here GHC doesn't let us apply **liftFunc** on **v** because **v** :: **b** and **liftFunc** wants an **x**. We really want our function to get a function that accepts any possible x!

Code 3:

{-# LANGUAGE RankNTypes #-}
liftTup :: (forall x. x -> f x) -> (a, b) -> (f a, f b)
liftTup liftFunc (t, v) = (liftFunc t, liftFunc v)

So it's not liftTup that works for all x, it's the function that it gets that does.

RunST (1)

runST :: forall a. (forall s. ST s a) -> a

runST has to be able to produce a **value** of **type a**, no matter what **type** we give as **a**.

runST uses an argument of type forall s. ST s a which certainly must somehow produce the **a**.

runST must be able to produce a value of type a
no matter what type the implementation of runST decides to give as s.

RunST (2)

The benefit is that this puts a constraint on the caller of runST in that the type a cannot involve the type s at all. You can't pass it a value of type ST s [s], for example. What that means in practice is that the implementation of runST is free to perform mutation with the value of type s. The type guarantees that this mutation is local to the implementation of runST.

RunST (3)

The type of runST is an example of a rank-2 polymorphic type because the type of its argument contains a forall quantifier. The type of foo above is also of rank 2. An ordinary polymorphic type, like that of bar, is rank-1, but it becomes rank-2 if the types of arguments are required to be polymorphic, with their own forall quantifier. And if a function takes rank-2 arguments then its type is rank-3, and so on. In general, a type that takes polymorphic arguments of rank n has rank n + 1.

Existential Quantifiation

-- test.hs

```
{-# LANGUAGE ExistentialQuantification #-}
```

data EQList = forall a. EQList [a]

eqListLen :: EQList -> Int

```
eqListLen (EQList x) = length x
```

```
ghci> :I test.hs
ghci> eqListLen $ EQList ["Hello", "World"]
```

2

RunST (4)

foo :: (forall a. a -> a) -> (Char,Bool) bar :: forall a. ((a -> a) -> (Char, Bool))

If I call bar, I can simply pick any type a that I like, and I can pass it a function from type a to type a. For example, I can pass the function (+1) or the function reverse. You can think of the forall as saying "I get to pick the type now". (The technical word for picking the type is instantiating.)

RunST (4)

The restrictions on calling foo are much more stringent: the argument to foo must be a polymorphic function. With that type, the only functions I can pass to foo are id or a function that always diverges or errors, like undefined. The reason is that with foo, the forall is to the left of the arrow, so as the caller of foo I don't get to pick what a is rather it's the implementation of foo that gets to pick what a is. Because forall is to the left of the arrow, rather than above the arrow as in bar, the instantiation takes place in the body of the function rather than at the call site.

Existential Quantifiation

ghci> :set -XRankNTypes
ghci> length (["Hello", "World"] :: forall a. [a])
Couldnt match expected type 'a' against inferred type '[Char]'
...
With Rank-N-Types, forall a meant that your expression
must fit all possible as. For example:
ghci> length ([] :: forall a. [a])
0

References

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