Software System Design and Implementation

Existentially Quantified Types

Gabriele Keller

The University of New South Wales
School of Computer Science and Engineering
Sydney, Australia



```
data Tree a
     Leaf
     Branch a (Tree a) (Tree a)
the type variable a is in scope here
```



we can only use type variables which are in scope

```
data Tree a
= Leaf
| Branch b (Tree b) (Tree b)
```

```
Not in scope: type variable 'b'
```



but we don't *have* to use them (phantom types):



With GADT notation:

```
data Tree a where
Leaf :: Tree a
Branch :: a -> Tree a -> Tree a
```

which is equivalent to:

```
data Tree a where
Leaf :: Tree a
Branch :: b -> Tree b -> Tree b
```



Type variables are implicitly ∀-quantified:

```
data Tree a where

Leaf :: forall a. Tree a

Branch :: forall a. a -> Tree a -> Tree a
```

```
data Tree a where
Leaf :: forall a. Tree a
Branch :: forall b. b -> Tree b -> Tree b
```



Type variables don't have to appear in the result

```
data M where
MC :: a -> M
```

```
data M where
MC :: forall a. a -> M
```

or in non-GADT notation (needs language extension enabled)

```
data M = forall a. MC a
```



```
data M where
MC :: a -> M
```

We can define a list of values of type M:

```
xs :: [M]
xs = [MC 5, MC True, MC "Why??"]
```

```
unpackM :: unpackM (MC
```

```
Couldn't match expected type 't' with actual type 'a'
because type variable 'a' would escape its scope

This (rigid, skolem) type variable is bound by
a pattern with constructor

MC :: forall a. a -> M,
in an equation for 'unpackM'
```

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES Y D N E Y • A U S T R A L I A

Existential Types

So, what is the actual type of unpackM?

```
unpackM :: M -> a
```

 Recall that type variables in Haskell are implicitly ∀-quantified, so the above type is the same as

```
unpackM :: forall a. M -> a
```

• But the real type of unpackM is (which can't be expressed in Haskell):

```
unpackM :: ∃a. M -> a
```

This is why these types are called 'existential types'

```
{-# LANGUAGE ExistentialQuantification #-}
data M = forall a. MC a
```



Existential Types

```
data N where
NC :: Show a => a -> N
```

```
data P where
PC :: (a -> String) -> a -> P
```

```
showNs :: [N] -> [String]
showNs ns = map show' ns
  where
  show' (NC x) = show x
```

```
showPs :: [P] \rightarrow [String]
showPs ps = map (\(PC f p) \rightarrow f p) ps
```



Example: Shapes

· Haskell:

```
data Shape
  = Circle ...
    Rectangle ...
    Square ...
perimeter :: Shape -> Double
perimeter (Circle ...) =
perimeter (Rectangle ...) =
area :: Shape -> Double
```

easy to add new functions on the Shape type, less so to add more variants



Example: Shapes

- In OO-languages
 - class Shape
 - · Circle, Rectangle, Square extend the class
 - easy to add new variants, less so to add more functions
- Use classes and overloading to model this in Haskell?

```
class Shape a where
  perimeter :: a -> Double
  area :: a -> Double

data Circle = Circle ...

instance Shape Circle where
  perimeter (Circle ...) = ...
  area (Circle ...) = ...
```



Rank-n polymorphism

- Write a function which, given
 - a polymorphic list constructor function a -> [a]
 - and two values of possibly different types
 - applies this function to both values and returns the lists
- Is this function type correct?

```
foo f a b = (f a, f b)
```

 Problem: we can write polymorphic functions in vanilla Haskell, but we can express the fact that we want a polymorphic function as argument



Rank-n polymorphism

- **Problem:** we can write polymorphic functions in vanilla Haskell, but we can't express the fact that we want a polymorphic function as argument
- Again, this is a scoping issue:

versus



Rank-n polymorphism

Rank-n polymorphism makes this possible

rank-2 polymorphic function

 Rank-n polymorphism can be used to control what information a function has access to



Remember the ST monad?

```
newSTRef :: a -> ST s (STRef s a)
readSTRef :: STRef s a -> ST s a
writeSTRef :: STRef s a -> a -> ST s ()
runST :: (forall s. ST s a) -> a
```



Existential Types and Rank-n types

VS

Note the difference:

```
data M where
MC :: a -> M
```

```
data M where
MC :: forall a. a -> M
```

```
data M = forall a. MC a
```

```
data M where
MC :: (forall a.a) -> M
```

data M = MC (forall a. a)



Error Handling

- Two types of errors:
 - Fatal errors: indicates serious problems that an application should not try to catch, as it requires external fix: program bug, stack overflow...
 - Non-fatal errors: conditions that an application should catch and handle.
- Further distinction
 - Synchronous errors:
 - raised as a direct consequence by the program itself
 - Asynchronous errors:
 - timeouts, user interrupt, resource exhaustion



Asynchronous error handling

- Asynchronous errors can happen at any time
- Can't (in general) be prevented from occurring by checks in the program
- Sometimes necessary to mask such exceptions to ensure proper clean-up



Synchronous error handling

 If a function can trigger a non-fatal error, it should in general be reflected in the type:

```
read :: Read a => String -> a
readMaybe :: Read a => String -> Maybe a
```

- If the function has to be partial for some reason, raise an appropriate error, don't just leave the patterns incomplete
- Compiler can detect incomplete patterns

-fwarn-incomplete-patterns



Synchronous error handling

- How errors are handled depends on programming language:
 - programming language support?
 - possible to throw exceptions?
 - exceptions declared in the type of a function/method?
 - handling statically enforced?

