

Existential Types

Sijmen van Bommel & Quinten Kock
based on Types and Programming Languages
(Pierce 2002)

Recap: Universal types

- Polymorphism
- $\forall X.T$: value has type $T[X:=S]$ for any type S
- type S is abstract: only known after specialization
- $\text{id} = \lambda X. \lambda x:X. x$: $\forall X. X \rightarrow X$
- erases to untyped $\lambda x. x$
- specializes to $\lambda x:S. x : S \rightarrow S$

Existential types

- $\{\exists X, T\}$: value has type $T[X:=S]$ for **some** type X
- value can be seen as pair $\{*S, t\}$: a type S and a term $t : T[X:=S]$
- type S is hidden: only visible in the definition of t

Type abstraction

Different hidden types, same existential type

$\rho : \{ \exists X, \{ a:X, f:X \rightarrow \text{Nat} \} \}$

A. $\rho = \{ * \text{Nat}, \{ a=0, f=\lambda x:\text{Nat}. x \} \}$

B. $\rho = \{ * \text{Bool}, \{ a=\text{False}, f=\lambda x:\text{Bool}. \text{if } x \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0 \} \}$

Type ambiguity

Same value, different existential type

$p = \{*\text{Nat}, \{v=0, f=\lambda x:\text{Nat}. \text{succ}(x)\}\}$

- A. $p : \{\exists X, \{v:X, f:X \rightarrow X\}\}$
- B. $p : \{\exists X, \{v:X, f:X \rightarrow \text{Nat}\}\}$
- C. $p : \{\exists X, \{v:X, f:\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}\}\}$
- D. $p : \{\exists X, \{v:\text{Nat}, f:\text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}\}\}$

Packing

packing a value can be done using **as**

$\{*T, t\}$ as U

where T is some type
t is a term/value
U is an existential type

Examples:

- $\{*\text{Nat}, 42\}$ as $\{\exists X, X\}$
- $\{*\text{Bool}, \text{true}\}$ as $\{\exists X, X\}$

Unpacking

Unpacking can be done using **let ... = ... in ...**

let {X,x} = p in v

where p is an existentially typed value

X becomes a type

x becomes a term/value

v is a term/value that may contain x

example:

p = {*Nat, {a: 42, get: λn:Nat.n} as {∃ X, {X, X -> Nat}}}

let {X,x} = p in x.get(x.a)

evaluates to?

Illegal unpacking

$p = \{*\text{Nat}, \{a: 42, \text{get}: \lambda n:\text{Nat}.n\}\} \text{ as } \{\exists X, \{X, X \rightarrow \text{Nat}\}\}$

let $\{X,x\} = p$ in $\text{succ}(x.a)$

argument of succ is X , not a number

let $\{X,x\} = p$ in $x.a$

type X escapes scope

Syntax

terms: ...

| $\{ *T, t \}$ as U

packing

| let $\{ X, x \} = p$ in v

unpacking

values: ...

| $\{ *T, v \}$ as U

package value

types: ...

| $\{ \exists X, T \}$

existential type

Evaluation rules

$\text{let } \{X,x\} = (\{*T,t\} \text{ as } U) \text{ in } e \rightarrow e[X := T, x := t]$ E-UnpackPack

$$\frac{t1 \rightarrow t2}{\{*T, t1\} \text{ as } U \rightarrow \{*T, t2\} \text{ as } U}$$

E-Pack

$$\frac{t1 \rightarrow t2}{\text{let } \{X,x\} = t1 \text{ in } e \rightarrow \text{let } \{X,x\} = t2 \text{ in } e}$$

E-Unpack

Typing rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : T[X := U]}{\Gamma \vdash \{ *U, t \} \text{ as } \{ \exists X, T \} : \{ \exists X, T \}}$$

T-Pack

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t1 : \{ \exists X, T \} \quad \Gamma, X, x : T \vdash y : Y}{\Gamma \vdash \text{let } \{ X, x \} = t1 \text{ in } y : Y}$$

T-Unpack

Abstract Data Types (ADTs)

- Existential types hide actual representation
- Useful for enforcing abstraction boundaries

```
let {X,x}=p in (λy:X. x.f y) x.a
```

- `x.f` and `x.a` are values from `p`.
- `X` is abstract for `Nat`, but:

```
let {X,x}=p in succ(x.a)
```

- is forbidden! We are not allowed to use values of type `X` as `Nat` outside of `p`.
- ADTs are like modules:
 - `let {X,x}=p ↔ import p`

ADT examples

- Counter

- `counterADT = { *Nat, {new=0, get= $\lambda i:\text{Nat}. i$, inc= $\lambda i:\text{Nat}. \text{succ}(i)$ }}`
as `{ $\exists C$, new:C, get: C->Nat, inc: C->C}`
- Prevents incorrect use (like dec)

- Associative datatypes

- abstract over hashmap vs treemap vs ...
- maintain invariants (e.g. that the tree is in order)

- Rational numbers

- Floating point vs fixed point vs ratio

Existential Objects

counterObject = {*Nat,

 { state = 5,

 methods = {get = $\lambda x : \text{Nat} . x$,

 inc = $\lambda x : \text{Nat} . \text{succ}(x)$ }}}

as

{ $\exists X$, {state: x , methods: {get: $X \rightarrow \text{Nat}$, inc: $X \rightarrow X$ }}}

let {X,body} = counterObject in body.methods.get(body.state)

evaluates to?

functions using counters (as existential objects)

$\text{sendinc} = \lambda c : \text{Counter} .$

let $\{X, \text{Body}\} = c$ in

$\{*X,$

$\{\text{state} = \text{body.methods.inc}(\text{body.state}).$

$\text{methods} = \text{body.methods}\}$

as Counter

$\text{sendinc} : \{\exists X, \{\text{state}:X, \dots\}\} \rightarrow \{\exists X, \{\text{state}:X, \dots\}\}$

ADTs

vs

Objects

usage: counter.get(counter.inc(counter.new))

type: { $\exists C$, {get: C-> Nat, ...}}

uses internal representation

set of available functions unextendable

full support for binary operators

usage: sendget (sendinc (counterObject))

type: { $\exists C$, {state: C, methods: {get:C->Nat, ...}}}

keeps packaged structure

set of available functions can be extended

limited support for binary operators

modern object oriented languages use a hybrid.

Encoding existential types as universal types (with example)

existential type: $\{\exists C, \{\text{get}: C \rightarrow \text{Nat}, \dots\}\}$

universal type: $\forall Y. (\forall C. \{\text{get}: C \rightarrow \text{Nat}, \dots\} \rightarrow Y) \rightarrow Y$

existential value: $\{*\text{Nat}, \{\text{get}=\text{id}, \dots\}\}$

universal value: $\lambda Y. \lambda y: (\forall C. \{\text{get}: C \rightarrow \text{Nat}, \dots\} \rightarrow Y). \\ y[\text{Nat}] (\{\text{get}=\text{id}, \dots\})$

existential usage: `let (Counter, counter) = p in v`

universal usage: `p[V] ($\lambda \text{Counter}. \lambda \text{counter}. v$)`