Typed Tagless Final an approach to embedded DSLs

Zixiu Su 2023-11-05

Contents

Intro

I was trying to implement a 311-style interpreter, this time in Haskell intead of Racket (which is untyped, or unityped). Very soon I found out there was a lot of hoops to jump through when it comes down to a typed language. I was not satisfied with my naive implementation and trying to improve my AST representation. Then I found Oleg's tutorial on so called "Typed Tagless Final" and learned some interesting techniques. And today I want to share with you what I learned.

What do I mean by a "311-style interpreter"?

Some object/source language:

- Simply typed lambda calculus (STLC)
- deBruijin indices
- extended with Bool/Int/...

Implemented in:

Haskell (or other \mathbf{TYPED} functional languages)

Something like this?

```
(would be perfectly fine in Racket)
data Exp = ...
```

My Naive Approach

Unimportant differences: Int vs Bool named vs debruijned Important: explain GADTs syntax (data Exp where...) use Data.Map as env union type for values

```
interp :: Exp -> Env -> Maybe Val

type Env = M.Map String Val

data Exp where
   Int :: Integer -> Exp
   Var :: String -> Exp
   Lam :: String -> Exp -> Exp
   App :: Exp -> Exp -> Exp

data Val where
   VInt :: Integer -> Val
   VClos :: String -> Exp -> Env -> Val
```

Choosing types

```
    interp :: Exp -> Env -> Val
    Env <- Data.Map</li>
    Define ADT
    data Exp
```

= B Bool

```
| V Var
| L Exp
| A Exp Exp
```

data Var = VS Var | V0

3. Val needs a union of different types (tags)

Show result code here

Problems:

- 1. Boilerplate
- 2. AST allowing ill-typed programs (example?) => write a type checker?
- 3. Packing/unpacking union type values

Cause: DSL embedding is "loose"

Q: How would you improve the AST?

GADTs to the Rescue

```
{-# LANGUAGE GADTs #-}
```

Tagless "Final"

Discussion

Appendix

References

Categorical Semantics

Comparison with free monads