

$\lambda$  's on the edge

## Advanced Functional Programming in C++

Alfons Haffmans

October 13, 2013

### Introduction

Functional programming emphasizes the use of immutable data structures and pure functions. A pure function's output is determined solely by its input. However, this does not capture all the complexity of realistic programs, like state, IO and exceptions.

In the late '80's and early 90's an approach was pioneered which incorporates impure features, like exceptions, side-effects and IO into functional programming languages. That approach relied heavily on concepts from category theory like functors and monads. Clearly C++ already supports impure features so does it therefore make sense to incorporate that framework into the language ? In this article I'll attempt to present an answer to that question.

To start off, let's try to model failure in a functional setting. A fairly straight-

forward approach is to have the function return a Boolean and a value as part of a pair. In Haskell's function notation the signature of that function is :

$$f :: a \rightarrow [bool, b]$$

The function  $f$  takes a value of type  $a$  and returns a pair of a Boolean and a value of type  $b$ . If the Boolean is true, an exception has occurred, and the other member of the pair is ignored. If it's false, the second slot contains the result of the computation. We can generalize this to a type class  $M$ :

$$f :: a \rightarrow Mb$$

$M$  represents the 'context' in which the computation occurs. Here are a few ways to apply a function to a value in context  $M$ :

$$fmap :: (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow M a \rightarrow M b$$
$$apply :: M (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow M a \rightarrow M b$$
$$bind :: M a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow M b) \rightarrow M b$$

These are all higher-order functions, which apply a function to a value in a context.

$fmap$  takes a function  $a \rightarrow b$  and applies to a value of type  $a$  in context  $M$ . The result is a value of type  $b$  in the same context.  $fmap$  corresponds to mapping a function over a container of values.

*apply* uses a function  $a \rightarrow b$  'lifted' into the context  $M$  and similarly applies it to a value in the context. Note that *apply* requires *fmap* to be implemented. *apply* is part of an applicative functor type class. It allows easier pipe-lining of functions working on values in contexts.

Lastly *bind* has a slightly different order in the type signature for historical reasons. It takes a value in a context, and feeds that value into the function  $(a \rightarrow M\ b)$ . *bind* implies the existence of *apply*. *bind* is part of the monad type class. Note that the functions applied by *fmap* and *apply* are pure functions. *bind* takes a function which returns a value in a context. It allows you to combine computations in the most flexible way.

In addition to the type interface each implementation needs to satisfy a number of laws. The justification for these laws is not so obvious from the intuitive introduction above, and can be found in abstract algebra and category theory.

## Functors

Let's start with just a little bit of category theory.

A category consists of objects and maps or arrows between the objects. The maps or arrows are functions which take a value from the domain and to a value in the co-domain. A simple example is the function  $f(n) = 2 * n + y$  where  $n$  is an integer. Here domain and co-domain are the same.

Maps can be combined to form other maps. This composition operation is denoted as  $(g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x))$  and is read as  $g$  after  $f$ . The objects A,B,C,...

and maps  $f, g, h, \dots$  form a category if they satisfy :

$$f \circ id_A = id_B \circ f$$

$$(h \circ g) \circ f = h \circ (g \circ f)$$

Of particular interest are mappings between categories themselves.

A very simple category is the monoid category  $\mathbb{1}$ . It consists of a single element  $\star$  and the identity  $id$ . It's domain and co-domain are the same. We can construct maps and label them as  $1_+, 2_+, \dots, n_+, \dots$ . The composite of two maps is defined as  $m_+ \circ n_+ = (n + m)_+$  so that  $5_+ \circ 3_+ = 8_+$ .

We can interpret this construction by letting  $\star$  correspond to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Each map  $n_+$  in the monoid corresponds to a map  $f_n$  such that  $f_n(x) = n + x$ , which is a curried  $+$  operator. It's easy to see that this correspondence respects function composition :  $(f_m \circ f_n)(x) = f_m(f_n(x)) = m + n + x = f_{n+m}(x)$ . and that  $f_0$  is the identity operator.

Note that this interpretation of the monoid  $\star$  is also a category. What we have just defined is a mapping from one category (the monoid  $(\star, n_+)$ ) to an other category :  $(\mathbb{Z}, (n+))$ .

A mapping between categories is called a functor. A functor  $\mathcal{F}$  maps objects and arrows or maps from one category to an other:

$$\mathcal{F}(f : A \rightarrow B) = \mathcal{F}(f) : \mathcal{F}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(B)$$

$$\mathcal{F}(id_A) = id_{\mathcal{F}(A)}$$

$$\mathcal{F}(g \circ f) = \mathcal{F}(g) \circ \mathcal{F}(f)$$

Functors in functional programming generalize the concept of mapping a function over values in a container of typeclass M. The typeclass in Haskell is :

class Functor *f* where

$$fmap :: (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow f\ a \rightarrow f\ b$$

The *fmap* function generalizes the simple functor  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $fmap :: a \rightarrow b$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{F}(f)$ . In terms of *fmap* the functor requirements read

$$fmap\ id = id$$

$$fmap(g \circ f) = (fmap\ g) \circ (fmap\ f)$$

Note that the *id* function on the left-hand side takes an value of type *a* whereas the one on the right-hand side take a container of type *a*.

```

1 template <template<typename T1, typename... D> class F>
2 struct functor {
3   template<typename A, typename B>
4   static std::function < F<B> (F<A>)> fmap(std::function <B (A)>
        f);
5
6   template<typename A, typename B>
7   static F<B> fmap(std::function <B (A)> f, F<A> L) {
8     return fmap(f)(L);
9   }

```

```
10 };
```

### Listing 1: functor in C++

Listing 1 shows a template which defines the functor *fmap* from type *A* to type *B* for a type class *F*. The class *F* can have more than one template parameter, as indicated by the variadic template. This allows specialization for containers since they have more than one template parameter.

For lists like *std::list* and *std::forward\_list* *fmap* corresponds to *map* and is equivalent to iteration over the elements in the list.

A shared pointer is another example of a container which holds a value of a particular type. The functor implementation for shared pointers is shown in list 2. *fmap* returns a new shared pointer holding the result of the function application. We need to return a new shared pointer because the input and return types of *f* may be different. Also note that if the dereference fails, an empty shared pointer is returned, rather than an exception thrown.

```
1 template <>
2 struct functor<std::shared_ptr> {
3     template<typename A, typename B>
4     static std::function<std::shared_ptr<B> (std::shared_ptr<A>)>>
        fmap (std::function<B(A)> f) {
5     return [=](std::shared_ptr<A> v) {
6         if (v) {
7             return std::make_shared<B>(f(*v));
8         }
9     return std::shared_ptr<B>(nullptr);
```

```

10     };
11 }
12
13 template<typename A, typename B, typename F>
14 static std::function<std::shared_ptr<B> (std::shared_ptr<A>)
    > fmap (F f) {
15     return [=](std::shared_ptr<A> v) {
16         if (v) {
17             return std::make_shared<B>(f(*v));
18         }
19         return std::shared_ptr<B>(nullptr);
20     };
21 }
22 };

```

Listing 2: shared pointer as container

```

1  typedef std::tuple<int, std::string> C;
2  std::list<std::shared_ptr<C>> L = {std::shared_ptr<C>{new C
    (10, "a")}, std::shared_ptr<C>{new C(20, "b")}, std::
    shared_ptr<C>{new C(3467, "mnhjk")}};
3  auto F = functor<std::shared_ptr>::fmap(std::function<C (C)
    >([](const C& c) { std::cerr << c << std::endl; return c;})
    );
4  functor<std::list>::fmap(F, L);
5  return 0;

```

Listing 3: mapping over a list of shared pointers

A functor gives the ability to apply a pure function to a value in a container. This decouples the values and the functions that operate on them from the containers these values may be in. For example, consider a list of shared pointers.

In listing 3 I define a function *show* which prints out the value of type *C*. I then combine two functors, one for each container to apply *show* to each shared pointer in the list. Lists of pointers are relatively standard in C++ programs. But functors can also be defined for unary functions  $a \rightarrow b$ .

```
1 template <typename A, typename B> struct unary_op {  
2  
3 };
```

Listing 4: unary operator

First I define the unary operator type in 4. A unary operator  $\rightarrow$  constructs a unary function  $:(\rightarrow)r\ a \Rightarrow (r \rightarrow a)$ . Next I'll provide an implementation for unary operators in 5

```
1 template<>  
2 struct functor<unary_op>  
3 {  
4     template<typename A, typename B, typename R>  
5     static auto fmap (std::function<B(A)> f) {  
6         return [f](std::function<A(R)> g) {  
7             return [f,g] (R x) {  
8                 return f(g(x));  
9             };  
10    };
```



```

11     };
12
13     template<typename A, typename B, typename R>
14     static std::function<B (R)> fmap (std::function<B(A)> f, std::
        function<A(R)> g) {
15         return [f,g](R x) -> B {
16             return f(g(x));
17         };
18     };
19
20 };

```

Listing 5: functor for unary operators

For a unary operator  $f$  in  $fmap$  would be  $(\rightarrow)r$  and  $fmap$  :

$$fmap (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow (r \rightarrow a) \rightarrow (r \rightarrow b)$$

$fmap$  takes a function  $(a \rightarrow b)$  and applies it *after* function  $(r \rightarrow a)$  to yield a function  $(r \rightarrow b)$ . This corresponds to function composition.

## Applicative Functors

Applicative functors address an obvious limitation of functors: What if we wanted to apply a function to multiple effectful results ? They were first discussed by McBride and Patterson [...], although they were documented before that. In

Haskell's notation applicative functors have the following type class

class (Functor f)  $\Rightarrow$  Applicative f where

$$\text{pure} \quad :: \quad a \rightarrow f \ a$$
$$(< \star >) \quad :: \quad f \ (a \rightarrow b) \rightarrow f \ a \rightarrow f \ b$$

Here  $f$  represent the container. The applicative functor adds the infix operation  $< \star >$  and operation *pure* to those of the functor. In C++ we don't have the same leeway in constructing functions names and fixity as we do in Haskell. I'll call  $(< \star >)$  *apply* and use it in prefix mode.

The *apply* or  $< \star >$  operation of the applicative functor looks similar to *fmap*, except that the function  $a \rightarrow b$  is inside the 'container'  $f$ . *pure* puts a value of type  $a$  into the container.

There is a close relation ship between functors and applicative functors :

$$\text{fmap} f \ x = \text{pure} f \ < \star > \ x$$

Lifting a function  $f$  into an environment using *pure* and applying to a value in a context is the same as using *fmap* to apply  $f$  directly.

```
1 template <template<typename T1, typename... D> class F>
2 struct applicative_functor : public functor <F>
3 {
4
5     template <typename A>
6     static F<A> pure(A val);
```

```

7
8  template<typename A, typename B>
9  static std::function < F<B> (F<A>)> apply(F <std::function<B(A
    )>> f );
10 };

```

Listing 6: applicative functor template in C++

6 shows the applicative functor as a template in C++. Each individual container needs to provide its own implementation.

## list and ziplist

For lists there are two possible implementations for the applicative functor. In both cases a list of functions is applied to a list of values, but in one case we apply each function to every value and in the other we apply a function only if we have a value in the corresponding position in the argument list. In the latter case we 'zip' the list of the functions and values.

```

1 template<> struct
2  applicative_functor<std::forward_list> : public functor<std::
    forward_list>{
3
4  template<typename A>
5  static std::forward_list<A> pure(A v) {
6      return std::forward_list<A>(1,v);
7  }
8  [...]

```

```

9  template<typename A, typename B, typename lambda>
10 static std::function< std::forward_list<B> (std::forward_list<
    A>> apply(std::forward_list<lambda> F) {
11     return [F](std::forward_list<A> L) {
12         std::forward_list<B> acc;
13         for (auto& func : F) {
14             for (auto& arg : L) {acc.push_front(func(arg));}
15         }
16         acc.reverse();
17         return acc;
18     };
19 };
20 };

```

Listing 7: `std::forward_list` is an applicative functor

The applicative functor for `std::forward_list` is shown in listing 7. The body of `apply` consists of two nested loops traversing the input lists.

```

1 template<typename A> using zip_list = std::list<A>;
2 [...]
3 template<> struct
4 applicative_functor<zip_list> : public functor<zip_list>{
5
6     template<typename A>
7     static zip_list<A> pure(A v) {
8         return applicative_functor<std::list>::pure<decltype(v)>(v);
9     }
10

```

```

11 [...]
12     template<typename A, typename B, typename lambda>
13     static std::function< zip_list<B> (zip_list<A>)> apply(
14         zip_list<lambda> F) {
15     return [F](zip_list<A> L) {
16         zip_list<B> acc;
17         auto it1 = F.begin();
18         auto it2 = L.begin();
19         while (it1 != F.end() && it2 != L.end()) {
20             auto func = *it1;
21             auto arg  = *it2;
22             acc.push_front(func(arg));
23             it1++;
24             it2++;
25         }
26         acc.reverse();
27         return acc;
28     };
29 };
30 };

```

Listing 8: ziplist is an applicative functor

In listing 8 I show the implementation of the applicative functor for the zip list based on *std::list*. The implementation of the *functor* is a straight forward map and is not shown. In the body of the *apply* method, the two lists are traversed in parallel. The traversal stops when either one of the lists has run out

of elements.

```
1
2 forward_zip_list<int> L = {2, 5, 10};
3 auto f = [](const int& c) { std::cerr << c << ", "; return c; };
4 auto lifted_lambda_1 = applicative_functor<std::list>::pure(f)
5 ;
6 applicative_functor<std::list>::apply<int, int>(lifted_lambda_1
7 )(L);
8 std::cerr << std::endl;
9 //prints 2,5,10
10 [...]
11 auto lifted_lambda = applicative_functor<zip_list>::pure(f);
12 applicative_functor<zip_list>::apply<int, int>(lifted_lambda)(L
13 );
14 //prints 2,
```

Listing 9: the applicative functor for list and ziplist

Listing 9 shows a simple example of how the applicative functors for list and zip list differ. A simple lambda function is lifted into a list and applied to a list of integers. For the list case all the elements are printed. For the zip list only one element is printed because the list of functions has only one element.

## list of pointers

Applicative functors can be extended to combinations of containers like lists of shared pointers. The code snippet in listing 10 shows the functor implementation

for a list of shared pointers. *fmap* can be written as a straightforward combination of *fmap* for the shared pointer and the list container. Listing 10 shows a code snippet of the applicative functor definition for a forward list of shared pointers. In this case we can't write the applicative as a combination of two applicative functors. The function in the definition for the applicative functor for lists is not a reference. *apply* encapsulates the access to the data stored in the shared pointer elements of the list.

```

1 struct functor<forward_list_of_ptr> {
2   [...]
3   template<typename A, typename B, typename F>
4   static std::function<forward_list_of_ptr<B> (<
        forward_list_of_ptr<A>)> fmap (F f) {
5     auto F = functor<std::shared_ptr>::fmap<A,B>(f);
6     return [F]( forward_list_of_ptr<A> L) {
7       return functor<std::forward_list>::fmap(F, L);
8     };
9   }
10 };

```

Listing 10: *fmap* implementation for a list of shared pointers

```

1 template<typename A> using forward_list_of_ptr = std::
    forward_list<std::shared_ptr<A>>;
2   [...]
3 template<> struct
4 applicative_functor<forward_list_of_ptr> : public functor<
    forward_list_of_ptr> {

```

```

5 [...]
6     template<typename A, typename B, typename lambda>
7     static std::function< forward_list_of_ptr<B> (
        forward_list_of_ptr<A>>> apply(forward_list_of_ptr<lambda
        > F) {
8     return [F](forward_list_of_ptr<A> L) {
9         forward_list_of_ptr<B> acc;
10        for (auto& func : F) {
11            for (auto& arg : L) {
12                auto res = applicative_functor<std::shared_ptr>::apply
                    <A,B,lambda>(func)(arg);
13                acc.push_front(res);
14            }
15        }
16        acc.reverse();
17        return acc;
18
19    };
20 };
21 }

```

Listing 11: applicative functor for a list of shared pointers

```

1     forward_list_of_ptr<int> L = {std::make_shared<int>(5),std::
        make_shared<int>(15),std::make_shared<int>(25),std::
        make_shared<int>(35)};
2     auto f = [](const int& c) { std::cerr << c << ", "; return c
        ;};

```



```

3
4     functor<forward_list_of_ptr >::fmap<int , int >(f)(L);
5
6     auto lifted_lambda = applicative_functor<forward_list_of_ptr
7         >::pure(f);
8     applicative_functor<forward_list_of_ptr >::apply<int , int >(
        lifted_lambda)(L);
9     std::cerr << std::endl;

```

Listing 12: example for list of pointers

In listing 12 I show how a function can be mapped over a list of pointers, using its functor and applicative. The results are not too surprising.

## brackets

In their paper [...] McBride and Paterson introduce a convenient 'bracket' notation to capture the application of a pure function  $f$  to a sequence of sub computations :

$$\llbracket f L_1 \dots L_n \rrbracket = f < * > L_1 < * > \dots < * > L_n$$

*pure* lifts the pure function  $f$  into the applicative functor, which is then applied to the containers in the remainder of the bracket. Note that the structure of the computation remains fixed. This makes brackets easier to use than using applicatives directly. The essence of the bracket notion is captured in listing 13

```

1 template <template<typename Tx, typename... D> class Cont,
    typename F, typename... T>
2 auto bracket (F f, Cont<T>... L)
3 {
4     auto cf = curry<decltype(f), T... >(f);
5     return bracket_helper<sizeof...(T), Cont , decltype(cf), T
        ...>::bracket(cf, L...);
6 }
7 [...]
8 template<template<typename Tx, typename... D> class Cont,
    typename F, typename T1, typename T2>
9 struct bracket_helper<2, Cont, F, T1, T2> {
10     static auto bracket(F cf, Cont<T1> L1, Cont<T2> L2) {
11         return bracket(cf)(L1)(L2);
12     }
13
14     static auto bracket(F cf) {
15         typedef decltype(cf(T1()))(T2())) ret_t;
16         return [cf] (Cont<T1> L1) {
17             auto C = bracket_helper<1, Cont, F, T1>::bracket(cf)(L1);
18             return [C](Cont<T2> L2) {
19                 applicative_functor<Cont> APF;
20                 auto J = APF.template apply<T2, ret_t>(C)(L2);
21                 return J;
22             };
23         };
24     };

```

```

25 };
26 [...]

```

Listing 13: applicative brackets in c++

Brackets are implemented by currying the function and applying the partially applied function to each subsequent container.

First we convert n-ary the function  $f$  by currying it :  $f :: (x, y, z) \rightarrow k \Rightarrow f_c :: x \rightarrow y \rightarrow z \rightarrow k$ .  $f_c$  is lifted into the container using  $\text{pure } f_c = Lx \rightarrow y \rightarrow z \rightarrow k$ . This is then applied to the first container  $L_1$  and results in a lifted partially applied function  $Ly \rightarrow z \rightarrow k$ . That is we have taken the function  $f_c$  and applied it to the value in the first container. The result is a container of a function with a cardinality one less than  $f_c$ .

We keep doing this until a result is returned. The implementation below applies the curried function recursively to the containers. The bottom of the recursion is reached when the last container is processed.

```

1  [...]
2  typedef int      T1;
3  typedef char     T2;
4  typedef std::string T3;
5  typedef applicative_functor<std::forward_list> apf_t;
6  m_t<T3> L3 = {std::string("hello"), std::string("goodbye")};
7  auto f3 = [] (T1 a, T2 b, T3 c) { return std::make_tuple(a,b,c); };
8  auto R3 = bracket(f3, L1, L2, L3);
9  std::cout << R3 << std::endl;

```

```

10  [...]
11  [(1,y,hello),(1,y,goodbye),(1,x,hello),(1,x,goodbye),(2,y,
    hello),(2,y,goodbye),(2,x,hello),(2,x,goodbye),(3,y,hello)
    ,(3,y,goodbye),(3,x,hello),(3,x,goodbye),]

```

Listing 14: applicative functor for the `std::forward_list` using brackets

Listing 14 I show how brackets can be used to apply a function to multiple lists.

```

1  template<typename a> using s_t = std::shared_ptr<a>;
2  typedef applicative_functor<std::shared_ptr> apf_t;
3  s_t<T1> L1 = apf_t::pure(1);
4  s_t<T2> L2 = apf_t::pure('a');
5  s_t<T3> L3 = apf_t::pure(std::string("hello"));
6  auto f3 = [] (T1 a, T2 b, T3 c) { return std::make_tuple(a,b,c
    );};
7  auto R3 = bracket(f3, L1, L2,L3);
8  std::cout << R3 << std::endl; //std::shared_ptr<
    St5tupleIllicSsEE>((1,a,hello))

```

Listing 15: applicative functor for shared pointers applied using bracket notation

In listing 15 the data in three separate pointers is combined to create a pointer to a tuple. Again notice that the function is pure in that it does not reference the container the data was in.

## Monads

The monad type class has the following declaration in Haskell :

class Monad m where

return ::  $a \rightarrow m a$

(>>=) ::  $m a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow m b) \rightarrow m b[...]$

Functors and applicative functors apply pure functions to values in containers. Pure functions have their place. They are easily combined and their results are easily verified. However pure functions don't capture all the complexity of a program. For example the computation defined in the body of the function may fail. We may want to combine functions like that as part of a multi step computation. In the case of failure in one of the steps the remainder of the computation should be discarded. An other example is IO. The return type of these functions is the IO channel, so these functions cannot be pure. We may want to combine functions which write data to an IO channel.

Yet we do want to combine functions like that in a meaningful way.

Monads need to satisfy certain laws, the justification of which can be found in category theory.

[TBD]...

## List Monad

```
1 template <template<typename T1, typename... D> class F>
```

```

2 struct monad : public applicative_functor <F>
3 {
4     template <typename A> static F<A> mreturn (A val) {
5         return applicative_functor<F>::pure(val);
6     }
7
8     template<typename A, typename B>
9     static std::function < F<B> (std::function< F<B> (A) > ) >
        bind(F<A> val);
10
11 };

```

Listing 16: monad definition in C++

Monads extend applicative functors and that's reflected in the definition shown in listing 16. I've used *mreturn* for *return* and *bind* for *>>=*. *mreturn* is identical to the *pure* function for applicative functors. I use a variadic template to allow monad to be specialized for stl containers which have multiple template arguments. The bind method in 16 is curried : It takes a monad of type *A* and return a function. This function takes an argument of type *A* and returns a monad of type *B*, just like haskell's monad definition shown above.

```

1 template<> struct monad<std::list> : public applicative_functor<
    std::list> {
2
3     template<typename A, typename B>
4     static std::function < std::list<B> (std::function< std::list<
        B> (A) > ) > bind(std::list<A> M) {

```

```

5      return [M](std::function<std::list<B> (A)> f) {
6          std::list<B> R;
7          std::list<std::list<B>> res = map(f, M);
8          for (auto& list : res) {
9              R.insert(R.end(), list.begin(), list.end());
10         }
11         return R;
12     };
13 }
14 [...]
15 };

```

Listing 17: monad for std::list

The implementation for the stl *std::list* container is shown in listing 17. I've elided the implementation of *mreturn*, which is passing its argument on to the applicative functor's pure method. Function *f* is mapped over list *M*. Since the return type of *f* is a list the result is a list of lists. This list is flattened, i.e. the lists are merged into a single list *B* which is then returned. This flattening operation is an essential part of the monad. It allows monadic operations to be combined.

```

1 template<> struct monad<std::shared_ptr> : public
    applicative_functor<std::shared_ptr> {
2
3     template<typename A, typename B>
4     static std::function < std::shared_ptr<B> (std::function< std
        ::shared_ptr<B> (A) > ) > bind(std::shared_ptr<A> M) {

```

```

5     return [M]( std :: function<std :: shared_ptr<B> (A)> f) {
6         if (M) {
7             return f(*M);
8         }
9         return std :: shared_ptr<B>();
10    };
11 }
12 [...]
13 };

```

Listing 18: monad implementation for `std::shared_ptr`

In 18 I show the monad implementation for `std :: shared_ptr`. The validity of the shared pointer is checked before it is dereferenced and its value passed on to the function  $f$ . If the shared pointer is empty (or invalid), an empty shared pointer of type  $B$  is returned. This implies that a chain of monadic computations can return null if any one of its individual computations fails.

A change in state  $s$  is represented by a function  $s \rightarrow (a, s)$ .  $a$  is the value associated with the state change. The state  $s$  is mutable.

```

1 template<typename A, typename S>
2 struct state_tuple {
3     explicit state_tuple (S s) : e(std :: make_pair(A(), s)), set(
4         false) {}
5     state_tuple (A a, S s) : e(std :: make_pair(a, s)), set(true) {}
6     state_tuple(const state_tuple& s) : e(s.e), set(s.set) {}
7     std :: ostream& pp(std :: ostream& strm) const {
8         if (set) {

```



```

8      strm << e;
9  }
10  else {
11      strm << " ((), " << e.second << " )";
12  }
13  return strm;
14 }

15
16 std::pair<A, bool> value() const {
17     return std::make_pair(e.first, set);
18 }
19
20 std::pair<S, bool> state() const {
21     return std::make_pair(e.second, true);
22 }
23
24 private :
25     std::pair<A, S> e;
26     bool set;
27 };

```

Listing 19: state tuple

The state tuple in listing 19 is a thin wrapper around *std::pair* which adds a few convenience methods. A state computation takes a state of type *S* and returns a state tuple of types *A* and *S*.

```

1 template<typename A, typename S>
2 using state_computation = std::function< state_tuple<A, S> (S)>;

```

---

Listing 20: state computation albel

The state class shown in 21 encapsulates the state computation and adds a few convenience methods.

```
1 template <typename A, typename S>
2 struct state
3 {
4     explicit state(state_computation<A,S> C) : C(C){}
5     state(const state& o) : C(o.C){}
6     state& operator= (const state& o) {
7         if (&o == this) {
8             return *this;
9         }
10        C      = o.C;
11        return *this;
12    }
13    std::ostream& pp(std::ostream& strm) const {
14        strm << "[state < " << typeid(A).name() << " ," << typeid(S).
15            name() << "]" ;
16        return strm;
17    }
18    state_tuple<A,S> run_state(S state) {
19        return C(state);
20    }
21 }
```

```

22 private :
23     state_computation<A,S> C;
24 };

```

Listing 21: state

```

1 template<typename A, typename S>
2 state_tuple<A,S> runState(state<A,S> M, S state)
3 {
4     return M.run_state(state);
5 }

```

Listing 22: runState

The *run<sub>state</sub>* method is key to the use of the state class and the function *runState* executes this method by passing a state to it.

```

1 [...]
2     std::default_random_engine de;
3     std::uniform_int_distribution<int> di(10, 20);
4     state_computation<int, std::uniform_int_distribution<int>>
5         getrand = [&de] (std::uniform_int_distribution<int> s) {
6         auto val = s(de);
7         return state_tuple<int, std::uniform_int_distribution<int>>
8             >(val, s);
9     };
10
11     state<int, std::uniform_int_distribution<int>> ST(getrand);
12     int n = 10;
13     auto S = runState(ST, di);

```

```

12  std::cerr << "iter : " << n << " " << S << std::endl;;
13  while ( n— > 0) {
14      S = runState(ST, S.state().first);
15      std::cerr << "iter : " << n << " " << S << std::endl;;
16  }
17  [..]

```

Listing 23: example of the use of the state class

The use of the state class is illustrated in listing 23 using a random number generator. A number is drawn from a uniform distribution of integers. *getrand* is the state computation: It takes the current state of the uniform distribution and returns a state tuple containing a random value as well as the new state. In the while loop the state returned by the state computation is the used to generate the next state. A monad can be used to glue subsequent state computations together.

The state in listing 21 contains a value of type A as well as a state of type S. This makes it a little different of the list or ptr containers which have a single type constructor. We going to make the reasonable assumption that the type of the state is not going to change between subsequent computations, although the type of the value could. For example we could change the example above to have *getrand* return a string in stead of an integer if the integer exceeds some threshold. We are less likely to want to combine results by different random number generators.

```

1  template< struct monad<state> : public applicative_functor<

```

```

1      state> {
2
3      template<typename S, typename A, typename B>
4      static state<B,S> bind(state<A,S>& M, std::function< state<B,S
5          > (A)>& f) {
6          state_computation<B,S> comp = [&f,&M](S s) {
7              auto res                = runState(M, s);
8              state<B,S> newval      = f (res.value().first);
9              return runState(newval, res.state().first);
10         };
11         return state<B,S> (comp);
12     };
13
14     template <typename S, typename A> static state<A,S> mreturn (A
15         val) {
16         return applicative_functor<state>::pure<S,A>(val);
17     }
18 };

```

Listing 24: state monad

The state monad in listing 24 takes a function with an argument of type  $A$  and a state with a value of type  $A$  and state of type  $S$  and returns a state of the same type but with a value of type  $B$ . This state contains a computation constructed in the body of the *bind* method. In the body of *comp* a new state is generated by calling *runState* on  $M$ , which is the state passed into *bind*. The function  $f$

is then called on the value generated by the state computation. The result is a new state which is run with the new value. *comp* is returned as the new state in the *state* constructor.

```
1 [...]
2 typedef std::uniform_int_distribution<int> idist;
3 std::default_random_engine de;
4
5 state_computation<int, std::uniform_int_distribution<int>>
6     getrand = [&de] (std::uniform_int_distribution<int> s) {
7     auto val = s(de);
8     return state_tuple<int, std::uniform_int_distribution<int>>
9         >(val, s);
10 };
11
12 state <int, idist> ST(getrand);
13
14 std::function<state<int, idist>(int)> f = [&de, &ST](int val) {
15     std::cerr << val <<std::endl;
16     return ST;
17 };
18
19 auto S1 = monad<state>::bind<idist, int, int>(ST, f);
20 auto S2 = monad<state>::bind<idist, int, int>(S1, f);
21 auto S3 = monad<state>::bind<idist, int, int>(S2, f);
22 auto S4 = monad<state>::bind<idist, int, int>(S3, f);
23 auto S5 = monad<state>::bind<idist, int, int>(S4, f);
24 auto S6 = monad<state>::bind<idist, int, int>(S5, f);
```

```

23  auto S7 = monad<state>::bind<idist , int , int>(S6, f);
24  auto S8 = monad<state>::bind<idist , int , int>(S7, f);
25  auto Sf = monad<state>::bind<idist , int , int>(S8, f);
26
27      auto S = runState(Sf, idist (10, 20));
28  std::cerr << S << std::endl;;
29  S = runState(Sf, idist (100, 200));
30  std::cerr << S << std::endl;;

```

Listing 25: example of the state monad

The state monad is used to string various stateful computations together. In listing 25 I revisit the random number generator example discussed earlier. *getrand* is a computation which gets an integer from the random number generator *s* passed into it as an argument. *ST* is the initial state. The state monad is used to construct a state which represents 10 calls to *getrand*. The function *f* prints the result of the random number generator to stderr. Notice that when last state *Sf* is constructed no random numbers have been generated yet. That is done by the call to *runState*. First The resulting computation is called with a distribution engine with a range between 10 and 20, and next with one with a range from 100 to 200.

The results of the random number generation in listing 25 are not available for further processing. To collect the results we need to extend the state to include a list and update the list with the result of the number generator.

```

1  [...]
2  typedef std::list<int>                                icont_t;

```

```

3  typedef std::uniform_int_distribution<int> idist_t;
4  typedef std::pair<icont_t, idist_t>          state_t;
5  typedef state_tuple<int, state_t>          state_tuple_t;
6
7  std::default_random_engine de((unsigned int)time(0));
8
9  state_computation<int, state_t> getrand = [&de] (state_t s) {
10     auto val = s.second(de);
11     s.first.push_back(val);
12     return state_tuple_t(val, s);
13 };
14
15 std::function<state_computation<int, state_t> (int, int)>
16     getrand2 = [&de](int f, int t) {
17     return [&de, f, t] (state_t s) {
18         auto val = s.second(de);
19         return state_tuple_t(val, std::make_pair(s.first, idist_t(
20             f, t)));
21     };
22 };
23
24 state <int, state_t> ST(getrand);
25
26 std::function<state<int, state_t>(int)> f = [&ST, &getrand2](int
27     val) {
28     std::cerr << val << std::endl;
29     if (val % 7 == 0) {

```



```

27     return state<int, state_t> (getrand2(10000,11456));
28 }
29 return ST;
30 };
31
32 auto S1 = monad<state>::bind<state_t, int, int>(ST, f);
33 auto S2 = monad<state>::bind<state_t, int, int>(S1, f);
34 [...]
35 auto Sf = monad<state>::bind<state_t, int, int>(S12, f);
36
37 auto S = runState(Sf, std::make_pair(icont_t(), idist_t(10,20)
    ));
38 std::cerr << S << std::endl;;
39 S = runState(Sf, std::make_pair(icont_t(), idist_t(100,200)));
40 std::cerr << S << std::endl;;
41 [...]

```

Listing 26: extended state monad example

The value in the state monad is not being used. In listing 26 the state is extended to include a list of value. In the state computation *getrand* the random value is inserted into the list as well are returned as part of the state tuple. The second computation *getrand2* is a curried function whose first argument is a new range for the uniform distribution. It returns a state computation which uses this new distribution range. The monadic function *f* now returns a different state, depending on whether the value passed in was a multiple of 7.

## Conclusions

## References

- [1] Bjarne Stroustrup  
*The C++ Programming Language*  
Addison-Wesley, 1997, 3rd edition.
- [2] Brian McNamara, Yannis Smaragdakis  
Functional programming with the FC++ library.  
J. Funct. Program. 14(4): 429-472 (2004)
- [3] David Vandevoorde, Nicolai M. Josuttis  
*C++ Templates*  
Addison-Wesley, 2003.
- [4] Andrei Alexandrescu  
*Modern C++ Design*  
Addison-Wesley, 2001
- [5] Miran Lipovača  
*Learn you a Haskell for great good : a beginner's guide*  
no starch press, San Fransisco, 2011
- [6] Graham Hutton  
*Programming in Haskell*  
Cambridge University Press, 2007

- [7] Richard Bird *Introduction to Functional Programming using Haskell* Prentice Hall Europe, 1998, 2nd edition
- [8] Anthony J. Field and Peter G. Harrison  
*Functional Programming*  
Addison-Wesley, 1989.
- [9] Michael L. Scott  
*Programming Language Pragmatics*  
Morgan Kauffmann, 2006, 2nd edition
- [10] Erich Gamma, Richard Helm, Ralph Johnson, John Vlissides  
*Design Patterns : Elements of Reusable Object-Oriented Software*  
Addison Wesley Longman, 1995
- [11] Nicolai M. Josuttis  
*The C++ Standard Library*  
Addison-Wesley, 2nd edition.
- [12] <https://github.com/fons/functional-cpp>
- [13] <http://www.macports.org/>
- [14] <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/language/lambda>
- [15] <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/utility/functional/function>
- [16] <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/language/auto>

- [17] <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/utility/functional/bind>
- [18] <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/utility/functional/placeholders>
- [19] [http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/algorithm/for\\_each](http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/algorithm/for_each)
- [20] [http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/algorithm/forward\\_list](http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/algorithm/forward_list)
- [21] <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/algorithm/transform>
- [22] <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/language/decltype>
- [23] <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/algorithm/accumulate>
- [24] zip function in Python  
<http://docs.python.org/2/library/functions.html#zip>  
zip function in Ruby  
<http://ruby-doc.org/core-2.0/Array.html#method-i-zip>  
Support in Perl  
<http://search.cpan.org/~lbrocard/Language-Functional-0.05/Functional.pm>
- [25] Brent Yorgey  
*The Typeclassopedia* The Monad.Reader, Issue 13; p17; 12 March 2009  
[www.haskell.org/wikiupload/8/85/TMR-Issue13.pdf](http://www.haskell.org/wikiupload/8/85/TMR-Issue13.pdf)
- [26] <http://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/utility/tuple>