Functional Programming (in C++)

,05tc

David Sankel Sankel Software

Functional Programming What? Why? How (in C++)? Algebraic Data Types : (), :=, ::=, \otimes , \oplus Functions : $a \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c)$ Generic Programming $: (C \triangleleft C) \rightarrow C \rightarrow int$ Category Theory : monoid, monad, etc.

unit, primitive type, one value, denoted ()

<u>unit,</u> primitive type, one value, denoted () + <u>product</u>, binary type operation, denoted a ⊗ b, "a and b", one of each



unit, primitive type, one value, denoted () product, binary type operation, denoted a \otimes b, "a and b", one of each sum, binary type operation, Denoted $a \oplus b$, "a or b", one of one

unit, (), one value product, $a \otimes b$, "a and b" sum, $a \oplus b$, "a or b"



<u>unit</u>, (), one value <u>product</u>, $a \otimes b$, "a and b" <u>sum</u>, $a \bigoplus b$, "a or b" <u>is the same as</u>, a := b<u>is implemented with</u>, a := b



true := () false := () bool := true \bigoplus false

true is implemented with unit. false is implemented with unit. A bool value is the same as a true value or a false value.



Z := () $N := Z \bigoplus N$

Z is implemented with unit. A N value is the same as a Z value or an N value.



Z := () $N \coloneqq Z \bigoplus N$

 $z \in Z$ $N_{0} = (0, z)$ $N_{1} = (1, N_{0}) = (1, (0, z))$ $N_{2} = (1, N_{1}) = (1, (1, (0, z)))$

Type Functions

Add parameter on left side of := or := symbol that can be used on the right.

 $\begin{bmatrix}] := () \\ L a := [] \bigoplus (a \otimes L a) \end{bmatrix}$

A value of "L of a" is either a value of [] or (a value of a and a value of "L of a").

Type Functions

 $\begin{bmatrix}] := () \\ L a := [] \bigoplus (a \otimes L a) \end{bmatrix}$

Say a is a value of type a and e is the value of type []. (0,e) (1,(a,(0,e)))(1,(a,(1,(a,(0,e))))

Type Functions

$\mathsf{Ta} := (\mathsf{Ta} \otimes \mathsf{Ta}) \oplus \mathsf{a}$

Binary tree with values of type 'a' at the leaves.



- Abstract

- Simple ((), :=, ::=, \otimes , \oplus)

- Powerful

Algebraic Data Types (in C++!) Our critera for functional concepts in C++ - No (minimal) syntax sugar, it scares away the new bees. - Mixes well with typical C++. - No copycatting other languages and their limitations ..

Easy ones

- Unit (): use boost::mpl::void___

- New unit types: T := () struct T {};

- "is the same as": a := b typedef b a;

Product Types

- z = a ⊗ b ⊗ c. struct. Named accessors - a ⊗ b. boost.fusion.vector. Access by index - boost.fusion.map. Both accessor methods.

Sum Types

- Can use enum when underlying types - are units, and - aren't used elsewhere - Can use a product type with an index. - common and error prone - Can use polymorphic base class. - not really nice syntax/error prone

<u>Sum Types</u>

boost.variant (best option!)
arbitrary underlying types
small syntax overhead
access by index or type

 $a \oplus b \oplus c$ boost::variant<a,b,c>

Algebraic Data Types (in C++!) "is implemented with", =, whap it in a struct R01 = doublestruct R01 { explicit R01(const double impl___) : impl(impl__) {} double impl; - accessor functions (invariant guaranteed) - internal implaccess function (invariant requirement)

Algebraic Data Types (in C++!) Type Functions (:= style) Use "type function trait" from boost.mpl. none := (), Op a := none \bigoplus a template< typename a > +ypedef boost:variant<none,a>

Algebraic Data Types (in C++!) Type Functions (= style) Use a wrapper template struct none = (), Op a = none \oplus a template< typename a > explicit Op(boost::variant<none,a>) boost::variant<none,a> impl;

Recursive Types

- sum types: use make recursive variant

- product types: use make_recursive_variant (see paper for details)

What the heck is a recursive product type? S a := a \otimes (S a)

- Seems like nonsense!?

What the heck is a recursive product type? S a := a \bigotimes (S a)

Seems like nonsense!?
Nope
Think of the recursion as being a computation of type (S a)

Laziness (in C++!)

How can we represent a computation of a value in C++?

Laziness (in C++!)

How can we represent a computation of a value in C++?

- A 0 angument function.

Laziness (in C++!)

How can we represent a computation of a value in C++?

A () angument function.
template< typename a> struct lazy
{typedef boost:function< a () > type;

What the heck is a recursive product type? S a = a \otimes (S a)

- Streams of type a. See paper for a direct implementation.



Functions

 $f: A \rightarrow B$

A set S of pairs (a,b) where $a \in A$ $b \in B$. For every $a \in A$, there exists exactly one corresponding pair in S.

bool f(int);

bool $f(int); => int \rightarrow bool$

What is a C++ function? bool f(int); => int-> bool What about multiple arguments?

Lets try another case. bool f2(int, int);



Lets try another case. bool $f_2(int, int); => (int\otimes int) \rightarrow bool$

Use our product type operator!
c++-function-tuples "f2 (2,13)"
Still something missing...

bool f3(int, int)
{ ++Someglobalvar;
return true; }

- $(in+\otimes in+) \rightarrow bool doesn'+ work!$ - Consider the corresponding set.

bool f3(int, int); { ++Someglobalvar; return true; } $(in+\otimes in+\otimes World) \rightarrow$ $(World\otimes bool)$

(in+⊗in+)→ bool doesn'+ work!
Consider the corresponding set
Introduce new parameter
and return value, World...

Translation

 $R f(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n);$

 $\wedge \wedge \wedge$

 $(A_1 \otimes A_2 \dots A_n \otimes World) \rightarrow (World \otimes R)$

Currying $a \otimes b \rightarrow c$ +o $a \rightarrow (b \rightarrow c)$

function returns a function (convenient)
→ is right associative
Works with any function where the domain is a product.

Translation

$$R f(A_1, A_2, ..., A_n)$$

 $(A_1 \otimes A_2 \dots A_n \otimes \text{World}) \rightarrow (\text{World} \otimes R)$

 $A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \dots A_n \rightarrow World \rightarrow (World \otimes R)$

Introducing IO io $a := World \rightarrow (World \otimes a)$

Simple type function
We can actually implement io a in C++.

template< typename a >
struct io
{
typedef boost:function<a ()> type; }

Translation

$$R f(A_{1}, A_{2}, \dots, A_{n});$$

 $(A_1 \bigotimes A_2 \dots A_n \bigotimes World) \rightarrow (World \bigotimes R)$

 $A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \dots A_n \rightarrow World \rightarrow (World \otimes R)$

 $A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \dots A_n \rightarrow io R$

Functions (in C++)

gfp library (netsuperbrain.com/gfp)

gfp::ciof (curried io function)
 Converts a c++ function pointer into a function as we formulated.

gfp::cfunc (curried function)
 cfunc<a,b,c>::type =>
 function<function<c (b)> a>

Intuition:

"an empty thing", could refer to several things, but not all.

"empty", a property of many things, but not all.

Formulation:

"an empty thing" - requires a type to be concrete - +ype (a $= Emptiable) \rightarrow a$ - read < as "has a profile in" - a function from types to values "empty" - +ype (a - HasEmpty) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow bool)

Formulation:

Emptiable, a type class - A typeclass is a set of pairs (a,p) - d is a = type or type function - p is a profile that fits certain patterns and laws Our restrictions - At most one pair per type - Profile is a simple value

HasEmpty:

An element in HasEmpty - (std wector <int>, z) where bool z(std:vector & z) { return z.empty(); } To implement "empty" we need to get the corresponding value (function) from a type in HasEmpty.

HasEmpty:

An call to "empty": std:vector<int> v; empty<std::vector<int>>:profile()(v);
looks up a profile given a type.
but wait...

HasEmpty:

emptykstd=vectorkint>>=profile()(v); - Passing v, of known type, makes the explicit type redundant. ☺ - empty cannot be passed to functions.☺

Generic Programming (in C++!) Polymorphic Functions: Idea is to infer the type arguments from the value anguments. struct Empty { typedef bool result_type; bool operator()(std:vector<int>) //... one operator() for each type. } empty; empty(v); //infers the type from v.

Generic Programming (in C++!) Polymorphic Values: Same type inference trick doesn't work for values Introduce resolve: resolve<std=vector<int>>(emptyThing); Polymorphic values must follow a Certain trait

Generic Programming (in C++!)

Polymorphic Values:

struct EmptyThing { template<typename T> struct result; result<this_type(vector<int>*)>=type operator()(vector<int>* dummy); emptyThing;

Generic Programming (in C++!) <u>Polymorphic Values & Functions</u>:

Covers all generics we care about
Cannot be extended to support new types without modification of underlying code.
No relation between related polymorphic values and functions.

Generic Programming (in C++!)

Polymorphic Classes:

Extendable collections of polymorphic values and functions.
Use partial template instantiation to select supported type.
The polymorphic entities select appropriate instantiation when used.

Category Theory

- deals abstractly with mathematical structures and relations between them.

- Gives some guidance as to what to do with generics.

- Very powerful and expressive.

Category Theory

 $\begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{Monoids}}\\ A\\ O \in A\\ + : A \rightarrow A \rightarrow A \end{array}$

A, O, and + form a monoid when + is associative and O is an identity for

Category Theory (Monoids) There are lots of monoids! int, +, 0 : sum monoid bool, &&, true: all monoid string, concat, ": string monoid $a \rightarrow m$: function monoid - m monoio - forwards monoid operations to results. io m: io monoid. Similar to function monoid.

Category Theory (Monoids)

Quick example: - header : Message \rightarrow string - contents : Message \rightarrow string

gfp::cfunc<Message,string> payload = gfp::mplus(header)(contents);

- called point free (pointless) programming!.

Category Theory

Much much more:

functor/pointed: functions, containers...
idiom (applicative functors): FRP, streams
monad: arbitrary computations
foldable: compress collections

Functional Programming (in C++!)

FP Benefits:

- Cleaner design → Cleaner code
 less code/static types → Less bugs
- Powerful tools

FP (in C++) Benefits:

- No need to switch languages
- Integrates well
- Easy to use (no special syntax)
- Highly Capable