Introduction to Perl: Seventh Lecture

Duncan C. White (d.white@imperial.ac.uk)

Dept of Computing, Imperial College London

January 2015

Contents

- Most programmers come to Perl from imperative/OO languages like C and Java, so there's a tendency to use Perl as a *Super C*.
- But Perl has many *functional programming* techniques which we can use in our own programs:
 - map and grep
 - code references for higher-order functions
 - passing functions around as values
 - data-driven programming: coderefs in data structures
 - coderefs are closures
 - function factories: functions that return functions!
 - iterators, finite and infinite
 - currying
 - lazy evaluation handling infinite Linked lists
- So in this lecture, I'm going to try to persuade you that *Perl is a functional language*. Well, sort of.
- I'm using the new Function::Parameters syntax throughout.

- We've already seen Perl's built-in **map** and **grep** operators, enabling you to transform every element of a list, or select interesting elements from a list, but we haven't stressed that these are higher order functions.
- For example, eg1:

Recall that map and grep are roughly:

```
        map OP ARRAY is
        grep OP ARRAY is

        my @result = ();
        my @result = ();

        foreach (ARRAY)
        foreach (ARRAY)

        {
        push @result, OP($_);

        }
        push @result, OP($_);

        }
        push @result, $_ if OP($_);
```

- The most fundamental Functional Programming concept is passing functions around as values.
- You can do this in Perl using a *coderef*, a reference to a function. Like a *pointer to a function* in C terms.
- For example: eg2 and eg3:

```
fun double scalar($n)
                                             fun double_array(@x)
ſ
                                             ſ
        return $n * 2;
                                                     return map { $_ * 2 } @x;
}
                                            }
                                            my $coderef = \&double_array;
my $coderef = \&double_scalar;
# TIME PASSES
                                             # TIME PASSES
my $scalar = $coderef->( 10 );
                                            my @array = coderef \rightarrow (1, 2, 3);
print "scalar: $scalar\n":
                                            my $str = join(',',@array);
                                             print "array: $str\n";
```

- Produces 20 and (2,4,6) as output.
- Note that a considerable amount of time may pass between taking the reference and invoking the referenced function, symbolised by **TIME PASSES** above.

• Can generalise this to **eg4**:

```
fun double scalar($n)
        return $n * 2;
}
fun double_array(@x)
ſ
        return map { $_ * 2 } @x;
3
fun apply( $coderef, @args )
Ł
        return $coderef->( @args );
}
my $scalar = apply( \&double_scalar, 10 );
print "scalar: $scalar\n":
my @array = apply( \&double_array, 1, 2, 3 );
my $str = join(',',@array);
print "array: $str\n";
```

- The results are the same as before.
- Do we need to name little helper functions like double_scalar() that are only used to make a coderef via \&double_scalar? No!

• Use anonymous coderefs as in eg5:

```
fun apply( $coderef, @args )
{
        return $coderef->( @args );
}
my $scalar = apply( fun ($x) { return $x * 2 }, 10 );
print "scalar: $scalar\n";
my @array = apply( fun (@x) { return map { $_ * 2 } @x }, 1, 2, 3 );
my $str = join(',',@array);
print "array: $str\n";
```

• If we add a prototype to apply() via:

fun apply(\$coderef,@args) :(&@) # or sub (&@) { my(\$coderef,@args)=@_;..

(Here, & tells Perl the given argument *must be a coderef*.)

• Then add the following inside apply():

```
local $_ = $args[0];
```

 $(local saves the old value of the global $_, before setting it to the given value, the new value persists until <code>apply()</code> returns when the old value is restored.)$

Now we can write map like code using \$_ in a code block:

```
my $scalar = apply { $_ * 2 } 10;
```

• Coderefs can be built into data structures such as:

```
my %op = (
    '+' => fun ($x,$y) { return $x + $y },
    '-' => fun ($x,$y) { return $x - $y },
    '*' => fun ($x,$y) { return $x - $y },
    '/' => fun ($x,$y) { return $x * $y },
);
```

• Then a particular coderef can be invoked as follows:

```
my $operator = "*"; my $x = 10; my $y = 20;
my $value = $op{$operator}->( $x, $y );
```

• Use to build a Reverse Polish Notation (RPN) evaluator:

```
fun eval_rpn(@atom)
                                             # each atom: operator or number
Ł
    mv @stack:
                                             # evaluation stack
    foreach my $atom (@atom)
        if( $atom = ~ / \d+$/ )
                                             # number?
        Ł
            push @stack, $atom;
        } else
                                             # operator?
        ſ
            die "eval_rpn: bad atom $atom\n" unless exists $op{$atom};
            my $y = pop @stack; my $x = pop @stack;
            push @stack, $op{$atom}->( $x, $y );
        }
    3
    return pop @stack;
}
```

 The above RPN evaluator, with some more error checking and example calls such as:

my \$n = eval_rpn(qw(1 2 3 * + 4 - 5 *));

is eg6. Try it out.

- This technique is often called *data-driven* or *table-driven* programming, very easy to extend by modifying the table.
- For example, add the following operators (giving eg7):

- %, ^ and > are conventional binary operators, but note that swap takes 2 inputs and produces 2 outputs the same two, swapped!
- This works because whatever the operator returns, whether one or many results, is pushed onto the stack.

- To vary the number of inputs each operator takes, change the data structure and code slightly (giving **eg8**).
- First, change the data structure:

- Here, each hash value is changed from a coderef to a *reference to* a 2-element list, i.e. a 2-tuple, of the form: [no_of_args, code_ref].
- So each existing binary operator op => function pair becomes:
- But now we can add unary and trinary ops as follows:

• The operator invocation code changes to:

- The args = reverse map {pop} 1...n line is cool:-)
- We can now write a call such as:

my \$n = eval_rpn(qw(7 5 * 4 8 * > 1 neg 2 neg ifelse));

• This is equivalent to the more normal expression:

```
if( 7*5 > 4*8 ) -1 else -2
```

- Which, because 35 > 32, gives -1.
- Change the 5 to a 4, this (because $28 \le 32$) gives -2.
- One could make further extensions to this RPN calculator, in particular variables could be added easily enough (store them in a hash, add get and set operators). But we must move on.

- So far, we've only seen passing coderefs into functions.
- However, you can write a function factory which constructs and returns a coderef. For example:

```
fun timesn($n)
{
        return fun ($x) { return $n * $x };
}
```

- timesn(N) delivers a newly minted coderef which, when it is later called with a single argument, multiplies that argument by N.
- For example (**eg9**):

```
my $doubler = timesn(2);
my $d = $doubler->(10); # 20
my $tripler = timesn(3);
my $t = $tripler->(10); # 30
print "d=$d, t=$t\n";
```

• Subtlety: in C at runtime, a function pointer is simply a machine address. In Perl, a coderef is a **closure:** a *machine address plus a private environment*. In this case, each timesn() call has a different local variable \$n which the coderef must remember.

 Objection 1: the previous example only used one coderef at a time. Replace the calls as follows (eg10):

- Here, we select either the doubler or the tripler based on dynamic input the doubler if the current command line argument is odd, else the tripler. So eg10 1 2 3 4 generates 2 6 6 12.
- Objection 2: \$n was a known (constant) value when the coderef was built. Did Perl rewrite it as a constant?
- We can disprove this idea a coderef can change it's environment!

```
fun makecounter($n)
{
        return fun { return $n++ };
}
```

```
• To use makecounter() write (eg11):
```

```
my $c1 = makecounter( 10 );
my $v;
$v = $c1->(); print "c1: $v\n";
$v = $c1->(); print "c1: $v\n";
$v = $c1->(); print "c1: $v\n";
```

- Every time \$c1 is called, it retrieves the current value of it's private variable \$n, increments it for next time, and returns the previous value. So we get 10 11 12.
- This is a special type of closure called an *iterator*. Calling an iterator to deliver the next value is called *kicking the iterator*.
- Objection 3: anyone can juggle one ball. Can you have more than one counter? Yes! **eg12** shows this:

```
my $c1 = makecounter( 10 );
my $c2 = makecounter( 100 );
my $v;
$v = $c1->(); print "c1: $v\n"; # 10
$v = $c1->(); print "c2: $v\n"; # 11
$v = $c2->(); print "c1: $v\n"; # 12
$v = $c1->(); print "c1: $v\n"; # 101
$v = $c1->(); print "c1: $v\n"; # 101
$v = $c1->(); print "c1: $v\n"; # 101
```

- So far, our iterators have generated infinite sequences. But an iterator can terminate when it finishes iterating (like each):
- Return undef as a sentinel to inform us that the iterator has finished. For example:

```
fun upto( $n, $max )
{
     return fun {
         return undef if $n > $max;
         return $n++;
    };
}
```

• Call this with code like (eg13):

• When run, this counts from 1 to 10 and then stops. Multiple counters work fine - because the closure environment includes \$n and \$max - eg14 shows an example (omitted here).

```
    Easy to define map and grep for iterators:

     # $it2 = map_i( $op, $it ): Equivalent of map for iterators.
            Given two coderefs ($op, an operator, and $it, an iterator),
     #
            return a new iterator $it2 which applies $op to each value
     #
            returned by the inner iterator $it.
     #
     #
     fun map_i( $op, $it ) :(&$)
            return fun {
                    mv $v = $it->():
                    return undef unless defined $v;
                    local \$ = \$v:
                    return $op->($v):
            };
     }
Now, we can write (eg15):
     mv $lim = shift @ARGV || 10:
     my $scale = shift @ARGV || 2;
     my $c = map_i { $_ * $scale } upto( 1, $lim );
     while( my $n = $c->() ) { print "$n,"; }
     print "\n":
• When run with lim=10, scale=3, this produces:
   3,6,9,12,15,18,21,24,27,30,
```

 grep_i(\$op, \$it) is not much more complicated, eg16 shows it (omitted here).

Duncan White (CSG)

- A hard-core functional programming feature is **Currying**: the ability to *partially call a function* to provide (say) a 3-argument function with it's first argument and deliver a 2-argument function.
- Simple to do:

```
fun curry( $func, $firstarg )
{
    return fun {
        return $func->( $firstarg, @_ );
    };
}
```

• Call this with code like (eg17):

• As expected, the \$plus4 function acts exactly as an *add 4 to my single argument* function, delivering 14 as the result.

- One of the coolest features of functional programming languages is **lazy evaluation** the ability to handle very large or even infinite data structures, evaluating only on demand.
- It's surprisingly easy to add laziness in Perl:
- Let's extend last lecture's linked List module to work with *lazy linked lists* (sometimes known as *streams*).
- Only one design change is needed: allow a list tail to *either* be an ordinary *nil-or-cons* list *or a coderef* a **promise** to deliver the next part of the list (whether empty or nonempty) on demand.
- When \$list->headtail() splits a node into head \$h and tail \$t, need to
 detect (via ref(\$t) eq "CODE") whether \$t is a promise (coderef).
- If st is a promise, we **force the promise:** invoke the promise function, delivering the real nil-or-cons tail list:

```
my( $h, $t ) = @$self;
$self->[1] = $t = $t->() if ref($t) eq "CODE";  # FORCE A PROMISE
return ( $h, $t );
```

• Note that after forcing the promise, we assign the result back into \$self->[1] in case the same list node is re-evaluated later.

Duncan White (CSG)

- Note: a lazy list may be finite or infinite. Given an infinite list \$inflist: \$inflist->len, \$inflist->rev and \$inflist->append(\$second_list) will never terminate. This can't be solved - it's inevitable!
- Fortunately, we have already engineered the concept of "show only the first N elements" into \$inflist->as_string() so that's ok.
- Perhaps we should set the system-wide limit to a reasonably large value, rather than leaving it zero (meaning unlimited):

```
our $as_string_limit = 40;
```

 Having modified and syntax checked List.pm, check that it still works with lists with no promises - i.e. non lazy lists (eg18):

```
use List;
$List::as_string_limit = 8;
# list_upto: return a non-lazy list of numbers between $min and $max
fun list_upto( $min, $max )
{
        return List->nil() if $min > $max;
        return List->cons( $min, list_upto($min+1, $max) );
}
my $list = list_upto( 100, 200 );
print "first few elements of upto(100,200) List: $list\n";
```

• Then, give it a lazy list (eg19) by adding a fun () or sub () coderef wrapper on the list_upto(\$min+1,\$max) call:

```
return List->cons( $min, fun { list_upto($min+1, $max) } );
```

- Without this, it was a conventional recursive function to generate a list. By *delaying the recursive call* until it's actually needed, we make it lazy.
- In this case, despite producing identical output, the lazy version never computes or stores elements 108..200.
- Can define map-like and grep-like operators for lazy lists. Here's

```
map_l($op, $list):
  return List->nil() if $list->isnil;
  my( $h, $t ) = $list->headtail;
  local $_ = $h; # set localised $_ for op
  return List->cons( $op->($h), fun { map_l( $op, $t ); } );
```

• Note that we've not made this a method, as we prefer to keep the map-like syntax rather than swap the arguments around in order to have the list (object) as the first argument. Instead we've given it a non clashing name and exported it.

 Using map_1(%op, \$list) and grep_1(%op, \$list), we can write rather pretty mathematical-style code. For example, start with an infinite list of odd numbers (eg20):

```
use List;
$List::as_string_limit = 8;
# $list = stepup( $n, $step ) - return an infinite list n, n+step, n+2*step...
fun stepup( $n, $step )
{
    return List->cons( $n, fun { stepup($n+$step,$step); } );
}
my $odds = stepup( 1, 2 );
print "first few odds: $odds\n";
```

```
• Which produces:
```

```
first few odds: [1,3,5,7,9,11,13,15,17,19...]
```

• Now generate an infinite list of even numbers by:

```
my $evens = map_l {$_ + 1} $odds;
print "first few evens: $evens\n";
```

Unsurprisingly, this produces:

first few evens: [2,4,6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20...]

• Now select only even numbers greater than 7:

my \$evengt7 = grep_1 {\$_ > 7} \$evens;

Which produces:

```
first few even gt7: [8,10,12,14,16,18,20,22,24,26...]
```

• Finally, select the subset that are exact squares:

my \$squares = grep_1 { my \$r = int(sqrt(\$_)); \$r*\$r == \$_ } \$evengt7;

Which produces:

first few even perfect squares > 7: [16,36,64,100,144,196,256,324,400,484...]

• Of course, this sequence of calls could be written as (eg20a):

```
my $evensgt7 = stepup( 8, 2 );
my $squares = grep_1 { my $r = int(sqrt($_)); $r*$r == $_ } $evensgt7;
```

 Can provide a merge_l(\$cmp, \$list1, \$list2) list operator to merge two sorted lists using a sort-like comparator, and using it (eg21):

```
my $odds = stepup( 1, 2 );
my $evens = stepup( 2, 2 );
my $all = merge_l { $a <=> $b } $odds, $evens;
```

What do you get it by merging odd and even integers? All integers!

• A better example might be (eg22):

• Here's a use for currying the comparator into merge_1 (eg22a):

```
my $numeric_merge = curry( \&merge_l, fun { $a <=> $b } );
my $m235 = $numeric_merge->( $numeric_merge->( $twos, $threes ), $fives );
my $all = grep_l { $_ > 1 } $m235;
```

Duncan White (CSG)