Cool Functional Tricks





Julian Doherty <u>@madlep</u> juliandoherty.com



We're hiring

careers.envato.com



Who here has written code like this?

def calculate_damage(current_damage, new_damage) current_damage + new_damage end

calculate_damage(5123, 23145) # 28268

Or this?

```
movies = [
  {movie: "Apollo 13", year: 1994, damage_cost: 26000000000},
  {movie: "Cast Away", year: 2000, damage cost: 600000000},
  {movie: "Sully", year: 2016, damage_cost: 101000000}
```

```
total damage cost = movies.map{ movie
 movie[:damage cost]
}.sum()
```

2761000000

Or this?

```
movies = [
  {movie: "Apollo 13", year: 1994, damage_cost: 26000000000},
  {movie: "Cast Away", year: 2000, damage cost: 600000000},
  {movie: "Sully", year: 2016, damage_cost: 101000000}
```

```
total damage cost = movies.reduce(0){ total, movie
  total + movie[:damage cost]
}
# 2761000000
```

Or even this?

total_damage_cost = movies.sum{|movie| movie[:damage_cost]}
2761000000

cost: 26000000000}, cost: 600000000}, 101000000}

What do we call this kind of code?

We call it... Trashing a whole bunch of stuff





























Let's figure out how much. But let's not make the problem worse

How do we minimise the damage? Three Things

 \rightarrow Statelessness → Immutability → Functional Purity









Statelessness

Code that is in it's own little world. All it has, is what is given to it. **There is nothing outside. There is no state**



```
class TomHanksDamage
  attr_accessor :da_vinci_code, :damage
  def calc_damage()
    MovieModel.find_tom_hanks_movies().each do |movie|
      @damage = @damage + movie.damage_cost
      @da_vinci_code = true if movie.da_vinci?
    end
  end
  def damage_cost()
    if @da_vinci_code
      1_000_000_000_000
    else
      Odamage
    end
  end
end
```



```
damage_cost = MovieModel.find_tom_hanks_movies().then{|movies|
  if movies.find(&:da_vinci?)
    1_000_000 000 000
  else
    movies.sum(&:damage_cost)
  end
```





"An exploration of how ones soul's sole actions of an individual lives/souls impact one another in the past, present and future..."



"An exploration of how ones soul's sole actions of an individual lives/souls impact one another in the past, present and future..."

GOOD LUCK DEBUGGING THAT





Only create data - Never change it.





```
class CloudAtlas::Soul
def initialize()
    @lives = []
end
def explore_soul(life)
    @lives << life
    CloudAtlas.every_single_other_soul.each do [other]
        other.impact_past_present_and_future(self)
    end
    do_something_philosophical_with_all_that_mutable_state()
end
end
```

```
tom = CloudAtlas::Soul.new
tom.explore_soul("Dr Henry Goose")
tom.explore_soul("Isaac Sachs")
# this goes on for 172 minutes...
```



```
class CloudAtlas::Soul
  def initialize(lives=[])
   @lives = lives
  end
```

```
def explore_soul(life, others)
    new_soul = CloudAtlas::Soul.new(@lives + [life])
    new others = others.map{|other|
     other.immutably_transform_past_present_and_future(new_soul)
    }
    exploration = new_soul.do_something_philosophical(new_others)
    [new_soul, new_others, exploration]
 end
end
```



```
initial_state = [
 CloudAtlas::Soul.new,
 CloudAtlas.every_single_other_soul,
["Dr Henry Goose", "Isaac Sachs"]
  .reduce(initial_state){|state, life|
   soul, others, explorations = state
   new_soul, new_others, exploration = soul.explore_soul(life, others)
    [new_soul, new_others, explorations + [exploration]]
 # this still goes on for like 3 hours...
```



Functional Purity Every time you call a function, it's the same

There are no side causes There are no side effects

Functional Purity

All you have are arguments you get given All you can do is compute something, and return it

If you call it again with the same arguments, it *must* return the same result



Functional Purity \rightarrow No |0 → **No** random \rightarrow **No** current time \rightarrow **No** threads \rightarrow **No** state in other objects → **No** Tom Hanks gifs




def gif_my_tom(tom) tom_gif = TomHanksMemeService.download_a_tom_gif!(tom) cache_image(tom_gif) tom.image = tom_gif tom.updated_at = Time.now tom.save_to_the_database! end



def actually_thats_a_whole_separate_talk() # I've only got 30 minutes 👋 # short: Google "Functional Core, Imperative Shell" # longer: grab me for 🛸 / 🗊 later # much longer: "Monads are just monoids in the category of endofunctors" # end

So?... What actually is functional programming?

→ Statelessness
 → Immutability
 → Functional Purity

What actually *is* functional programming? TL;DR? Expressing your logic like maths operations

Stop thinking of a list of imperative instructions **Start** thinking how you can transform your data

Don't think about *how* it needs to happen Think about *what* needs to happen



Seems like a lot of messing around...



Functions fit in our brains

Less to think about Less to go wrong

The CPU couldn't care less

even if all your code was reams of global variables and a mess of spaghetti goto statements

Our brains need simple structures

 \rightarrow We can create it \rightarrow We can reason about it \rightarrow We can test it \rightarrow We can maintain it \rightarrow We can change it

But Ruby is an OO language though, right? **Everything is a function if** you squint hard enough

Plain Old (Immutable) Ruby Objects

```
class TomHanks
 def initialize(movies = [], damage_cost = 0)
    amovies = movies
   @damage_cost = damage_cost
  end
```

```
def add_movie_damage(movie, damage)
   TomHanks.new(@movies + [movie], @damage cost + damage)
 end
end
```

```
tom = TomHanks.new()
destructive tom = tom.add movie damage("Forest Gump", 50 000 000)
```

Plain Old Ruby Objects

I thought you said **state** was bad, and we need to do statelessness?



Plain Old Ruby Objects

I thought you said **state** was bad, and we need to do statelessness? Everything is a function if you squint hard enough



Everything is a function if you squint hard enough

self is just an implicit variable passed to a function. If you treat it like that, it's *ok*.

t hard enough d to a function. *ok*.

What would Python do?

```
class TomHanks:
  def __init__(self, movies = [], damage_cost = 0):
    self.movies = movies
    self.damage_cost = damage_cost
  def add_movie_damage(self, movie, damage):
    return TomHanks(self.movies + [movie], self.damage cost + damage)
```

```
tom = TomHanks()
```

destructive_tom = tom.add_movie_damage("Forest Gump", 50000000)

also_destructive_tom = TomHanks.add_movie_damage(tom, "Forest Gump", 50000000)

What would Elixir do?

```
defmodule TomHanks do
  defstruct [movies: [], damage_cost: 0]
  def add_movie_damage(tom, movie, damage) do
    %TomHanks{tom |
      movies: [tom.movies | movie],
      damage_cost: tom.damage_cost + damage
    }
  end
end
```

```
tom = %TomHanks{}
destructive_tom = TomHanks.add_movie_damage(tom, "Forest Gump", 50_000_000)
```

We get something else for free with Ruby methods Blocks

Blocks

Let you pass an anonymous function to any Ruby method

class Apollo13 # ... def stir_oxygen_tanks? @oxygen_tanks.any?{|tank| yield tank} end end

Blocks let you choose different implementations

```
class Apollo13
 # ...
  def stir_oxygen_tanks?
   @oxygen_tanks.any?{|tank| yield tank}
  end
end
apollo13.stir_oxygen_tanks?{|tank|
  !tank.stirred today?
apollo13.stir_oxygen_tanks?{|tank|
  tank.pressure_sensor_malfunctioning?
```

Two ways to call blocks {} VS do ... end

apollo13.stir_oxygen_tanks?{|tank| tank.stirred today? }

apollo13.stir_oxygen_tanks? do tank tank.stirred today? end



Controversial block syntax opinion

Use {} for when you care about the returned value

Use do ... end for side effects

Ignore line count

Controversial block syntax opinion

should_stir = apollo13.stir_oxygen_tanks?{ tank tank.pressure_sensor_malfunctioning?

apollo13.stir_oxygen_tanks do |tank| if tank.number == 2 tank.explode! tom.say "Houston, we have a problem" end end

Communicate intent with {} or do ... end It's not about dogmatic whitespace rules

If you use Rubocop Set block delimiters to semantic

#.rubocop.yml Style/BlockDelimters: EnforcedStyle: semantic



Object#then is super cool

remove state from your context put it in a block

```
damage_cost = MovieModel.find_tom_hanks_movies().then{|movies|
  # I can see `movies` here
  do stuff(movies)
  do other stuff(movies)
 I can not see `movies` here
# statelessness is preserved
```



then is super cool

The implementation is trivial and elegant though

```
class Object
  def yield_self
    yield self
  end
```

alias then yield_self end

The thing is though... Blocks don't really exist

Not as objects at least. Syntax sugar for passing a bunch of code

What if we want to grab hold of a block?

class Apollo13

- # ...
- # prefix last argument with &
- def stir_oxygen_tanks?(&should_stir)

then you can use it like any other object
@oxygen_tanks.any?{|tank| should_stir.(tank)}
end

end

Now we have it, we can pass it around

class Apollo13 # ... def stir_oxygen_tanks?(&should_stir) # prefix it with & again to pass as a block @oxygen tanks.any?(&should stir) end end

What is this captured block thing?

- def do_block(&block)
 block.inspect
 end
- do_block { "I'm a \$" }
 # "#<Proc:0x00007f8e35173c00@(irb):35>"

A block you grab with & is a Proc object

procs =~ lambdas (mostly...)

We'll use them interchangably in this talk There are some subtle differences

We'll ignore that for today



Procs (and lambdas) are first class functions

"first class" just means something you can assign to a value, and pass around like anything else

procs are first class anonymous functions (aka lambdas)

```
my_proc = proc{|x,y| x + y}
my_proc.(1,2)
# 3
my_lambda = lambda{|x,y| x + y}
my_lambda.(1,2)
# 3
my_lambda = ->(x,y){x + y}
```

my_lambda.(1,2)

3
Lambdas can be passed as blocks with the & operator

missions = [apollo11, apollo12, apollo13, ...]

```
mission result = ->(mission){
  if mission.tom hanks is commander?
    "Houston, we have a problem"
```

```
else
 "success"
end
```

```
missions.map(&mission result)
["success", "success", "Houston, we have a problem", ...]
```



Lambdas can be passed as blocks with the ${\bf B}$ operator

More about & later...

Currying

curried_add.(2) #<Proc:0x0000125...> curried_add.(2).(3) #<Proc:0x0000126...> curried_add.(2).(3).(4) # 9

curry creates a curried lamba

add = ->(x,y,z){x + y + z} #<Proc:0x0000123...> add.(2,3,4)# 9

curried add = add.curry curried_add.(2) curried add.(2).(3)curried add.(2).(3).(4)

#<Proc:0x0000124...> #<Proc:0x0000125...> #<Proc:0x0000126...> # 9

Lambdas can be partially applied

Kinda like dynamically setting default args

Useful if you need to pass extra args and do "dependency injection"

(like config, or some other context)

add_two = curried_add.(2) add two.(3)add_two.(3).(4)add two.(3, 4)

#<Proc:0x0000127...> #<Proc:0x0000128...> # 9 # 9

Lambdas can be partially applied

```
mission_result -> (flight_director, crew){
  if flight_director.is_ed_harris?
    "Failure is not an option"
  else
    successful_if_crew_does_ok(crew)
  end
```

but our report function doesn't know about flight directors... def mission_report(mission, &result_lambda) "for #{mission.name}, the result was: #{result_lamba.call(mission.crew)}"

```
end
```

```
# so we curry our lambda
mission_result_with_ed = mission_result.curry.call(ed_harris)
mission_report(apollo13, &mission_result_with_ed)
# Failure is not an option
```

Lambdas can be composed with << and >>

add_two = $->(x) \{x + 2\}$ times_three = $->(x) \{x * 3\}$

(add_two << times_three).(4)
add_two.(times_three.(4))
(4 * 3) + 2 == 14</pre>

(add_two >> times_three).(4)
times_three.(add_two.(4))
(4 + 2) * 3 == 18

There are many ways to call a lambda

my_lambda.(foo) my lambda.call(foo) my lambda[foo] my lambda === foo # so you can use in case statements my lambda.yield(foo)

yield... That's interesting...

Remember blocks?

class Apollo13 # ... def stir_oxygen_tanks? @oxygen_tanks.any?{|tank| yield tank} end end

```
apollo13.stir_oxygen_tanks?{|tank|
  !tank.stirred_today?
```



Remember blocks?

Blocks are called with yield... lambdas are called with yield



This gives us insight into how yield works



Remember blocks?

So these code snippets are equivalent

def stir_oxygen_tanks? @oxygen_tanks.any?{|tank| yield tank} end

def stir_oxygen_tanks?(&should_stir) @oxygen_tanks.any?{|tank| should_stir.yield(tank) } end



yield is not doing anything magic

Just calling the implicit block



What was that thing about the ε operator before? & converts an object into a block

What was that thing about the B operator before?B converts an object into a block

Objects... like lambdas and procs

& converts an object into a block

Which is how we can pass a lambda as a block

missions = [apollo11, apollo12, apollo13, ...]

```
mission_result = ->(mission){
    if mission.tom_hanks_is_commander?
        "Houston, we have a problem"
    else
        "success"
    end
}
```

```
missions.map(&mission_result)
["success", "success", "Houston, we have a problem", ...]
```

o a block a as a block

& converts an object into a block

It works with other things too. Like symbols... [1, -3, 2, -4].select(&:positive?) # [1,2]

Under the hood, it's just calling to_proc on the symbol

```
class Symbol
  def to_proc # simplified...
   ->(obj){ obj.send(self) }
   end
end
```

```
[1, -3, 2, -4].select(&:positive?)
```

```
is_pos = :positive?.to_proc
[1, -3, 2, -4].select(&is_pos) # [1, 2]
```

is_pos2 = ->(x){x.send(:positive?)
[1, -3, 2, -4].select(&is_pos2)

You can convert your code to lambdas too

Use & operator, and implement to_proc

```
class Adder
  def initialize(addend)
    @addend = addend
  end
  def to_proc
    ->(x)\{x + addend\}
  end
end
add_two = Adder.new(2)
[2,5,1,7].map(&add_two)
# [4, 5, 3, 9]
```

Functions love recursion

```
def factorial(n, acc=1)
    if n <= 1
        acc
        else
        factorial(n-1, n*acc)
        end
end</pre>
```

```
factorial(1) # 1
factorial(5) # 120
```

Functions love recursion Ruby's stack *doesn't* love recursion though...

factorial(100000) # Oh oh...
stack level too deep (SystemStackError)

Traceback (most recent call last): 10080: from factorial.rb:14:in `<main>' 10079: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial' 10078: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial' 10077: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial' 10076: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial' 10075: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial' 10074: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial' 10073: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial' ... 10068 levels... 4: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial' 3: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial' 1: from factorial.rb:5:in `factorial'

Each function call goes on the stack

Too many, and you'll overflow it eventually

Luckily, we have a tail call optimisation

A function is "tail recursive" if the last thing a function does is return a value and **nothing** else afterwards

```
def factorial(n, acc=1)
  if n <= 1
    # last thing in this branch 🗹
    acc
  else
    # last thing in this branch 🗹
    factorial(n-1, n*acc)
  end
end
```

Enabling tail call optimisation

main.rb
RubyVM::InstructionSequence.compile_option = {
 tailcall_optimization: true,
 trace_instruction: false
}
require_relative 'factorial'

factorial(100000)
28242294079603478742934215...
Nice

What did all those cool tricks have in common? **The Three things**

- \rightarrow statelessness \rightarrow immutability \rightarrow functional purity
- \rightarrow (And Tom Hanks trashing stuff)

Statelessness, immutability, and purity

If you take anything away from today:

Statelessness, immutability, and purity

If you take anything away from today:

90% of functional programming is about those three things

They let you make functions that fit in your brain

AND HATS ALL HAVE



IOSAVABOUTHAI



Thank vou. **Cool Functional Tricks In Ruby**

Julian Doherty <u>@madlep</u> juliandoherty.com

