

2nd Interpreter of the Term

(Due to Friedman and Felleisen, the authors of TLS)

An L-expression is an S-expression which is either:

- (AND I1 I2), or
- (OR I1 I2), or
- (NOT I1), or
- an arbitrary symbol, which we call a variable

Here I1 and I2 are arbitrary L-expressions, so this is an inductive definition once we add 'and nothing else is an L-expression'

- (a) Write and certify a function `lexp?` which checks whether an S-expression is an L-expression.
- (b) Write and certify a function `covered?` of an L-expression `lexp` and a list of symbols `los` that tests whether all the variables in `lexp` are in `los`.
- (c) For the evaluation of L-expressions we need association lists, or `alists`. An alist for L-expressions is a list of (variable, value) pairs. The variable component is always a symbol, and the value component is either the number 0 (for false) or 1 (for true). Write and certify a function `lookup` of the symbol `var` and the association list `al`, so that `(lookup var al)` returns the value of the first pair in `al` whose `car` is `eq?` to `var`.
- (d) If the list of symbols in an alist for L-expressions contains all the variables of an L-expression `lexp`, then `lexp` is called `_closed_` with respect to this alist. A closed L-expression can be evaluated essentially by substituting the values of the variables given in the alist for the variable occurrences in the L-expression. You are asked to write and certify the function `value` of an L-expression `lexp` and an alist `al`, which, after verifying that `lexp` is closed with respect to `al`, determines whether `lexp` means true or false. If `lexp` is not closed wrt `al`, then `(value lexp al)` should return the symbol `not-covered`.

(a) comprises the pre-evaluation sanity check

(b) and (c) comprise the environment subsystem

```

(b) (define (covered? lexp los)
      (cond ((symbol? lexp) (member? lexp los))
            ((member? lexp 'AND OR)
             (and (covered? (first-arg lexp) los)
                  (covered? (second-arg lexp) los)))
            (else (covered? (first-arg lexp) los))))

```

This is an example of recursive descent, exploiting the inductive structure of LEX.

(c) an example a-list might be

```

((x 0) (y 1) (z 1))

```

i.e., a flat list of bindings. There's no restriction on the number of times a given variable can occur —

eg

```
((x 0) (y 1) (z 1) (z 0))
```

is also an a-list.

The lookup function will ignore all but the first binding for a variable.

```

(define (lookup var alist)
  (cond ((eq? var (caar alist)) (cadr alist))
        (else (lookup var (cdr alist)))))

```

This returns the value from the first (leftmost) binding of var.

Note That $(\text{AND } x \ y)$ means one thing if alist is $((x \ 0) (y \ 1))$, and means something else if alist is $((x \ 1) (y \ 1))$ — explains the need for the alist argument.

(d) We separate checking from evaluation — we are assuming pre-processor value is satisfied — ie, lexp really is in LEXP, and also that $(\text{covered? lexp (map car alist)})$ is true.

(define (value lexp alist) alist is This system's representation of environments.
(cond ((symbol? lexp) (lookup lexp alist))
 ((and? lexp)
 (and (value (first-arg lexp) alist)
 (value (second-arg lexp) alist)))
 ((or? lexp)
 ...
 ((not? lexp)
 ...)))

(define (check-and-evaluate lexp alist)
 (cond ((not (lexp? lexp)) 'syntax-error)
 ((not (covered? lexp (map car alist)))
 'not-covered)

; pre for value guaranteed at this point.
(else (value loop alist)))

it will be useful to notice that a list can be thought of as a stack -

list
cons
car
cdr

stack
push
top
pop

(The left end of the list is the top of the stack)

We will make use of this to implement local variables (and, generally, scope) in the TLS interpreter → ch 10 of The Little Schemer → starting next.

Note that all variables in the LEX system are global

(historical reference: this was true of BASIC in the 1960s as well as of the first versions of FORTRAN)

.....

; For scheme, we need somewhat more complex environment structures.

.....

; to see this, let's consider some lambda forms and their associated environments

; example 1

((lambda (a b)
 (+ a b))
 2 3)

system responds to this call by extending the base environment by adding the rib.

; the expression (+ a b) is evaluated in this environment

; (a b)----|----(2 3)

vars : values ; positional correspondence is assumed.
; essentially the same flat structure used for L-exps, perhaps represented as a pair of lists -- the
; first is a list of names, i.e., (a b), and the second is the list of corresponding values, (2 3)

The lookup procedure here would be to simultaneously cdr down the vars and values lists

But this simple one-rib environment is not always adequate

Consider:

; example 2

```
((lambda (a b)
  (+ a (* b ((lambda (a c) (+ (* a c) b))
    1 2)
  )))
  3 4)
```

; the expression $(+ (* a c) b)$ is evaluated in this environment

```
; (a c) ---|--- (3 4)
;          |
; (a b) ---|--- (1 2)
```

; and can be seen to have value $(+ (* 3 4) 2) = 14$. The search for a given symbol begins with the first environment; proceeding to the second rib only if the symbol does not occur in the first rib. What happens if the symbol does not occur in any rib?

; when this expression has been evaluated, the outer expression $(+ a (* b 14))$ is evaluated in

```
; (a b) ---|--- (1 2)
```

; to give $(+ 1 (* 2 14)) = 29$

; these environment structures are usually described as 'rib-cage environments': you can see the structure, suggested in our diagrams

; clearly, any interpreter is going to need to 'push' and 'pop' ribs at appropriate times.

system sees $((\text{lambda } (a b) \text{ mu})$
 $(1 2))$
and adds the rib

$(a b) \text{ --- } (1 2)$

Using this rib, values for a and b are read out. But then it sees another call — so it adds a second rib,

namely $(a c) \text{ --- } (3 4)$

so that the env. now has 2 ribs

and the values of a and c and b are now determined in the current environment.