Mutation Revisited

- ► ⟨⟨PLAI Chapter 14⟩⟩
- ► We saw in homework 6 that as a side effect of our lookup implementation it was easy to implement
- {set! <id> <FLANG>}
 via

Return value of set!

- ▶ What should be the value of a 'set!' expression? There are three obvious choices:
 - 1. return some bogus value,
 - 2. return the value that was assigned,
 - 3. return the value that was previously in the box.
- Option 2 (return new value) is useful in C

```
x = y = 0
```

```
while (c = getchar()) { ... }
```

- ▶ Option 3 (return old value) is also potentially useful. E.g.:
- x = y = x;
 - ▶ the expression "x = x + 1" has the meaning of C's "++x" when option (2) is used, and "x++" when option (3) is used.)
- access.

Racket chooses the first option, separating mutation from

- ▶ The programmer must explicitely choose what value to return.
- ► This also means that some form of sequencing is needed (e.g. Racket begin forms)

Mutation is a big change

- ▶ The code change is small, but
- ▶ the (target) language change is large
- bindings are not fixed; substitution no longer makes sense as a semantic model.

State and Environments

► There can be only one:

```
Or not:
  (define (make-counter)
    (let ([counter (box 0)])
      (lambda ()
        (begin
          (set-box! counter (+ 1 (unbox
             counter)))
          (unbox counter)))))
  (define foo (make-counter))
  (define bar (make-counter))
```

▶ We don't need the pass by reference semantics of boxes here:

```
(define (make-counter)
  (let ([counter 0])
      (lambda ()
            (begin (set! counter (+ 1 counter))
            counter))))
```

(define foo (make-counter))
(define bar (make-counter))

▶ Mutation and lexical scope are working **together** here

▶ Internal state is invisible (can't even tell it is integer).

Implementing Objects with State

 Mutable state encapsulated by closures gives us a natural implementation of objects

```
(define (make-point x y)
  (let ([the-x x]
        [the-y y])
    (lambda (msg)
      (case msg
        [(getx) the-x]
        [(gety) the-y]
        [(incx) (set! the-x (add1 the-x))])))
(define P (make-point 0 0))
(P 'incx)
(P 'getx)
```

► How do we make this typecheck

[(gety) the-y]; [(incx)]

► Side effects can easily be incorporated in operations

the-x))

[(incx) (begin (set! the-x (add1

(update-screen))]))))

► A simple imitation of inheritance can be achieved using delegation to an instance of the super-class:

Preprocessing yields something like the racket default class system

```
(define point%
  (class object%
    (init x y)
    (super-new)
    (define current-x x)
    (define current-y y)
    (define/public (getx) current-x)
    (define/public (gety) current-x)
    (define/public (incx)
             (set! current-x
                    (add1 current-x)))))
(define P (new point% [x 10] [y 10]))
(send P incx)
(send P getx)
```