

Tuesday Lecture Week 8

Updated Feb 27, 2018

Storage management and scheme

objects in scheme are allocated dynamically and are never freed like Java, Python, ML, but NOT like C and C++

types are latent, not manifest

dynamic type checking for latent types

static type checking for manifest types

python also has latent types

java, ml, c and c++ have more like manifest types

static scoping, can look at each identifier and look at who did it, so scheme is like java, python, c, ml, what language is scheme unlike? some have dynamic scoping, if you look at identifier, you might not know where declaration might be, you have to run the program to find out how scoping works, one example is lisp. in lisp if you're trying to look up the value of an identifier, you look at the caller's identifiers

contrast to this, to static scoping which is used in most languages -- static scoping if we have nested functions works as follows: look at current function, if you don't find it, you look in definer's, then in definer's definer, etc. static scoping means you follow the static chain, where every frame points at its definer's frame

with dynamic scoping, follow dynamic frame, find in caller's frame, etc

both make sense and when they decided to define lisp, they decided to do dynamic scoping because it's easier and cheaper. because you don't need to maintain static frames. static scoping has higher probability and reliability

another advantage of static scoping is efficiency

if you know that the variable is in your definer's function, it's cheap to find the value of a statically scoped variable

w/ dynamic scoping, everytime you look up a variable not in this function, you enter a loop and that loop might take a while

so dynamic scoping is less efficient and less reliable

if your caller set path in that environment, you inherit that
 the shell environment also uses dynamic scoping
 advantage: means you can set a variable in your program and adjust behavior of
 everything you run without that software knowing or caring
 so you get extra flexibility with dynamic scoping
 not something you can easily do with static scoping
 lets you reach into code in ways you couldn't do before
 w/ a global variable, you declare it, someone includes it, and so that they can see it, then
 they statically know the variable exists
 we could have modified the shell to use static scoping, and then everyone to include PATH,
 but it's a hassle
 we want it to be simple and flexible so we do dynamic scoping

```
(define y 12)
(define f(lambda(x) (+x y)))
(define g(lambda(y) (f 17)))
(g 6)
```

when g runs, the y in second line we talk about is the y that's 12 in first line in scheme
 if we did this in lisp, then this y in second line is the y in the third line
 lambda is a long version

scheme uses call by value, which is almost like all the languages we've seen before. one
 language that doesn't is prolog
 evaluate all the arguments to the functions first and then take copies of those values and
 then the function can play w/ those values
 scheme folks want you to know they don't use the fancy ones we'll talk about later there's
 other calling functions
 scheme has a wide variety of built in object types, including a type some languages don't
 have, called procedures
 in scheme, procedures are first class values, some called functions, and we don't treat them
 specially in scheme, they're just objects like any other objects
 no special syntax for them the idea is that you shouldn't think of procedures as being in a
 separate namespace, they're just objects and they're values
 in particular, there's a variety of procedures, include continuations these are special
 procedures that are kinda like cut, reach in and alter flow of control. that's what
 continuations do in scheme, they let you change how scheme interpreter behaves. you can
 call them whenever, and start using scissors on interpreter.
 scheme has a very simple syntax, has a property that's very useful: has a straightforward

representation as data

this is one of the key features of the language, easy to write scheme programs that generate other scheme programs

style of generation is different from higher order programming in ML

you're writing a higher order function w/ a different feel than ML

w/ scheme, you can just write

say you have this

```
(let a (x y)(cons x y))
```

we can say here's a piece of data

can do this w/ java or c++

key advantage of lisp and scheme over others, backbone of AI. you want your programs to be smarter, so you write programs that generate programs

your programs mutate, they change themselves, which is easy to do in lisp and scheme

when lisp was first designed, they couldn't decide on the syntax and they were in a rush to get it out

so simple syntax w/ parentheses

in scheme, tail recursion optimization is required

constraint on the implementation, implementation is required to avoid overflowing the stack as long as your code is tail recursive

tail recursion optimization says if the last thing your function does is call another function, f calls g, and it returns whatever g returns, then the compiler is required to optimize the call such a way that we don't grow the stack

scheme has high level arithmetic, they try to get at least integer arithmetic and rational to work correctly

don't have to worry about integer overflow

no integer overflow

if you want to be computing w/ fractions, you can do so without having any rounding error get exact integer arithmetic

so $1/3$ is a number, equals $1/3$ EXACTLY, no rounding error

multiple precision arithmetic, uses strings of smaller numbers instead of one large string

suppose I keep getting bigger and bigger integers

say I take a big number and square it

of words needed to represent is gonna double, then you run out of memory

integer overflow in scheme is the same thing as memory exhaustion

so do heavy arithmetic in C but represent in Scheme?

Scheme does have floating point, and it has complex

syntax of scheme:

SYNTAX OF SCHEME.

letters and identifiers in scheme

'a means yield the symbol of a without the value of a

quasi quoting

it works like quoting, except you're allowed to stop quoting in the middle of the expression and start evaluating

``(+, x y)`

what this means is please return a list that's three elements

evaluate the sub expression

define and lambda isn't in the syntax? the first element is an identifier, that identifier is a keyword

complete low level syntax of scheme,

scheme keywords:

define id E

you can say i'd like to define a function called caaar

`(define caaar (lambda (x) (car (car (car (x))))))`

`(lambda (x y) E)`

evaluates those expression w/ variables bound

this lambda expression doesn't evaluate E, but just remembers to be evaluated later

special case:

`(lambda () E)` in which case this is a function, just calling E and returning E. called a thunk

(f) with no arguments. if f is a thunk, then we get the value that the thunk returns

these are not the only forms

you can define a lambda expression in which the first thing is not paren, but an identifier like

`(lambda x E)`

this is a procedure that's veryaccepts any number of arguments, passed as a list into x

so when this function is called, x is bound to a list of values these values are the values that were passed to this function

there's a fancier flavor of this:

`(lambda x y, z) E` x is bound to first arg, y to second arg, z is bound to a list of 3rd, 4th, etc

z might be empty if you call function w/ 2 arguments

example of how you might want to use this is if you want to define a printf function to be lambda and it takes a format string followed by any number of args and then it goes and does its thing

`(define printf (lambda (format, args)))`

printf takes one argument and the other arguments

proper list -- has empty list at the end

improper list -- follow that chain and you end up with something not nil

(define list (lambda (x) x))

basic data structure in lisp and scheme is pairs not lists

when we say we have a list, internally what we have is a couple of pairs

since we want to be able to do pairs in general, want to be able to have a syntax for pairs to build, we want to have a syntax for this:

in scheme, every value is an object, all represented by pointers to actual data. you only see the pointers not the actual data

(define (list.x) x) is syntactic sugar for (define list (lambda (x) x))

(define (ngargs, as)) if i called (nargs 5 7 () #f) should be 4

first we check to see if as is 0

(if (null? as)

(if I T E)

anything other than #f counts as true

there's a fancier special form for the keyword: (cond I T) (I2 T2) /first I that returns true, it goes into T

can always write cond in terms of if

(and E1..En) kind of operators like the && in C and Java

the minute it finds one that's false, it stops evaluating and returns #f

walks through expressions right to left and when it finds a false one, then stops evaluating and returns #f

if all of them evaluate to true, then it returns the value of En (the last one conditional and

the difference is that in C, && always returns a boolean but here it can return false or anything

of (E1....En) returns value of first true Ei. the fact that they return arbitrary expressions instead of boolean, could be useful

((LET X1)(Y E2)) (+ (*2X)Y))

we don't really need let

it's kind of like cond, but not like if

same as saying ((lambda (x y) (+ (* 2 x) y)) E1 E2)

when you do let, the order is the same as the order in text, so its easier
read code the way its executed, which is why almost all scheme programmers use let
instead of lambda
because of this equivalence, the scope of x extends

named let -- syntax looks like this: (let f ((())()) unlike order let, in a named let, f is bound to
function, and that function is one has this as a body and formal aramters



Want to save this note?
Sign In/Sign Up

[Terms of Service](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)