## TTC CLEUCO Therese The Ance



We didn't expect you so soon.

It is good to be back. What's next?

Let's look at deep again.

Here is a definition using (if  $\dots$ ):

And let's look at *deepM* with the new version of *deep* included:

```
(define deepM
  (let ((Rs (quote ())))
       (Ns (quote ()))
    (letrec
      (D (lambda (m)))
             (if (zero? m)
                (quote pizza)
                (cons (D (sub1 m))
                  (quote ()))))))
      (lambda(n)
        (let ((exists (find n Ns RS)))
          (if (atom? exists)
              (let ((result (D n)))
                (set! Rs (cons result Rs))
                (set! Ns (cons n Ns))
                result)
              exists))))))
```

Easy: D should refer to deepM instead of itself.

```
(define deepM
  (let ((Rs (quote ())))
       (Ns (quote ())))
    (letrec
      ((D (lambda (m))
             (if (zero? m)
                (quote pizza)
                (cons (deepM (sub1 m)))
                  (quote ()))))))
      (lambda(n)
        (let ((exists (find n Ns RS)))
           (if (atom? exists)
              (let ((result (D n)))
                (set! Rs (cons result Rs))
                (set! Ns (cons n Ns))
                result)
              exists()))))))
```

Can you help D with its work?

Good. Is it true that there is no longer any need for (letrec ...) in deepM

Yes, since D is no longer mentioned in the definition of D.

This means we can use (let ...)

```
(define deepM
 (let ((Rs (quote ()))
       (Ns (quote ())))
    (let
      ((D (lambda (m))
             (if (zero? m)
                (quote pizza)
                (cons (deepM (sub1 m)))
                  (quote ())))))
      (lambda (n)
        (let ((exists (find n Ns RS)))
          (if (atom? exists)
             (let ((result (D n)))
                (set! Rs (cons result Rs))
                (set! Ns (cons n Ns))
                result)
              exists))))))
```

Better: there needs to be only one (let ...) Why?

Because Ns and Rs do not appear in the definition of D

This is true.

```
(define deepM
  (let ((Rs (quote ())))
       (Ns (quote ()))
       (D (lambda (m)))
             (if (zero? m)
                (quote pizza)
                (cons (deepM (sub1 m)))
                  (quote ()))))))
    (lambda (n)
         (let ((exists (find n Ns RS)))
           (if (atom? exists)
              (let ((result (D n)))
                (set! Rs (cons result Rs))
                (set! Ns (cons n Ns))
                result)
              exists)))))
```

Can we replace the one use of D by the expression it names?

Since the definition does not contain (set!  $D ext{ ...}$ ) and D is used in only one place, we can replace D by its value:

What should we place at the dots?

Therefore we can unname an expression that we named with the (let ...)

Yes, that is why the two definitions are equivalent.

Don't you think applying a (lambda ...) immediately to an argument is equivalent to (let ...)

Yes, determining the value of either one means determining the value of the value parts after associating a name with a value.

Complete the following definition of deepM

Is it true that all we got was another  $(\mathbf{let} \dots)$ 

And it introduced a name to name another name.

Is there a (set! $m  ext{}$ ) in the value part of (let $((m n))  ext{}$ )	No. Are you asking whether we should unname again?
We could, couldn't we?	Yes, because now a name is replaced by a name.
(define deepM   (let ((Rs (quote ()))	(if (zero? n)
Wouldn't you like to know how much help deepM gives?	What does that mean?
Once upon a time, we wrote deepM to remember what values deep had for given numbers.	Oh, yes.
How many <i>cons</i> es does <i>deep</i> use to build pizza	None.
How many conses does deep use to build (((((pizza)))))	Five, one for each topping.
How many conses does deep use to build (((pizza)))	Three.

130 Chapter 17

How many conses does deep use to build pizza with a thousand toppings?	1000.
How many conses does deep use to build all possible pizzas with at most a thousand toppings?	That's a big number: the conses of (deep 1000), and the conses of (deep 999), and, and the conses of (deep 0).
You mean 500,500?	Yes, thank you, Carl F. Gauss (1777–1855).
Yes, there is an easy way to determine this number, but we will show you the hard way. It is far more exciting.	Okay.
Guess what it is?	Can we write a function that determines it for us?
Yes, we can write the function $consC$ which returns the same value as $cons$ and counts how many times it sees arguments.	This is no different from writing deepR except that we use add1 to build a number rather than cons to build a list.
	(define consC (let ((N 0)) (lambda (x y) (set! N (add1 N)) (cons x y))))
Don't forget the imaginary name.	$(\underline{\mathbf{define}}\ \underline{N}_1\ 0)$

 $\begin{array}{c} (\underline{\mathbf{define}} \ consC \\ (\mathbf{lambda} \ (x \ y) \end{array}$ 

 $(cons \ x \ y)))$ 

(set!  $\underline{N}_1$  (add1  $\underline{N}_1$ ))

Could we use this function to determine 500,500?

Sure, no problem.

How?

We just need to use consC instead of cons in the definition of deep:

Wasn't this exciting?

Well, not really.

So let's see whether this new deep counts conses

How about determining the value of (deep 5)?

That is easy; we shouldn't bother. What is the value of  $N_1$ 

We don't know, it is imaginary.

But that's how we count conses

How could we possibly see something that is imaginary?

Here is one way.

Is this as if we had written:

```
(define counter)
```

```
(\underline{\mathbf{define}}\ \underline{N}_2\ 0)
```

```
(define consC

(let ((N 0))

(set! counter

(lambda ()

N))

(lambda (x y)

(set! N (add1 N))

(cons x y))))
```

```
egin{aligned} & (	extbf{define} \ counter \ & (	extbf{lambda} \ () \ & \underline{N}_2)) \end{aligned}
```

```
 \begin{array}{l} (\underline{\mathbf{define}} \ consC \\ (\mathbf{lambda} \ (x \ y) \\ (\mathbf{set!} \ \underline{N_2} \ (add1 \ \underline{N_2})) \\ (cons \ x \ y))) \end{array}
```

Yes, what does counter refer to?	A function, perhaps?
Have we ever seen an incomplete definition before?	No, it looks strange.
(define counter)	
It just means that we do not care what the first value of <i>counter</i> is,	because we immediately change it?
Correct. But how many arguments does counter take?	None?
None!	So how do we use it?
What is the value of (counter)	It is whatever $\underline{N}_2$ refers to.
And what does $N_2$ refer to?	At this time, 0.
What is the value of (deep 5)	((((((pizza))))).
What is the value of (counter)	5?
Yes, 5	How did that happen? "Each time $consC$ is used, one is added to $\underline{N}_2$ . And the answer to $(counter)$ always refers to whatever $\underline{N}_2$ refers to."
What is the value of (deep 7)	(((((((pizza))))))).
What is the value of (counter)	Obvious: 12.

Is it clear now how we determine 500,500?

Not quite; we need to use *deep* on a thousand and one numbers.

But that is easy. Modify the function supercounter so that it returns the answer of (counter) when it has applied its argument to all the numbers between 0 and 1000

As with (let ...) and (lambda ...), we can also have more than one expression in the value part of a (letrec ...):

```
(\textbf{define } \textit{supercounter} \\ (\textbf{lambda } (f) \\ (\textbf{letrec} \\ \hline \\ (S (\textbf{lambda } (n) \\ (\textbf{if } (\textit{zero? } n) \\ (f n) \\ (\textbf{let } () \\ (f n) \\ (S (\textit{sub1 } n)))))))) \\ (S 1000) \\ (\textit{counter}))))
```

What is the value of (supercounter $f$ ) where $f$ is $deep$	500512.
Is this what we expected?	No! We wanted 500500.
Where did the extra 12 come from?	Are these the leftovers from the previous experiments?
That's correct.	We should not have leftovers.
Let's get rid of them.	How?
Good question! Write a function set-counter	What does it do?

134 Chapter 17

The function *set-counter* and *counter* are opposites. Instead of getting the value of the imaginary name, it sets it.

We could modify the definition of cons C.

```
(define counter)
```

```
(define set-counter)
```

```
(define consC

(let ((N 0))

(set! counter

(lambda ()

N))

(set! set-counter

(lambda (x)

(set! N x)))

(lambda (x y)

(set! N (add1 N))

(cons x y))))
```

And what happens now?

We get three functions and an imaginary name:

```
(define N_3 0)
```

```
rac{(	extbf{define}\ counter}{(	extbf{lambda}\ ()} \ rac{N_3}{}))
```

```
 \begin{array}{c} (\underline{\mathbf{define}} \ consC \\ (\mathbf{lambda} \ (x \ y) \\ (\mathbf{set!} \ \underline{N}_3 \ (add1 \ \underline{N}_3)) \\ (cons \ x \ y))) \end{array}
```

Now, what is the value of (set-counter 0)

But?	It changed $\underline{N}_3$ to 0.
What is the value of $(supercounter\ f)$ where $f$ is $deep$	500500.
Is this what we expected?	Yes!
It is time to see how many <i>conses</i> are used for ( <i>deepM</i> 5)	Don't we need to modify its definition so that it uses $consC$ ?
Of course! What are you waiting for?	(define deepM (let ((Rs (quote ()))
How many $cons$ es does $deepM$ use to build $(((((pizza)))))$	Probably five?
What is the value of (counter)	500505.
Yes!	Yes, but it means we forgot to initialize with set-counter.

What is the value of (set-counter 0)	
How many $conses$ does $deepM$ use to build $(((((pizza)))))$	Five.
What is the value of (counter)	5.
What is the value of (deep 7)	(((((((pizza))))))).
What is the value of (counter)	Obvious: 7.
Didn't we need to set-counter to 0	No, we wanted to count the number of conses that were needed to build (deepM 5) and (deepM 7).
Why isn't this 12	Because that was the point of deepM.
What is (supercounter $f$ ) where $f$ is $deepM$	Don't we need to initialize?
No. What is (supercounter $f$ ) where $f$ is $deepM$	1000.
How many more <i>conses</i> does <i>deep</i> use to return the same value as <i>deepM</i>	499,500.
"A LISP programmer knows the value of everything but the cost of nothing."	Thank you, Alan J. Perlis (1922–1990).

But we know the value of food!

```
(((((((((((((((more pizza))))))))))))))))))))
  (((((((((((((more pizza))))))))))))))))))
   (((((((((((((more pizza))))))))))))))))
    ((((((((((((more pizza))))))))))))))))
     (((((((((((more pizza))))))))))))
      ((((((((((more pizza))))))))))
       (((((((((more pizza)))))))))
        ((((((((more pizza)))))))))
         (((((((more pizza)))))))
         ((((((more pizza))))))
          (((((more pizza)))))
           ((((more pizza))))
            (((more pizza)))
             ((more pizza))
              (more pizza)
               more pizza)
```

138 Chapter 17

Here is rember1\* again:

```
(define rember1*
  (lambda (a l)
    (letrec
      ((R (lambda (l oh))
              (cond
                ((null? l)
                 (oh (quote no)))
                ((atom? (car l))
                 (if (eq? (car l) a)
                     (cdr \ l)
                     (cons\ (car\ l)
                       (R (cdr l) oh)))
                (else
                   (let ((new-car
                          (letcc oh
                             (R (car l)
                               oh))))
                     (if (atom? new-car)
                         (cons (car l)
                           (R (cdr l) oh))
                         (cons new-car
                           (cdr\ l))))))))))
      (let ((new-l (letcc oh (R l oh))))
        (if (atom? new-l)
            new-l)))))
```

Write it again using our counting version of cons

This is a safe version of the last definition we saw in chapter 14:

```
(define rember 1 *C
  (lambda (a l)
    (letrec
      ((R (lambda (l oh))
              (cond
                ((null? l)
                 (oh (quote no)))
                 ((atom? (car l))
                 (if (eq? (car \ l) \ a)
                     (cdr \ l)
                     (consC (car l)
                       (R (cdr l) oh)))
                (else
                   (let ((new-car
                           (letcc oh
                             (R (car l)
                               oh))))
                     (if (atom? new-car)
                         (consC (car l))
                           (R (cdr l) oh))
                         (consC new-car
                           (cdr\ l))))))))))
      (let ((new-l (letcc oh (R l oh))))
        (if (atom? new-l)
            new-l)))))
```

What is the value of (set-counter 0)

```
What is the value of ((food) more (food)), (rember1*C \ a \ l) because this list does not contain noodles. where a is noodles and l is ((food) more (food))
```

And what is the value of (counter)

0, because we never used *consC*. We always used the compass needle and the North Pole to get rid of pending *consC*es.

Do you also remember the first good version of rember1\*

```
(define rember1*
  (lambda (a l)
     (letrec
       ((R (lambda (l)
               (cond
                  ((null? l) (quote ()))
                  ((atom? (car l))
                   (if (eq? (car \ l) \ a)
                       (cdr l)
                       (cons\ (car\ l)
                         (R (cdr l))))
                  (else
                    (\mathbf{let}\ ((\mathit{av}\ (R\ (\mathit{car}\ l)))))
                       (if (eqlist? (car \ l) \ av)
                           (cons (car l)
                             (R (cdr l))
                           (cons av
                              (cdr \ l))))))))))
       (R \ l))))
```

Rewrite it, too, using consC

It is the version that failed by repeatedly checking whether anything had changed for the *car* of a list that was a list:

```
(define rember 1 *C2
  (lambda (a l))
    (letrec
       ((R (lambda (l))
               (cond
                 ((null? l) (quote ()))
                 ((atom? (car l))
                  (if (eq? (car \ l) \ a)
                      (cdr l)
                      (consC (car l))
                         (R((cdr(l)))))
                 (else
                    (\mathbf{let}\ ((\mathit{av}\ (R\ (\mathit{car}\ l))))
                      (if (eqlist? (car l) av)
                          (consC (car l))
                            (R (cdr l))
                          (consC av
                            (cdr\ l))))))))))
       (R l))))
```

What is the value of (set-counter 0)

```
What is the value of ((food) more (food)).

(consC (consC f (quote ()))

(consC (consC f (quote ()))

(quote ()))))

where
f is food
and
m is more
```

What is the value of (counter)	5.
What is the value of (set-counter 0)	
(rember1*C2 a l) where    a is noodles and    l is ((food) more (food))	((food) more (food)), because this list does not contain noodles.
And what is the value of (counter)	5, because rember1*C2 needs five consCs to rebuild the list ((food) more (food)).
What food are you in the mood for now?	Find a good restaurant that specializes in it and dine there tonight.