

SICP-Problem set 5

Jinfeng Lin

April 12, 2015

1 Homework

1.1 Exercise 4.6

See in the code file.

1.2 Exercise 4.7

It is enough to add the `(eval (let*-let-nested-lets exp) env)` to `eval` to let the `let*` run. Because we have rewrite the `let*` into `let` and first call will call on `let*`? clause, while the second one will come back to `let`?. So no extra work need to be done to let it run.

1.3 Exercise 4.13

I think it is better to just unbind the current frame. Because other wise this function would be dangerous. Any function have the right to interfere other function's performance. If some function overload basic operator like `+` and then decide to unbind it, then any function's `+` will be disabled. So I chose to unbind in the current frame.

1.4 Exercise 4.15

Assuming the `try` function works, then `(try try)`'s behaviors depend on the `if` clause of `(halts? p p)`. If `try` could halt `try` then `if(halts? p p)` will go to true branch which will run-forever; Other wise if `try` could not halt `try` then `(halts? try try)` return false, the result is false. So there don't have such a function `halt?`

1.5 Exercise Cond vs If

If itself now become a procedure which means that the branches will be evaluated as the prediction does. In the normal scheme, the prediction is evaluated before the two branches. So the factorial function now could never hit the 1 clause any more, it will keep evaluating the recursive branch, so if you run `(factorial 3)` you will get a error report.

2 Building Evaluator