Programming Abstractions

Week 11-1: MiniScheme F and G, lambdas and set!

Stephen Checkoway

Announcement

Homework 7 is now up on the website

- Use the same groups as before (this time, they should be created already)
- It's due on the 19th

Review: How do we parse an application like (+ 2 3)?

A. `'(app-exp + 2 3)`

B. `'(app-exp + (2 3))`

C. `'(app-exp (var-exp +) (lit-exp 2) (lit-exp 3))`

D. `'(app-exp (var-exp +) ((lit-exp 2) (lit-exp 3)))`

E. None of the above

At a higher-level of detail

Applications are parsed into two parts

- The expression for the procedure part
- The list of parsed arguments

Evaluating an app-exp

Evaluating an app-exp

How do we evaluate the `app-exp` we get from
`(app-exp parsed-proc list-of-parsed-args)`?

Evaluating an app-exp

How do we evaluate the `app-exp` we get from
`(app-exp parsed-proc list-of-parsed-args)`?

In steps

- We evaluate the `parsed-proc` and the `list-of-parsed-args` in the current environment
- Then we call `apply-proc` with the evaluated procedure and list of arguments

MiniScheme F: Lambdas

EXP →	number	parse into `lit-exp`
	| symbol	parse into `var-exp`
	| (if *EXP EXP EXP*)	parse into `ite-exp`
	| (let (*LET-BINDINGS*) *EXP*)	parse into `let-exp`
	| (lambda (*PARAMS*) *EXP*)	parse into `lambda-exp`
	| (*EXP EXP**)	parse into `app-exp`

LET-BINDINGS → *LET-BINDING**
LET-BINDING → [symbol *EXP*]*
PARAMS → symbol*

Implementing lambdas

Parsing

Parse a lambda expression such as `(lambda (x y z) body)` into a new `lambda-exp` structure

This needs

- The parameter list, e.g., `'(x y z)`
- the parsed `body`

Note that the parameter list is not parsed, it's just a list of symbols

Implementing lambdas

Evaluating

What should a `lambda-exp` evaluate to?

Closures!

We need a closure data type

- `(closure parameter-list body environment)`
- `(closure? obj)`
- `(closure-params c)`
- `(closure-body c)`
- `(closure-env c)`

The `parameter-list` and the `body` come from the `lambda-exp`

The `environment` is the current environment argument to `eval-exp`

Where should the new closure data type be defined? Why?

A. `parse.rkt`

B. `interp.rkt`

C. In the same file as `prim-proc`

D. A and C

E. B and C

To recapitulate

To parse a lambda

- Make a new `lambda-exp` data type to hold parameters and body

To evaluate a lambda

- Make a new `closure` data type to hold the parameters, body, and environment

Nothing new is needed for parsing calls to lambda expressions; why?

Evaluating calls to closures

Recall: All applications are evaluated by calling apply-proc with the evaluated procedure and the list of evaluated arguments

Here's what our apply-proc looks like after homework 6

```
(define (apply-proc proc args)
  (cond [(prim-proc? proc)
         (apply-primitive-op (prim-proc-op proc) args)]
        [else (error 'apply-proc "bad procedure: ~s" proc)]))
```

Evaluating calls to closures

We need to add some code before the `else`

```
(define (apply-proc proc args)
  (cond [(prim-proc? proc)
         (apply-primitive-op (prim-proc-op proc) args)]
        [(closure? proc) …]
        [else (error 'apply-proc "bad procedure: ~s" proc)]))
```

How do we evaluate the closure?

How do we evaluate the closure?

At a high level (don't think about MiniScheme here), given a closure and some arguments, how do we evaluate calling the closure?

How do we evaluate the closure?

At a high level (don't think about MiniScheme here), given a closure and some arguments, how do we evaluate calling the closure?

Steps

- Extend the closure's environment with bindings from the closure's parameters to argument values
- Evaluate the body of the closure in this extended environment

How do we evaluate the closure?

At a high level (don't think about MiniScheme here), given a closure and some arguments, how do we evaluate calling the closure?

Steps

- Extend the closure's environment with bindings from the closure's parameters to argument values
- Evaluate the body of the closure in this extended environment

If you find yourself wanting to pass the environment from `eval-exp` to `apply-proc`, there is something wrong; you don't need to do that

Example: `((lambda (x y) (+ x y)) 3 5)`

Parsing

Parse into an `(app-exp proc args)`

```
'(app-exp (lambda-exp (x y)
                      (app-exp (var-exp +)
                               ((var-exp x)
                                (var-exp y))))
          ((lit-exp 3)
           (lit-exp 5)))
```

Example: `((lambda (x y) (+ x y)) 3 5)`

Evaluating

```
'(app-exp (lambda-exp (x y)
                      (app-exp (var-exp +)
                               ((var-exp x) (var-exp y))))
          ((lit-exp 3) (lit-exp 5)))
```

This is evaluated in the current environment `e` by calling apply-proc with the evaluated procedure and evaluated arguments

The procedure evaluates to

```
'(closure (x y)
          (app-exp (var-exp +)
                   ((var-exp x) (var-exp y)))
          e)
```

The arguments evaluate to `'(3 5)`

Example: `((lambda (x y) (+ x y)) 3 5)`

Evaluating

`apply-proc` will evaluate the closure

```
'(closure (x y)
          (app-exp (var-exp +)
                   ((var-exp x) (var-exp y)))
          e)
```

by calling `eval-exp` on the body in the environment `e[x ↦ 3, y ↦ 5]`

Since the body is an `app-exp`, it'll evaluate `'(var-exp +)` to get `'(prim-proc +)` and the arguments to get `'(3 5)`

Example 2

Parsing

Example 2

Parsing

What is the result of parsing this?

```
(let ([f (lambda (x) (* 2 x))])
  (f 6))
```

Example 2

Parsing

What is the result of parsing this?

```
(let ([f (lambda (x) (* 2 x))])
  (f 6))
```

```
'(let-exp (f)
          ((lambda-exp (x)
                       (app-exp (var-exp *)
                                ((lit-exp 2) (var-exp x)))))
          (app-exp (var-exp f)
                   ((lit-exp 6))))
```

Example 2

Evaluating

```
'(let-exp (f)
          ((lambda-exp (x)
                       (app-exp (var-exp *)
                                ((lit-exp 2) (var-exp x)))))
          (app-exp (var-exp f)
                   ((lit-exp 6))))
```

Evaluate the `let-exp` by extending the current environment `e` with f bound to the closure we get by evaluating the `lambda-exp` in environment `e`:

```
'(closure (x)
          (app-exp (var-exp *) ((lit-exp 2) (var-exp x)))
          e)
```

Example 2

Evaluating

With `f` bound to

```
'(closure (x)
          (app-exp (var-exp *) ((lit-exp 2) (var-exp x)))
          e)
```

we next evaluate the body of the let

```
'(app-exp (var-exp f) ((lit-exp 6)))
```

This will evaluate `'(var-exp f)`, getting the closure above and evaluate the arguments getting '(6)

`apply-proc` will call `eval-exp` on the body of the closure and the extended environment `e[x ↦ 6]`

This is another application expression and the process continues

`set!` expressions

MiniScheme G: set! and begin

EXP → number	parse into `lit-exp`
| symbol	parse into `var-exp`
| (if *EXP EXP EXP*)	parse into `ite-exp`
| (let (*LET-BINDINGS*) *EXP*)	parse into `let-exp`
| (lambda (*PARAMS*) *EXP*)	parse into `lambda-exp`
| (set! symbol *EXP*)	parse into `set-exp`
| (begin *EXP**)	parse into `begin-exp`
| (*EXP EXP**)	parse into `app-exp`

LET-BINDINGS → *LET-BINDING**
LET-BINDING → [symbol *EXP*]*
PARAMS → symbol*

What is the value of

```
(let ([x 10])
  (+ x
     (let ([x 20])
       x)
     x))
```

This is the sum of 3 numbers

A. 30

B. 40

C. 50

D. 60

What is the value of

```
(let ([x 10])
  (+ x
     (begin
       (set! x 20)
       x)
     x))
```

This is the sum of 3 numbers

A. 30

B. 40

C. 50

D. 60

Assignments

Assignment expressions are different in nature than the functional parts of MiniScheme

The `set!` expression introduces mutable state into our language

We're going to use a Scheme `box` to model this state

Boxes in Scheme

`box` is a data type that holds a mutable value

- Constructor: `(box val)`
- Recognizer: `(box? obj)`
- Getter: `(unbox b)`
- Setter: `(set-box! b val)`

Example usage

We can create a `box` holding the value 275 with
`(define b (box 275))`

We can get the value in the box with `(unbox b)`

We can change the value in the box with `(set-box! b 572)`

If we use `(unbox b)` afterward, it'll return 572

This models the way variables work in non-functional languages

Implementing set!

To implement set! in MiniScheme

- Change the environment so that *everything* in the environment is in a box
- When we evaluate a `var-exp`, we'll lookup the variable in the environment, `unbox` the result, and return it
- When we evaluate a set expression such as `(set! x 23)`, we'll lookup `x` in the environment to get its box and then set the value using `set-box!`

We can do this in four simple steps

Implementing `set!`

Step 1

We need to box every value in the environment

Two ways to do this (and I'm quoting Bob here)

- If you are young and cocky and sure you can find every place you extend the environment, you can replace each call
  ```
  (env syms vals old-env)
  ```
  with
  ```
  (env syms (map box vals) old-env)
  ```
- If you have 68 years of experience with screwing up [I'm still quoting Bob here], you might prefer to change the definition of `env` to do
  ```
  (list 'env sims (map box vals) old-env)
  ```

Implementing `set!`

Step 2

Do *not* change your `env-lookup` procedure

Do change the line in eval-exp that evaluates var-exp expressions to

```
[(var-exp? tree) (unbox (env-lookup e (var-exp-sym tree)))]
```

At this point, the interpreter should work exactly as it did before you introduced boxes!

Implementing `set!`

Step 3

Set expressions have the form `(set! sym exp)`

You need a new data type for these, I used `set-exp`

When parsing, put the unparsed symbol (i.e., `'x` rather than `(var-exp 'x)`) into the `set-exp` and the parsed expression

Implementing `set!`

Step 4

Inside eval-exp, you'll need some code

```
[(set-exp? tree)
 (set-box! (env-lookup …)
           (eval-exp …))]
```

Let's make set! useful!

MiniScheme now has set! but it isn't of much use until we can execute a sequence of expressions like

```
(let ([x 0])
  (begin
    (set! x 23)
    (+ x 5)))
```

In Racket, we don't need the `begin`, but we do in MiniScheme because our let expressions only have a single expression as a body

The begin expression

`(begin exp1 exp2 ... expn)`

You need a new data type to hold these

- Since begin creates a sequence of expressions, I called mine `seq-exp` but `begin-exp` is also a good name (and visually distinct from `set-exp`)

To evaluate one of these, you evaluate each expression in turn, returning the final one

- You can create a helper function to do that, or you can use our old friend: `foldl`
- My code looks something like `(foldl (λ (exp acc) (eval-exp exp e)) (void) …)`
- `(void)` returns, well, a void value which does nothing