

211hw5

Homework 5 (Due Friday 2/19/2009 at 10:00am)

Submit this assignment via Owl-Space In contrast to the previous assignments, submit each problem in a separate .ss file: 1.ss, 2.ss, 3.ss, and 4.ss (if you do the extra credit problem). Unfortunately, none of the languages supported by DrScheme will allow these files to be combined. The *Pretty Big* Scheme language allows top-level identifiers (functions and variables) to be redefined, but it does *not* support check-expect. All of the student languages--the only ones that support check-expect--prohibit redefinition.

Embed answers that are not program text in a Scheme block comment or block commenting brackets (#| and |#).

Use the Intermediate Student with lambda language.

Given the Scheme structure definitions:

```
(define-struct sum (left right))
(define-struct prod (left right))
(define-struct diff (left right))
(define-struct quot (left right))
```

an arith-expr is either:

- a number n,
- a sum (make-sum ae1 ae2),
- a product (make-prod ae1 ae2),
- a difference (make-diff ae1 ae2), or
- a quotient (make-quot ae1 ae2)

where n is a Scheme number, and ae1 and ae2 are arith-exprs.

The following 4 exercises involve the data type arith-expr. If you are asked to write a function(s), follow the design recipe: contract, purpose, examples /tests, template instantiation, code, testing (which happens automatically when the examples are given in (check-expect . . .) form). Follow the same recipe for any help function that you introduce.

1. (40 pts.) Write an evaluator for arithmetic expressions as follows:
 - Write the (function) template for arith-expr
 - Write a function to-list that maps an arith-expr to the corresponding "list" representation in Scheme. Numbers are unchanged. Some other examples include:

```
(to-list (make-sum (make-prod 4 7) 25)) => '(+ (* 4 7) 25)
(to-list (make-quot (make-diff 4 7) 25)) => '(/ (- 4 7) 25)
```

Note: you need to define the output type (named scheme-expr) for this function, but you can omit the template because this assignment does not include any functions that process this type.

- Write a function eval: arith-expr -> number that evaluates an arith-expr. Your evaluator should produce exactly the same result for an arith-expr E that Scheme evaluation would produce for the list representation (to-list E).
2. (40 pts.) Extend the definition of <arith-expr> as follows:
 - Add a clause for variables represented as Scheme symbols.
 - Write the (function) template for this definition.
 - Modify your definition of to-list to support the new definition of arith-expr.
 - Given the Scheme structure definition:

```
(define-structure binding (var val))
```

a binding is (make-binding s n) where s is a symbol and n is a number and an environment is a (list-of binding). Write a (function) template for processing an environment.

- Define a top-level variable (constant) empty-env that is bound to the empty environment.
- Write a function extend that takes environment env, a symbol s, and a number n, and returns an extended environment identical to env except that it adds the additional binding of s to n. The definition of extend trivial; it requires no recursion. As a result, extend satisfies the invariant

```
(check-expect (extend empty-env s n) (list (make-binding s n)))
```

In the remainder of the problem, use empty-env and extend to define example environments for test cases.

- Write a function lookup that takes a symbol s and an environment env and returns the first binding in env with a var component that equals s. If no match is found, lookup returns empty. Note that the return type of lookup is not simply binding. Define the a new union type called option-binding for the the return type.

- Write a new `eval` function for the new definition of `arith-expr`. The new `eval` takes *two* arguments: an `arith-expr` `E` to evaluate and an environment `env` specifying the values of free variables in `E`. For example,

```
(eval 'x (extend empty-env 'x 17)) => 17
(eval (make-prod 4 7) (extend empty-env 'x 17)) = 28
(eval 'y (extend empty-env 'x 17)) => some form of run-time error
```

If an `arith-expr` `E` contains a free variable that is not bound in the environment `env`, then `(eval E env)` will naturally produce some form of run-time error if you have correctly coded `eval`. Do *not* explicitly test for this form of error.

- (20 pts.) An environment is really a finite function (a finite set of ordered pairs). It is *finite* in the sense that it can be completely defined by a finite table, which is not true of nearly all the primitive and library functions in Scheme (and other programming languages). Even the identity function is *not* finite. For the purpose of this exercise, we redefine the type environment as `(symbol -> option-binding)`.
 - Rewrite `eval` to use environment defined as a finite function in `(symbol -> option-binding)` instead of as a `(list-of option-binding)`. If you cleanly coded your definition of `eval` in the preceding problem using `lookup`, `make-binding`, and `extend`, all that you have to do to your solution to the previous problem is redefine the bindings of `lookup`, `empty-env`, and `extend`, and revise your test cases for `extend`. You can literally copy the entire text of your solution to problem 2; change the definitions of `lookup`, `empty-env`, and `extend`; update your documentation (annotations) concerning the environment type; and revise your tests for `extend`. Note that `extend` cannot be tested (since the result is a function!) without using `lookup` to examine it. (If you wrote a correct solution to problem 2, you can do this problem in less than 15 minutes!)
Hint: you can use lambda-notation to define a constant function for `empty-env` and `extend` can be defined as a functional that takes a function (representing an environment) and adds a new pair to the function--using a `if` embedded inside a lambda-expression.
- Extra Credit (50 pts.) Add support for lambda-expressions in your evaluator as follows:
 - Extend the definition of `<arith-expr>` by adding a clause for unary lambda-expressions and a clause for unary applications of an `arith-expr` to an `arith-expr`. Use the name `lam` for the structure representing a lambda-expression and the names `var` and `body` for the accessors of this structure. Use the name `app` for the structure representing an application and the names `head` and `arg` for the accessors of this structure. Note that the head of an `app` is an `arith-expr` not a `lam`.
 - Write a (function) template for the newest definition of `arith-expr`.
 - Extend the definition of `to-list` to support the newest definition of `arith-expr`.
 - Extend the definition of `eval` to support the newest definition of `arith-expr`. Note that `eval` can now return functions as well as numbers. Your biggest challenge is determining a good representation for function values. What does `eval` return for a `lam` input? That input may contain free variables. In principle, you could represent the value of the `lam` input by a revised `lam` (with no free variables) obtained by substituting the values for free variables from the environment input (just like we do in hand-evaluation). But this approach is tedious and computationally expensive. A better strategy is to define a structure type (called a *closure*) to represent a function value. The structure type must contain the original `lam` and a description of what substitution would have been made, deferring the actual substitution just as `eval` defers substitutions by maintaining an environment.