

# Evaluating Functional Scheme Programs

Comp 210

Spring 2001

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Conventions</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Evaluating Expressions</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1	Values are values, are values, ...	1
2.2	Conditionals	2
2.2.1	The Laws of if	2
2.2.2	The Laws of cond	2
2.3	The Laws of Application	3
2.3.1	Primitive applications	3
2.3.2	lambda applications	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Evaluating definitions</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Rules for local	5

## 1 Conventions

*Evaluating* an expression means finding a value for that expression. We use a step-by-step process to repeatedly simplify an expression until it is so simple that it is a value. Evaluating a program means evaluating each of its expressions (all but the last of which are definitions) in turn.

A law of the form

$$P = Q$$

where  $P$  and  $Q$  are program fragments (expressions or sequences of expressions) means that  $P$  and  $Q$  have the same behavior; one can be substituted for the other without changing the meaning of the program. Hence,  $=$  means exactly what it means in high school algebra. In addition, every law

$$P = Q$$

has the property that  $Q$  is “closer” to an answer (assuming one exists) than  $P$ .

$E, E_1, E_2, \dots$  are expressions.  $V, V_1, V_2, \dots$  are values.  $n, n_1, n_2, \dots$  are names (variables, placeholders).  $N$  is a non-negative integer.

## 2 Evaluating Expressions

Some syntactically well-formed expressions—such as  $(+ 'a 2)$ ,  $(first\ empty)$ ,  $(1\ 2)$ , etc.—do not have a value according to these rules. We say that evaluation of such expressions “sticks”.

### 2.1 Values are values, are values, ...

Values are the answers produced by computations. Every value is also an expression, but no evaluation is required (or possible!).

Some examples:

Value	Kind of Value
0	number (exact)
1/3	number (exact)
0.3333333333333333	number (inexact)
6.023e23	number (inexact)
<i>true</i>	boolean
<i>false</i>	boolean
'piston	symbol
"Scheme"	string
<i>empty</i>	list
$(cons\ 'a\ empty)$	list
$(list\ 6\ 120)$	list
$+$	built-in function (primitive operation)
$(lambda\ (x)\ (+\ x\ y))$	user-defined function ( <b>lambda</b> expression)

**Note:** The evaluation rules assume that the abbreviated syntax for Scheme function definitions has been expanded so that the right hand sides of function definitions are **lambda** expressions.

### 2.2 Conditionals

#### 2.2.1 The Laws of if

If the test of an **if** expression is not a value, evaluate it to one by repeatedly applying the following rule

$$(\text{if } E_1\ E_2\ E_3) = (\text{if } E'_1\ E_2\ E_3) \quad \text{if } E_1 = E'_1$$

If the test of an **if** expression is a value, the next step depends on whether the value is *true*. (Stylistically, you should use a boolean expression for the test, but Scheme permits any value and treats anything but *false* as true.)

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{if } false\ E_2\ E_3) &= E_3 \\ (\text{if } V\ E_2\ E_3) &= E_2 \quad \text{if } V \neq false \end{aligned}$$

### 2.2.2 The Laws of cond

If the test of the first clause is not a value or **else**, evaluate it to a value.

$$(\text{cond } [E_1 E_2] \dots) = (\text{cond } [E'_1 E_2] \dots) \quad \text{if } E_1 = E'_1$$

If the first condition (test expression) is a value or **else**, then one of the following rules applies:

$$\begin{aligned}(\text{cond } [false E] \dots) &= (\text{cond } \dots) \\(\text{cond } [V E] \dots) &= E \quad \text{if } V \neq false \\(\text{cond } [else E] \dots) &= E\end{aligned}$$

If there are no clauses — as in “(**cond**)” — the value is undefined. Generally, evaluation of a **cond** expression should result in selection of one of the clauses (and evaluation of its consequent expression.)

Here are some examples:

$$\begin{aligned}(\text{cond } [(> 10 12) (+ 7 8)] [\text{else } (* 6 4)]) &= (\text{cond } [false (+ 7 8)] [\text{else } (* 6 4)]) \\&= (\text{cond } [\text{else } (* 6 4)]) \\&= (* 6 4) \\(\text{cond } [true (+ 7 8)] [\text{else } (* 6 4)]) &= (+ 7 8) \\(\text{cond } ['foo (+ 7 8)] [\text{else } (* 6 4)]) &= (+ 7 8)\end{aligned}$$

### 2.3 The Laws of Application

Evaluate each of the subexpressions of an application in turn from left to right.

$$(V_1 \dots V_{i-1} E \dots) = (V_1 \dots V_{i-1} E' \dots) \quad \text{if } E = E'$$

Given an application consisting of values

$$(V_1 V_2 \dots V_N)$$

we apply different laws depending on whether the head value  $V_1$  is a primitive procedure or a user-defined procedure (a **lambda** expression). If the head value is not a procedure, then evaluation sticks; there are no rules for reducing applications of non-procedures. Some sticking expressions are  $(1\ 2)$ ,  $(1)$ , and  $((\text{cons } 'a \text{ empty}) \text{ empty})$ .

#### 2.3.1 Primitive applications

There is a large table of laws for directly reducing to a value the application of a primitive to a set of values. You know most of these rules from grammar school; the remainder are described (implicitly) in the course lecture notes and Kent Dybvig’s book.

For instance, if (and only if)  $U$  is a value,  $V$  is a list value, and  $W$  is a non-list value, then:

$$\begin{aligned}(\text{first } (\text{cons } U V)) &= U \\(\text{rest } (\text{cons } U V)) &= V \\(\text{cons? } (\text{cons } U V)) &= true \\(\text{cons? } W) &= false\end{aligned}$$

Examples:

```
(first (cons 1 empty)) = 1
(rest (cons 1 empty)) = empty
(cons? 1) = false
(cons? (cons 1 empty)) = true
(+ 1 2) = 3
```

If a primitive operation is applied to illegal inputs, then evaluation sticks and does not produce an answer. Some sticking expressions are *(first empty)*, *(rest 1)*, and *(+ empty 2)*.

### 2.3.2 lambda applications

If the head value in an application is a **lambda** expression

```
(lambda (name1 ... nameN) E)
```

where  $name_1, \dots, name_N$  are names and  $E$  is an expression, then the following rule specifies the next step in evaluating the application:

$$((\mathbf{lambda} (name_1 \dots name_N) E) V_1 \dots V_N) = E_{[V_1 \text{ for } name_1] \dots [V_N \text{ for } name_N]}$$

where the notation  $E_{[Value \text{ for } name]}$  means  $E$  with all free occurrences of  $name$  safely replaced by  $Value$ . (Locally bound variables in  $E$  must be renamed if they clash with free variables in  $V_1, \dots, V_N$ .)

Examples:

```
((lambda (x) (+ x x)) 7) = (+ 7 7)
((lambda (f) (lambda (x) (f (f x)))) (lambda (y) (+ x y)))
  ≠ (lambda (x) ((lambda (y) (+ x y)) ((lambda (y) (+ x y)) x)))
((lambda (f) (lambda (x) (f (f x)))) (lambda (y) (+ x y)))
  = (lambda (z) ((lambda (y) (+ x y)) ((lambda (y) (+ x y)) z)))
```

## 3 Evaluating definitions

The preceding section gives laws for evaluating Scheme expressions in the absence of program definitions. But Scheme programs have the form

```
(define n1 E1)
(define n2 E2)
...
(define nN EN)
E
```

where  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_N$  are names and  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_N, E$  are expressions using Scheme primitives and the defined names  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_N$ . The expression  $E$  is called the body of the program and each expression  $E_k$  is called the body of the definition (**define**  $n_k$   $E_k$ ).

If the definition bodies  $E_k$  are all values

```

(define  $n_1$   $V_1$ )
(define  $n_2$   $V_2$ )
...
(define  $n_N$   $V_N$ )
 $E$ 

```

then we evaluate the expression  $E$  as described above with the added provision that the names  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_N$  have values  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_N$ , respectively. More precisely, the program evaluation law says

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{(define } n_1 \text{ } V_1) \\
 \text{(define } n_2 \text{ } V_2) \\
 \dots \\
 \text{(define } n_N \text{ } V_N) \\
 E
 \end{array}
 =
 \begin{array}{l}
 \text{(define } n_1 \text{ } V_1) \\
 \text{(define } n_2 \text{ } V_2) \\
 \dots \\
 \text{(define } n_N \text{ } V_N) \\
 E'
 \end{array}
 \quad \text{if } E = E', \quad \text{assuming } n_1, n_2, \dots, n_N \text{ have} \\
 \text{values } V_1, V_2, \dots, V_N, \text{ respectively}$$

If the definition bodies  $E_1, \dots, E_N$  that are not all values, use this rule:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{(define } n_1 \text{ } V_1) \\
 \dots \\
 \text{(define } n_{k-1} \text{ } V_{k-1}) \\
 \text{(define } n_k \text{ } E_k) \\
 \dots \\
 \text{(define } n_N \text{ } E_N) \\
 E
 \end{array}
 =
 \begin{array}{l}
 \text{(define } n_1 \text{ } V_1) \\
 \dots \\
 \text{(define } n_{k-1} \text{ } V_{k-1}) \\
 \text{(define } n_k \text{ } E'_k) \\
 \dots \\
 \text{(define } n_N \text{ } E_N) \\
 E
 \end{array}
 \quad \text{if } \begin{array}{l} \dots \\ \text{(define } n_{k-1} \text{ } V_{k-1}) \\ E_k \end{array} = \begin{array}{l} \text{(define } n_1 \text{ } V_1) \\ \dots \\ \text{(define } n_{k-1} \text{ } V_{k-1}) \\ E'_k \end{array}$$

These laws force us to evaluate the bodies of all definitions in sequential order before evaluating the body of the program.

### 3.1 Rules for local

To evaluate programs containing *local*, we need to introduce the concept of *promotion* (also called *flattening*). Given an expression of the form

$$(\text{local } [(\text{define } n_1 \text{ } E_1) \dots (\text{define } n_N \text{ } E_N)] \text{ } E)$$

we first convert the local definitions of the names  $n_1, \dots, n_N$  to global definitions of new names  $n'_1, \dots, n'_N$ , renaming all bound occurrences of  $n_1, \dots, n_N$ . Then we evaluate the transformed expression  $E$  in the context of the new definitions. This conversion process is called the *promotion* or *flattening* of a *local* expression. The new names  $n'_1, \dots, n'_N$  must be chosen so that they are distinct from all other names in the program.

Let

```

(define  $n_1$   $V_1$ )
...
(define  $n_{k-1}$   $V_N$ )
 $E$ 

```

be a program where the program body  $E$  has the form

$$\mathcal{C}[L]$$

where  $L$  is an expression

$(local [(define\ n_1\ E_1) \dots (define\ n_N\ E_N)]\ E)$

enclosed in the surrounding program text  $\mathcal{C}[\ ]$  to form the expression  $E$ . Assume that no subexpressions in  $E$  to the left of the subexpression  $L$  can be reduced. Hence,  $L$  is the leftmost expression in the entire program that can be reduced. In this case, the surrounding text  $\mathcal{C}[\ ]$  is called the *evaluation context* of  $L$ .

Using the notation introduced above, we can describe the *promotion step* reducing the program by the following rule:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (define\ n_1\ V_1) \\
 & \dots \\
 & (define\ n_{k-1}\ V_N) \\
 & \mathcal{C}[(local\ [(define\ n_1\ E_1) \dots (define\ n_N\ E_N)]\ E)] \\
 & = \\
 & (define\ n_1\ V_1) \\
 & \dots \\
 & (define\ n_{k-1}\ V_N) \\
 & (define\ n'_1\ E_{1[n'_1\ for\ n_1]} \dots [n'_N\ for\ n_N]) \\
 & \dots \\
 & (define\ n'_N\ E_{N[n'_1\ for\ n_1]} \dots [n'_N\ for\ n_N]) \\
 & \mathcal{C}[E_{[n'_1\ for\ n_1]} \dots [n'_N\ for\ n_N]]
 \end{aligned}$$

In other words, we replaced  $L$  by the body of  $L$  with  $n_1, \dots, n_N$  renamed and we added appropriate definitions for the new names in the sequence of **define** statements preceding the program body. Note that free occurrences of the names  $n_1, \dots, n_N$  must be renamed in the expressions  $E_1, \dots, E_N$ , as well as  $E$ .