

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
 Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science  
 6.S184—Zombies Drink Caffeinated 6.001  
 IAP 2010

**Recitation 4**

\*\*\*\*SOLUTIONS\*\*\*\*

## Can I quote you on that?

(*quasiquote* *expr*) is like *quote*, but can selectively evaluate pieces. Much like *quote* can be abbreviated as *'*, *quasiquote* is often shortened as *'*. *Quasiquote* acts just like *quote*, except where the following two operators appear in the body of the quotation:

1. (*unquote* *x*) - give value of *x*. Can be abbreviated with *,*, as in *,x*.
2. (*unquote-splicing* *x*) - give value of *x*, assume it's a list, and splice the element into the outer list. Can be abbreviated *,@*, as in *,@x*.

For example, if *foo* is bound to *#t* and *bar* is bound to (*yay rah*):

```
'(foo bar baz)           ; (foo bar baz)
'(',foo bar baz)         ; (#t bar baz)
'(foo ,bar baz)          ; (foo (yay rah) baz)
'(foo ,@bar baz)         ; (foo yay rah baz)
'(foo bar ,baz)          ; error: unbound variable baz
'(',(not foo) bar baz)   ; (#f bar baz)
```

As demonstrated by the last example, the unquoted expressions aren't limited to just names.

If *x* is bound to 3, *y* is bound to (5 6), and *z* is bound to (7 8 9), use *quasiquote* to build the value (a 1 2 3 b 4 5 6 (7 8 9) c).

```
'(a 1 2 ,x b 4 ,@y ,z c)
```

If *name* and *value* are bound, use *quasiquote* to build a *define* expression that would bind the name to the value.

```
'(define ,name ,value)
```

If *params* and *body* are bound, use *quasiquote* to build a *lambda* expression with the given parameters and body.

```
'(lambda ,params ,@body)
```

## And iff'n you know what I mean...

The `and` special form evaluates its arguments one at a time. If it ever encounters an expression that evaluates to `#f`, it skips evaluating the rest of the expressions, and immediately returns `#f`. If none of the expressions evaluate to `#f`, it returns the value of the last expression. That is:

```
(and #f (/ 1 0)) ; => #f, not an error!
(and #t 2)      ; => 2
(and 2)         ; => 2
(and)          ; => #t
```

Write a syntactic transformer called `and->if` that changes any given `and` expression into a series of nested `if` statements.

```
(define (and->if exp)
  (define (helper exp)
    (if (null? exp)
        #t
        (if (= (length exp) 1)
            (car exp)
            '(if ,(car exp)
                  ,(helper (cdr exp))
                  #f))))
    (helper (cdr exp)))
```

## ...or iff'n you don't...

Relatedly, the `or` special form evaluates its arguments one at a time, and returns the first non-false value that it sees. If none of its arguments are true, it returns `#f`. Write a syntactic transformer called `or->if` which changes and given `or` expression into a series of nested `if` statements.

```
(define (or->if exp)
  (define (helper exp)
    (if (null? exp)
        #f
        '(let ((value ,(car exp)))
            (if value
                value
                ,(helper (cdr exp))))))
    (helper (cdr exp)))
```

## Is this the right place for an argument?

As we've alluded to a couple times already, some procedures in normal scheme can take an arbitrary number of arguments. This is done by providing an unusual parameter list to `lambda`, as follows:

```
(define foo (lambda (x y . z) (cons (+ x y) z)))
(foo 1 2)      ; => (3)
(foo 1 2 5)   ; => (3 5)
```

Remember that `'(x y . z)` is interpreted by the reader as an improper list – that is, the same as `(cons 'x (cons 'y 'z))`. Our version of `m-eval` doesn't object to the lambda definition above, but fails to do the right thing when the lambda is called. Alter the `extend-environment` procedure to support this form.

```
(define (extend-environment vars vals base-env)
  (define (helper rest-vars rest-vals)
    (cond ((and (null? rest-vars) (null? rest-vals))
           '())
          ((null? rest-vars)
           (error "Too many args supplied" vars vals))
          ((symbol? rest-vars)
           (list (list rest-vars rest-vals)))
          ((null? rest-vals)
           (error "Too few args supplied" vars vals))
          (else
           (cons (list (car rest-vars) (car rest-vals))
                 (helper (cdr rest-vars) (cdr rest-vals))))))
  (let ((matching (helper vars vals)))
    (cons (make-frame (map first matching) (map second matching)) base-env)))
```

## Double the bubble, double the trouble!

Louis Reasoner thinks it would simplify the evaluator a lot to condense `m-eval` and `m-apply` as follows:

```
(define (m-eval exp env)
  (cond ((self-evaluating? exp) exp)
        ((variable? exp) (lookup-variable-value exp env))
        ((quoted? exp) (text-of-quotation exp))
        ((assignment? exp) (eval-assignment exp env))
        ((definition? exp) (eval-definition exp env))
        ((if? exp) (eval-if exp env))
        ((lambda? exp)
         (make-procedure (lambda-parameters exp) (lambda-body exp) env))
        ((begin? exp) (eval-sequence (begin-actions exp) env))
        ((cond? exp) (m-eval (cond->if exp) env))
        ((let? exp) (m-eval (let->application exp) env))
        ((application? exp)
         (let ((procedure (m-eval (operator exp) env))
               (arguments (list-of-values (operands exp) env)))
           ;;; code from m-apply inserted here
           (cond ((primitive-procedure? procedure)
                  (apply-primitive-procedure procedure arguments))
                 ((compound-procedure? procedure)
```

```

(eval-sequence
 (procedure-body procedure)
 (extend-environment (procedure-parameters procedure)
                    arguments
                    env))) ;; can just use env here
(else (error "Unknown procedure type -- APPLY" procedure))))
(else (error "Unknown expression type -- EVAL" exp)))

```

Does this work? Why or why not?

**No – because you drop a frame from the current environment, thus giving you dynamic scoping, which is useless.**

## See let rec. Let, rec, let!

The `let` special form is very useful for defining local variables. Of course, it can also be used to define local procedures. What is the output of the following? Why?

```

(let ((fact
      (lambda (x)
        (if (= x 1)
            1
            (* x (fact (- x 1)))))))
      (+ (fact 3) (fact 4)))

```

How might you extend `let` to fix this issue? Scheme has a special form which handles this case, called `letrec`. Write a syntactic transformer, `letrec->let`, for `m-eval`.

```

(define (letrec->let exp)
  '(let (,@(map (lambda (var) (list var #f)) (let-bound-variables exp)))
    ,@(map (lambda (var val) '(set! ,var ,val))
          (let-bound-variables exp)
          (let-values exp))
    (begin ,@(let-body exp))))

```