Lecture 5 — August 17, 2015

- Today:
 - Environment encapsulation
 - More higher-order procedures: Fixed points
 - Language typing
 - Dotted-tail notation
- Readings:
 - Finish *SICP* 2.2–2.4
 - Read SICP 2.5, 3.1, 3.2

CSE130, Summer Session II

Lambdas encapsulate their environment

A lambda remembers the values of the variables in its environment:

```
(define (make-adder a)
  (lambda (n) (+ n a)))
(define successor (make-adder 1))
(define add-5 (make-adder 5))
(successor 2)
(add-5 10)
(add-5 (add-5 (successor 24)))
```

The cons-car-cdr Conspiracy

A group of functions can "conspire" with each other. What we want is to define our <u>own</u> cons, car, and cdr functions:

```
(define (cons a b)
  (lambda (selector)
    (if selector a b)))
(define (car p) (p #t))
(define (cdr p) (p #f))
```

The cons-car-cdr Conspiracy

- Section 2.1.3 "mind boggling" definition
- We don't need Booleans, cond, nor if!

```
(define (cons a b)
  (lambda (selector)
    (selector a b)))
(define (car p)
  (p (lambda (a b) a)))
(define (cdr p)
  (p (lambda (a b) b)))
```

Fixed points

- A number x is called a *fixed point* of a function f if x satisfies the equation f(x) = x.
 - E.g.,: sin(0) = 0, cos(0.73908513321) = 0.73908513321
 - E.g.,: abs(x) for all non-negative x
- For some functions *f* we can locate a fixed point by making an initial guess and applying *f* repeatedly...

f(x) f(f(x)) f(f(f(x)))f(f(f(f(x)))) ...

Rad 0.739085134161583									
()	mc	m+	m-	mr	AC	+/_	%	÷
2 nd	X²	X ³	x ^y	e ^x	10 [×]	7	8	9	×
$\frac{1}{x}$	²√X	∛x	ÿ√x	In	log ₁₀	4	5	6	
x!	sin	COS	tan	е	EE	1	2	3	+
Deg	sinh	cosh	tanh	π	Rand	0		•	=

• ...until the value doesn't change by some small number

Finding fixed points

```
(define tolerance 0.00001)
```

```
(define (fixed-point f first-guess)
  (let loop ([guess first-guess])
     (let ([next (f guess)])
       (if (< (abs (- guess next)) tolerance)
            next
            (loop next)))))
```

- Apply f to the guess to get next
 - if | guess next | < tolerance, you've found it
 - Otherwise, keep on looking with **next** as the new **guess**

Square roots

- The *square root* of *n* is the *x* such that $x^2 = n$
 - In other words, an *x* such that x = n / x
 - E.g., the square root of 5 is the x where x = 5 / x
- So, let f(x) = 5 / x
- Thus, we want the *x* such that x = f(x)
- In other words, we want to find the fixed point of this f

Square roots

• Our first attempt...

```
(define (sqrt n)
  (fixed-point (lambda (x) (/ n x)) 1.0))
```

doesn't converge.

- E.g., (sqrt 5) will just keep repeating 1 and then 5 and then 1... as the guesses:
 - f(1) = 5
 - f(f(1)) = f(5) = 1

Square roots, continued

- Solution: Don't let the guesses change so much. Instead, try the *average* of the previous guess with the new guess
- This leads to finding the fixed point of a different function:

```
(define (average x y)
 (/ (+ x y) 2))
(define (sqrt n)
 (fixed-point
  (lambda (x) (average x (/ n x)))
  1.0))
```

> (sqrt 5)
2.236067977499978
> (* 2.236067977499978 2.236067977499978)
5.000000000000843

Square roots, continued

This *average dampening technique* can be useful for other cases. Abstract it and we get a procedure that takes a procedure as input and returns a new procedure!

```
; (number -> number) -> (number -> number)
(define (average-damp f)
  (lambda (x)
    (average x (f x))))
; number -> number
(define (sqrt n)
  (fixed-point
   (average-damp
    (lambda (x) (/ n x)))
   1.0))
```

Debugging the process

• Use the output functions display and newline:

```
> (sqrt 5)
1.0
3.0
2.33333333333333333
2.238095238095238
2.2360688956433634
2.236067977499978
```

compose

• This higher-order procedure takes two procedures as input:

```
; (number -> number), (number -> number), number -> number
(define (compose f g x)
  (f (g x)))
```

```
(compose square double 3)
(square (double 3))
(square (* 2 3))
(square 6)
(* 6 6)
36
```

compose

 But the body of compose itself doesn't require x to be a number, nor f and g to be functions on numbers!

```
(define (compose f g x)
 (f (g x)))
(compose
 (lambda (p) (if p "yin" "yang"))
 (lambda (x) (> x 0))
 -5)
```

• What is the type of f? g? x? the result?

-----> "yang"

compose

• But not every combination of functions can be composed:

```
> (compose < square 5)
<: arity mismatch;
the expected number of arguments does not match the
given number
expected: at least 2
given: 1
arguments.:</pre>
```

```
> (compose square double "tofu")
+: contract violation
    expected: number?
    given: "tofu"
    argument position: 1st
    other arguments.:
```

Typing compose

(define (compose f g x) (f (g x)))

- x can be of any type, let's call that type C
- This is known as a type variable:
 - All places where a given type variable appears must match when you fill in the actual operand types
- Constraints:
 - **f** and **g** must be functions of one argument
 - the argument type of \mathbf{g} matches the type of \mathbf{x} (what we call C)
 - the argument type of **f** matches the result type of **g** (call it A)
 - the result type of **compose** is the result type of **f** (call it *B*)
- So:

compose: $(A \rightarrow B)$, $(C \rightarrow A)$, $C \rightarrow B$

"cader" and "caduder"

Common to see in some Lisp code, so you should be aware of it:

(define (cadr lst) (compose car cdr lst))
(define (caddr lst) (compose cadr cdr lst))

Alternative formulation:

```
; o: (B -> C), (A -> B) -> (A -> C)
(define (o f g)
  (lambda (x) (compose f g x)))
(define cadr (o car cdr))
(define caddr (o car (o cdr cdr)))
```

The for-each procedure

 A useful higher-order expression for its side effects (e.g., I/O) instead of the value it returns:

```
(define (for-each proc lst)
  (if (not (null? lst))
        (begin
            (proc (car lst))
            (for-each proc (cdr lst)))))
> (for-each (lambda (x) (display x) (newline))
            (list 57 321 88))
57
321
```

88

- This implementation demonstrates the "one-armed-if" and begin special forms.
- In Racket, there is no one-armed-if, so just supply some value

Static typing

- With static typing, the type of every expression can be known by analyzing the program
 - Under *type checking*, the types are explicitly supplied by the programmer (e.g., Java)
 - Under *type inference*, the types can be deduced based on how expressions are *used*.
- Type inference in ML:
 - if the + operator is used on a, then a must be an integer
 - if b is initialized by the result of f, then it has the same type of what f returns
 - If c is passed as the first argument to g, then it has the same type as g's first parameter
- Lambdas in Java 8 employ type inference

Dynamic typing

- Under *dynamic* or *latent typing*, the types of (some) expressions can only be determined by executing specific instances of them at runtime
 - In some implementations, every value has a "tag" associated with it, indicating its type (e.g., Scheme)
 - Programmer does not need to specify types
 - When an operation is applied, the tags of its operands are checked to see if the operation is allowed.
 - Might only be caught on a primitive procedure, if the user-defined procedure doesn't check
- You can write this in Scheme, but not in ML:

(define (foo n) (if (< n 0) (- n) foo))</pre>

Languages without typing

- An *untyped language* offers no safety
 - E.g. in Assembly a floating-point number can be added to an address
 - C/C++ are statically typed, but you can subvert the type system explicitly (type casting) and implicitly (dangling pointers)
- When something "goes wrong" in an untyped language all bets are off: whatever happens is not defined and it depends upon the OS/hardware
- Both statically typed and dynamically typed languages can be type safe by fully defining the semantics for all scenarios
- Note: The phrases "strong typed" and "weak typed" are meaningless in the sense there are multiple and conflicting definitions for them.

Dotted-tail notation

- Procedures like + and list have variable arity: they can take different numbers of arguments
- You can put a dot '.' before the final parameter name in a procedure definition to be a list that will be a list of remaining arguments:

```
(define (same-parity first . rest)
   ...)
```

```
> (same-parity 2 3 4 5 6 7 8)
'(2 4 6 8)
> (same-parity 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12)
'(1 3 5 7 9 11)
```

Using dotted-tail notation

```
(define (same-parity first . rest)
  (let iter ([lst (cons first rest)])
     (cond
      [(null? lst) '()]
      [(equal? (even? first) (even? (car lst)))
      (cons (car lst) (iter (cdr lst)))]
      [else (iter (cdr lst))])))
```

Dotted-tail notation with lambda

 Works for lambdas too, but there must be another parameter before the dot:

```
(define same-parity
  (lambda (first . rest) ...)) ;; OK
(define print-all
  (lambda (. lst) ...)) ;; illegal use of '.'
```

• But you can handle this case by omitting the parenthesis:

The list procedure

- > (list 4 (list 25 16)) ----> '(4 (25 16))
- Can this only be implemented with a special form?

```
(define (list . x)
```

A problem with recursive calls

• What if we want to call ourselves directly?

```
(define (print-all . lst)
  (if (not (null? lst))
     (begin
        (display (car lst))
        (newline)
        (print-all (cdr lst)))
        'done))
```

• What happens?

(print-all 1 2 3)

Adding indirection

• One fix is to add indirection, like the original version:

```
(define (print-all . lst)
  (let loop ([lst lst])
   (if (not (null? lst))
      (begin
          (display (car lst))
          (newline)
          (loop (cdr lst)))
          'done)))
```

```
> (print-all 1 2 3)
1
2
3
```

Using apply

- We want the elements of the list to be the direct arguments, and not have the list *itself* be a single argument.
- The apply procedure takes a procedure and a list and applies procedure to the elements of the list as arguments:



Calling recursively via apply

• Still tail-recursive, because apply is the last thing it does!

```
(define (print-all . lst)
  (if (not (null? lst))
      (begin
        (display (car lst))
        (newline)
        (apply print-all (cdr lst)))
        'done))
```

```
> (print-all 1 2 3)
1
2
3 ;; Still Works!
```