## Readings and References

- Reading
» Sections 2-2.1.3, Structure and Interpretation of Computer Programs, by Abelson, Sussman, and Sussman
- Other References
» Section 6.3.2, Revised ${ }^{5}$ Report on the Algorithmic Language Scheme (R5RS)


## Procedural abstractions

- So far, we have talked about primitive data elements and done various levels of abstraction using procedures only
» This is a key capability in being able to recognize and implement common behaviors
- The ability to combine data elements will further extend our ability to model the world


## Compound data

- In order to build compound structures we need a way to combine elements and refer to them as a single blob
- We can write a lambda expression that combines one or more expressions
» the resulting combination is a procedure
- We can write a cons expression that ties two data elements together
" the resulting combination is a pair


## (cons a b)

- Takes a and b as args, returns a compound data object that contains a and $b$ as its parts
- We can extract the two parts with accessor functions car and cdr ("could-er")
(define a (cons 12 ))
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## car and cdr

(define a (cons 1 2))
(define $b$ (cons $a$ 3))
(car (car b))
(cdr (car b))
(cdr b)

(define a (cons 12 ))
(car a)
(cdr a)
car (cons 3 4))
cdr (cons 3 4)
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## (car (cdr c))

(define $c$ (cons (cons 12$)$ (cons 3 4)))
(car (car c))
(cdr (car c))
(car (cdr c))
(cdr (cdr c))


## (cadr c)

## pair? predicate

- (pair? $z$ ) is true if z is a pair
(define $c(c o n s(c o n s 12)(c o n s 34)))$
(pair? c)
(pair? (car c))
(pair? (cdr c))
(pair? (caar c))
(pair? (cdar c))
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## nil

- if there is no element present for the car or cdr branch of a pair, we indicate that with the value nil
» nil (or null) represents the empty list '()
- (null? z ) is true if z is nil

```
(define d (cons 1 '()))
(car d)
(cdr d)
(null? (car d))
(null? (cdr d))
```

(define e (cons 1 (cons 2 (cons 3 '()))))

```
(car e)
(car (cdr e))
(car (cddr e))
(define (zip z)
    (if (pair? z)
        (begin
                (display (car z))
            (display " ")
            (zip (cdr z)))
            (newline)))
```



## Email from Steve Russell

- I wrote the first implementation of a LISP interpreter on the IBM 704 at MIT in early in 1959. I hand-compiled John McCarthy's "Universal LISP Function".
- The 704 family $(704,709,7090)$ had "Address" and "Decrement" fields that were 15 bits long in some of the looping instructions. There were also special load and store instructions that moved these 15 -bit addresses between memory and the index registers ( 3 on the 704, 7 on the others )
- We had devised a representation for list structure that took advantage of these instructions.
- Because of an unfortunate temporary lapse of inspiration, we couldn't think of any other names for the 2 pointers in a list node than "address" and "decrement", so we called the functions CAR for "Contents of Address of Register" and CDR for "Contents of Decrement of Register".
- After several months and giving a few classes in LISP, we realized that "first" and "rest" were better names, and we (John McCarthy, I and some of the rest of the AI Project) tried to get people to use them instead.
- Alas, it was too late! We couldn't make it stick at all. So we have CAR and CDR.


## What do we really know about pairs?

- An Application Programming Interface (API)
» cons - constructor
» car, cdr-accessor functions
- We may think we know how they are stored
» box-and-pointer drawings
» pointers to pointer blocks ...
- But if we can stay at the API level, the separation between layers of implementation can stay clean which is a "good thing"
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## "Need to know" only

- As much as possible, the API should only expose the functions that the user needs in order to accomplish tasks with the logical data object we are defining
» If the implementation does not expose unnecessary details, then the user won't use them and you won't be stuck with them forever
- You want to be able to jack up the house and roll in a completely different foundation
» think about the evolution of device drivers
» open, read, write, status, control, close


## Can we implement cons/car/cdr?

- If we focus on the behaviors that are defined what do we actually need to do?
- (cons a b)
» define something that can be used later to extract a and b
- (car something)
» recover a from something
- (cdr something)
" recover b from something


## something

- We tend to think of the something returned by cons as a structured data variable of some sort
- However, the only actual requirement on something is that we can recover a and b from it using procedures named car and cdr
- How about we use a procedure definition for something ...


## (cons a b)

- Takes a and b as args, returns a compound data object (aka something) that contains a and b as its parts
- We can extract the two parts with accessor functions car and cdr ("could-er")

```
(define a (cons 1 2))
(car a)
(cdr a)
```



Procedural representation of pairs

```
(define (cons x y)
    (lambda (m) (m x y)))
(define (car z) (define a (cons 1 2))
    (z (lambda (p q) p)))
(define (cdr z)
    (z (lambda (p q) q)))

\section*{Lexical closure}
- Take another look at the definition of cons
```

(define (cons x y)
(lambda (m) (m x y)))
(define (car z)

```
    (z (lambda (p q) p)))
- Where did the values of x and y come from? » the initial call to cons, the definition call
- Are they still around when we call car and cdr?
" yes, they are part of the environment that is stored by the lambda definition statement in cons

\section*{definition and execution}
(define (cons \(x y\) )
(lambda (m) (m x y)))
- \(x\) and \(y\) are referenced in the environment of the lambda expression's definition
" its lexical environment, which is in the definition of cons
- not the environment of its execution
» its dynamic environment, which is in car```

