Class 12: Recursion, Revisited

Held: Wednesday, 13 September 2006

Summary: Today we continue our consideration of the process of recursion.

Related Pages:
- EBoard.
- Lab: Recursion.
- Reading: Recursion.

Notes:
- Don’t forget tomorrow’s convo.
- I’ve made slight rearrangements to the schedule to accommodate a bit more time for recursion.
- Today’s pedagogical problem: Do I tell you that recursion is hard, which makes you react as if it’s hard, or do I tell you that it’s easy, which may frustrate you if you fail to find it so?
- We may be getting a bit out of synch with the other 151. We should get back in synch in about a week.

Overview:
- Detour: Scheme’s Evaluation Strategy.
- Example: Difference.
- Q&A.
- Lab.

Detour: Scheme’s Evaluation Strategy

- Since it came up yesterday (and has come up indirectly in the past), let’s revisit (or perhaps visit) the strategy Scheme uses for evaluating expressions.
- If the expression to be evaluated is a name, look up the value associated with the name and then evaluate the value.
- If the expression to be evaluated is a primitive value (a number, string, character, procedure, boolean, symbol, or some other type that we haven’t yet covered), just use that value.
- If the expression to be evaluated is a procedure application (typically indicated by an open paren), evaluate all of the parameters to the procedure and then apply the procedure.
  - We’ll come back to how you apply procedures.
- If the expression to be evaluated is a special operation (also called a macro), such as and, or, if, and cond, follow the evaluation rules for that operation.
If the procedure to be applied is a user-defined procedure, substitute the actual parameters (those that appear in the procedure application) for the formal parameters (those that appear in the procedure definition) in the body, and then evaluate the body.

If the procedure to be applied is a built-in procedure, follow the rules for the built-in procedure.

For example, given, consider the following definitions:

```lisp
(define double
  (lambda (x)
    (+ x x))
(define a 5)
```

Consider the following expression

```lisp
(double (double (* 7 (+ 1 a))))
```

The top-level expression is a procedure application, so we need to evaluate the parameters.

The only parameter is

```lisp
(* 7 (+ 1 a))
```

Again, this is a procedure application, so we evaluate its parameters.

There are two parameters, 7 and (+ 1 a).

7 is a primitive value, so we’re done with it.

(+ 1 a) is a procedure application, so we evaluate its parameters.

There are two parameters, 1 and a.

1 is a primitive value, so we’re done with it.

a is the name for 5, so we use that.

We’re now ready to compute (+ 1 5). Since + is a built-in operation, we do what it’s supposed to do, and the value of this sub-expression is 6.

We’re now ready to compute (* 7 6). Again, we rely on the built-in operation, and get 42 for this subexpression.

We’re now ready to compute (double 42). This time, we have a user-defined operation, so we plug in 42 for x in the body, and get (+ 42 42).

The value of that sum is 84.

We’re now ready to compute (double 84). This is left as an exercise for the reader.

Another Example: Difference

To help understand the difference between the two versions of sum, let us consider a variant in which we compute a similar value, but using subtraction rather than addition.

```lisp
(define difference
  (lambda (numbers)
    (if (null? numbers)
        0
        (- (car numbers) (difference (cdr numbers))))))

(define new-difference
  (lambda (numbers)
    (new-difference-helper (car numbers) (cdr numbers)))))
```
(define new-difference-helper
  (lambda (difference-so-far remaining)
  (if (null? remaining)
  difference-so-far
  (new-difference-helper (- difference-so-far (car remaining))
  (cdr remaining))))

- Do we get the same values from these two procedures? Why or why not?

Questions and Answers

- I will reserve time for questions and answers.

Lab

- Continue to work on the lab.
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