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Lecture 10—Mutual Recursion, Equivalence and Syntactic Sugar
Mutual Recursion

We haven’t yet seen how multiple functions can recursively call each other? (Why can’t we do this with what we have?)

ML uses the keyword and to provide different scope rules. Example:

fun even i = if i=0 then true else odd (i-1)
and odd i = if i=0 then false else even (i-1)

Roughly extends the binding form for functions from fun f1 x1 = e1 to fun f1 x1 = e1 and f2 x2 = e2 and ... and fn xn = en.

Actually, you can have val bindings too, but bindings being defined are in scope only inside function bodies. (Why?)

Syntax gotcha: I always forget you write and fi xi = ei, not and fun fi xi = ei.
Mutual Recursion Idioms

1. Encode a state machine (see product_sign example)
   • Sometimes easier to understand than explicit state values.

2. Process mutually recursive types, example:

   ```
   datatype webtext = Empty
   | Link of webpage * string * webtext
   | Word of string * webtext
   and webpage = Found of string * webtext
   | Unfound of string
   ```

   A function “crawl for word” is inherently mutually recursive. (You could make a datatype for “webtext or webpage”, but that’s ugly.)

Problem: the Web has cycles, which (sigh) is a common need for mutation in ML.

Unproblem: When crawling, we don’t want cycles (use Unfound if we have seen the page before).
Where are We

- We have covered enough basics to focus more on concepts now
- Before Scheme: Equivalence, parametric polymorphism, type inference, modules/abstract-types
- Homework 3 due October 29 (do not wait)
- Exam Monday November 1 (more info later)
Equivalence

“Equivalence” is a fundamental programming concept

- Code maintenance / backward-compatibility
- Program verification
- Program optimization
- Abstraction and strong interfaces

But what does it mean for an expression (or program) $e_1$ to be “equivalent” to expression $e_2$?
First equivalence notion

Context (i.e., “where equivalent”)

- Given where $e_1$ occurs in a program $e$, replacing $e_1$ with $e_2$ makes a program $e'$ equivalent to $e$
- At any point in any program, replacing $e_1$ with $e_2$ makes an equivalent program.

The latter (contextual equivalence) is much more interesting.

For the former, the body of an unused function body is equivalent to everything (that typechecks).
Second equivalence notion

“how equivalent”

• “partial”: $e$ and $e'$ are equivalent if they input and output the same data (any limits on input?)

• “total”: partial plus $e$ and $e'$ have the same termination behavior

• efficiency: $e$ and $e'$ are totally equivalent and one never takes more than (for example) $c$ times longer than the other (or uses much more space or ...)

• syntactic notions: $e$ and $e'$ differ only in whitespace and comments (for example)

Key notion: what is observable? (memory, clock, REP-loop, file-system, ...)
Accounting for “Effects”

Consider whether \( \text{fn } x \Rightarrow e1 \) and \( \text{fn } x \Rightarrow e2 \) are totally contextually equivalent.

Is this enough? For all environments, \( e1 \) terminates and evaluates to \( v \) under the environments if and only if \( e2 \) terminates and evaluates to \( v \) under the environment.

We must also consider any effects the function may have.

Purely functional languages have fewer/none, but ML is not purely functional.

In real languages, contextual equivalence usually requires many things.

Nonetheless, “equivalence” to me usually means total contextual equivalence.
Syntactic Sugar

When all expressions using one construct are totally equivalent to another more primitive construct, we say the former is “syntactic sugar”.

- Makes language definition easier
- Makes language implementation easier

Examples:

- `e1 andalso e2` (define as a conditional)
- `if e1 then e2 else e3` (define as a case)
- `fun f x y = e` (define with an anonymous function)
More sugar

#1 e is just let val (x,...) = e in x end

*If we ignore types*, then we have even more sugar:

let val p = e1 in e2 end is just (fn p => e2) e1.

In fact, if we let every program type-check (or just use one big datatype), then a language with just functions and function application is as powerful as ML or Java (in the Turing Tarpit sense).

This language is called “lambda calculus” – we’ll learn a bit more about it later.
Equivalences for Functions

While sugar defines one construct in terms of another, there are also important notions of meaning-preserving changes involving functions and bound variables.

They're so important that a goal of language design is that a language supports them.

But the correct definitions are subtle.

First example: systematic renaming

Is \( \text{fn } x \Rightarrow e_1 \) is equivalent to \( \text{fn } y \Rightarrow e_2 \) where \( e_2 \) is \( e_1 \) with every \( x \) replaced by \( y \)?
Systematic renaming requires care

What if $e_1$ is $y$?

What if $e_1$ is $\text{fn } x \Rightarrow x$?

Need caveats: $\text{fn } x \Rightarrow e_1$ is equivalent to $\text{fn } y \Rightarrow e_2$ where $e_2$ is $e_1$ with every free $x$ replaced by $y$ and $y$ is not free in $e_1$.

Note: We can provide a very precise recursive (meta-)definition of free variables in an expression.

Next: Is $(\text{fn } x \Rightarrow e_1)\ e_2$ equivalent to $e_3$ where $e_3$ is $e_1$ with every $x$ replaced by $e_2$?
Argument Substitution

Is \((\text{fn } x \Rightarrow e1) \ e2\) equivalent to \(e3\) where \(e3\) is \(e1\) with every \(x\) replaced by \(e2\)?

- Every \textit{free} \(x\) (of course).

- A free variable in \(e2\) must not be bound at an occurrence of \(x\).
  (Called “capture”.)
  - Always satisfiable by renaming bound variables.

- Evaluating \(e2\) must have no effects (printing, exceptions, infinite-loop, etc.)
  - Closely tied to the rule that arguments are evaluated to values \textit{before} function application. (Not true for all languages)
  - In ML, many expressions have no such effects (\(x\), \#foo \(x\), ...); much fewer in Java.

- Efficiency? Could be faster or slower. (Why?)
Unnecessary Function Wrapping

A common source of bad style for beginners

Is \( e_1 \) equivalent to \( \text{fn} \ x \Rightarrow e_1 \ x \)?

Sure, provided:

- \( e_1 \) is effect-free
- \( x \) does not occur free in \( e_1 \)

Example:

\[
\text{List.map (fn} \ x \Rightarrow \text{SOME} \ x) \ lst
\]

\[
\text{List.map} \ \text{SOME} \ lst
\]
Summary

We breezed through some core programming-language facts and design goals:

- Definition of equivalence depends on observable behavior
- Syntactic sugar “makes a big language smaller” by defining constructs in terms of equivalence
- Notion of free and bound variables crucial to understanding function equivalence.
- Three common forms of function equivalence:
  - Systematic Renaming
  - Argument Substitution
  - Unnecessary Function Wrapping