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• Interpreting LBI (Language Being Implemented)
  • Assume Correct Syntax
  • Check for Correct Semantics
  • Evaluating the AST

• LBI “Macros”

• Eval, Quote, and Quasiquote

• Variable Number of Arguments

• Apply
Building an LBI Interpreter

• We are skipping the parsing phase ← **Do Not Implement**
  - Can be skipped because AST ("Abstract Syntax Tree") nodes represented as Racket structs.

• LBI vs. Metalanguage:
  - MUPL is the LBI.
  - Racket is the “metalanguage”.

![Abstract Syntax Tree Diagram]
A larger language example...

```plaintext
(struct const (int) #:transparent)
(struct negate (e1) #:transparent)
(struct add (e1 e2) #:transparent)
(struct bool (b) #:transparent)
(struct multiply (e1 e2) #:transparent)
(struct eq-num (e1 e2) #:transparent)
(struct if-then-else (e1 e2 e3) #:transparent)
```

\( LBI \rightarrow (\text{add} (\text{const} 1) (\text{const} 1)) \)

Metalanguage → Racket structs/operations on structs/the above code.
Correct Syntax Examples

Using these Racket structs...

(struct const (int) #:transparent)
(struct add (e1 e2) #:transparent)
(struct if-then-else (e1 e2 e3) #:transparent)

...we can interpret these LBI programs:

(const 34)
(add (const 34) (const 30))
(if-then-else (bool #t) (const 10) (const 20))
Incorrect Syntax Examples

While using these Racket structs...

```racket
(struct const (int) #:transparent)
(struct add (e1 e2) #:transparent)
(struct if-then-else (e1 e2 e3) #:transparent)
```

...we can assume we won’t see LBI programs like:

```racket
(const “dan then dog”)
(add 5 4)
(if-then-else (bool `(1 2)) (const 5) (bool #f))
```

Illegal input ASTs may crash the interpreter - this is OK
**Racket vs. LBI**

Structs in Racket, when defined to take an argument, can take any Racket value:

```
(struct const (int) #:transparent)
(struct add (e1 e2) #:transparent)
(struct if-then-else (e1 e2 e3) #:transparent)
```

But in LBI, we restrict `const` to take only an integer value, `add` to take two LBI expressions, and so on…

```
(const “dan then dog”)
(add 5 4)
(if-then-else (bool `(1 2)) (const 5) (bool #f))
```

Illegal input ASTs may crash the interpreter - **this is OK**
LBI Syntax

- If \( n \) is a Racket integer, then \((\text{const } n)\) is an LBI expression.
- If \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \) are LBI expressions, then \((\text{add } e_1 \ e_2)\) is an LBI expression.
- If \( e_1, e_2, \) and \( e_3 \) are LBI expressions, then \((\text{if-then-else } e_1 \ e_2 \ e_3)\) is an LBI expression.
- .......
LBI Semantics

- All values evaluate to themselves. This includes `bool` and `const`.
- An `add` evaluates its subexpressions and, assuming they both produce integers, produces the integer that is their sum.
- An `if-then-else` evaluates its first expression to a value `v1`. If it is a boolean, then if it is `#t`, then evaluates its second subexpression, else it evaluates its third subexpression.
- ……
Check for Correct Semantics

What if the program is a legal AST, but evaluation of it tries to use the *wrong* kind of value?

```
(struct const (int) #:transparent)
(struct add (e1 e2) #:transparent)
(struct if-then-else (e1 e2 e3) #:transparent)
```

This is invalid LBI syntax that we need to check for...

```
(add (const 1) (bool #t))
(if-then-else (const 5) (const 5) (bool #f))
```

- You should detect this and give an error message that is not in terms of the interpreter implementation
Evaluating the AST

• `eval-exp` should return a LBI value
• LBI values all evaluate to themselves
• Otherwise, we haven’t interpreted far enough

(const 7) ; evaluates to (const 7)
(add (const 3) (const 4)) ; evaluates to (const 7)
Evaluating the AST

- What’s wrong with this implementation of eval? (other than it being called “eval-exp-wrong”...)
Evaluating the AST

- It doesn’t recursively check for semantic correctness!
  - Let’s see a better version of this...
Macros Review

- Extend language syntax (allow new constructs)
- Written in terms of existing syntax
- Expanded before language is actually interpreted or compiled
LBI “Macros”

• Interpreting LBI using Racket as the metalanguage
• LBI is made up of Racket structs
• In Racket, these are just data types
• Why not write a Racket function that returns LBI ASTs?
LBI “Macros”

If our LBI Macro is a Racket function

(define (++) (add (const 1) exp))

Then the LBI code

(++) (++) (const 7))

Expands to

(add (const 1) (add (const 1) (const 7)))
LBI “Macros”

If our LBI Macro is a Racket function

\[
\text{(define (andalso e1 e2) (if-then-else e1 e2 (bool #f)))}
\]

Then the LBI code

\[
(andalso (bool #t) (bool #t))
\]

Expands to

\[
(\text{if-then-else (bool #t) (bool #t) (bool #f))}
\]
• Syntactically, Racket statements can be thought of as lists of tokens

• (+ 3 4) is a “plus sign”, a “3”, and a “4”

• quote-ing a parenthesized expression produces a list of tokens
quote Examples

(+ 3 4) ; 7

; '(+ 3 4)
(quote (+ 3 4))
'( + 3 4)

; '(+ 3 #t)
(quote (+ 3 #t))
'( + 3 #t)
quasiquote

• Inserts evaluated tokens into a quote
• Convenient for generating dynamic token lists
• Use unquote to escape a quasiquote back to evaluated Racket code
• A quasiquote and quote are equivalent unless we use an unquote operation
Self Interpretation

• Many languages provide an `eval` function or something similar
• Performs interpretation or compilation at runtime
  • Needs full language implementation during runtime
• It's useful, but there's usually a better way
• Makes analysis, debugging difficult
Racket's `eval` operates on lists of tokens.
Like those generated from `quote` and `quasiquote`.
Treat the input data as a program and evaluate it.
Variable Number of Arguments

• Some functions (like +) can take a variable number of arguments

```scheme
(define fn-any
  (lambda xs ; any number of args
    (print xs)))

(define fn-1-or-more
  (lambda (a . xs) ; at least 1 arg
    (begin (print a) (print xs)))))

(define fn-2-or-more
  (lambda (a b . xs) ; at least 2 args
    (begin (print a) (print a) (print xs))))
```
apply

• Applies a list of values as the arguments to a function in order by position

```
(define fn-any
  (lambda xs ; any number of args
    (print xs)))
(apply fn-any (list 1 2 3 4)); '(1 2 3 4)
(apply + (list 1 2 3 4)); 10
(apply max (list 1 2 3 4)); 4
```