**CS61A Notes – Week 9: Mutation**

**Revenge of the Box-and-pointers**

*I've been waiting for several weeks to bring up something you've noticed all along – there are different degrees of “sameness” in Scheme. Or, more specifically, things can be* equal?*, and things can be* eq?*. Now, you're finally old enough to know the truth.*

equal? Is used to compare **values**. We say two things are equal? if they evaluate to the same thing. For example, (equal? '(2 3 4) '(2 3 4)) returns #t, since both are lists containing three elements: 2, 3, and 4. This is the comparison method that you're all familiar with.

eq?, however, is used to compare **objects** (not in the OOP sense of the word). We say two things are eq? if they point to the same object. For those of you proficient in C, you may think that (eq? x y) if x and y are both pointers holding the same address values. In other words, (eq? '(2 3 4) '(2 3 4)) returns #f, because, though the two lists hold the same values, **they are not the same list!**

Consider this:

> (define x (list 1 2 3))

> (define y (list 1 2 3))

> (define z x)

Then (eq? x y) returns #f but (eq? z x) returns #t. How many lists are created total?

**QUESTION**

**We can also test if procedures are equal?. Consider this:**

**> (define (square x) (\* x x))**

**> (define (sqr x) (\* x x))**

**> (eq? square sqr) => #f**

**> (equal? square sqr) => #f**

**It's obvious that square and sqr are not eq?. But they're also not equal? because for procedures, equal? does the same thing as eq?. Why can't we tell that square and sqr really do the same thing – and thus, should be “equal?”? (Since you guys are always paranoid, no, this won't be on the test.)**

**Because you guys don't do the lab...**

Take a look at this procedure from *SICP*, exercise 3.14:

(define (mystery x)

(define (loop x y)

(if (null? x)

y

(let ((temp (cdr x)))

(set-cdr! x y)

(loop temp x))))

(loop x '()))

(define v (list 'a 'b 'c 'd))

(define w (mystery v))

To help clarify, loop uses the “temporary” variable temp to hold the old value of the cdr of x, since the set-cdr! on the next line destroys the cdr.

**QUESTION**

**Draw box-and-pointer diagrams that show the structures v and w after evaluating those expressions. What does Scheme print for the values of v and w?**

**Teenage Mutant Ninja... erm, Schemurtle (you try to do better)**

**Mutation** refers to changing a data structure. Since our preferred data structure are pairs, naturally, then, to perform mutation on pairs, we have set-car! and set-cdr!. Note that set-car! and set-cdr! are NOT special forms! That’s why you can execute things like (set-car! (cdr lst) (+ 2 5)).

To write procedures that deal with lists by mutation (rather than by constructing entirely new lists like we’ve done so far), here’s a possible approach: first, try to do the problem without using mutation, as you normally would. Then, whenever you see cons used in your procedure, think about how you can modify the procedure to use set-car! or set-cdr! instead.

**Do not confuse** set-car! and set-cdr! with set!. set! is used to change the value of a *variable*, or, what some symbol in the environment points to. set-car! and set-cdr! are used to change the value *inside a* cons *pair*, and thus to change elements and structure of lists, deep-lists, trees, etc. They are *not the same!*

Also, in working with lists, you’ll often find that you use set-car! to change elements of the list, and set-cdr! to alter the structure of the list. This shouldn’t be a surprise – recall that in a list, the elements are the car of each pair, and the subsequent sublists are the cdr. But don’t be fooled into thinking set-car! is always for element changes and set-cdr! is always for structural changes; in a richer data structure, either can be used for anything.

**QUESTIONS**

**1. Personally – and don’t let this leave the room – I think set-car! and set-cdr! are useless; we can just implement them using set!. Check out my two proposals for set-car!. Do they work, or do they work? Prove me wrong:**

**a. (define (set-car! thing val)**

**(set! (car thing) val))**

**a. (define (set-car! thing val)**

**(let ((thing-car (car thing)))**

**(set! thing-car val)))**

**1. I’d like to write a procedure that, given a deep list, destructively changes all the atoms into the symbol justin:**

**> (define ls ‘(1 2 (3 (4) 5)))**

**> (glorify! ls) => return value unimportant**

**> ls => (justin justin (justin (justin) justin))**

**Here’s my proposal:**

**(define (glorify! L)**

**(cond ((atom? L)**

**(set! L ‘justin))**

**(else (glorify! (car L))**

**(glorify! (cdr L)))))**

**Does this work? Why not? Write a version that works.**

**1. We’d like to rid ourselves of odd numbers in our list:**

**(define my-lst ‘(1 2 3 4 5))**

**a. Implement (no-odd! ls) that takes in a list of numbers and returns the list without the odds, using mutation: (no-odd! my-lst) => ‘(2 4)**

**a. Implement (no-odd! ls) again. This time, it still takes in a list of numbers, but can return anything. But after the call, the original list should be mutated so that it contains no odd numbers. Or,**

**(no-odd! my-lst) => return value unimportant**

**my-lst => ‘(2 4)**

**(Try to consider if this is possible before you start!)**

**1. It would also be nice to have a procedure which, given a list and an item, inserts that item at the end of the list by making only one new cons cell. The return value is unimportant, as long as the element is inserted. In other words,**

**> (define ls ‘(1 2 3 4))**

**> (insert! ls 5) => return value unimportant**

**> ls => (1 2 3 4 5)**

**Does the following procedure work? If not, can you write one that does?**

**(define (insert! L val)**

**(if (null? L)**

**(set! L (list val))**

**(insert! (cdr L) val)))**

**1. Write a procedure, remove-first! which, given a list, removes the first element of the list destructively. You may assume that the list contains at least two elements. So,**

**> (define ls ‘(1 2 3 4))**

**> (remove-first! ls) => return value unimportant**

**> ls => (2 3 4)**

**And what if there’s only one element?**

**1. Implement our old friend's ruder cousin, (reverse! ls). It reverses a list using mutation. (This is a standard programming job interview question.)**

**1. Implement (deep-map! proc deep-ls) that maps a procedure over every element of a deep list, without allocating any new cons pairs. So,**

**(deep-map! square ‘(1 2 (3 (4 5) (6 (7 8)) 9))) =>**

**‘(1 4 (9 (16 25) (36 (49 64)) 81))**

**1. Implement (interleave! ls1 ls2) that takes in two lists and interleaves them without allocating new cons pairs.**