

# The ACL2s Language

Pete Manolios  
Northeastern

# Let

```
► (let ((v1 x1)
      ...
      (vn xn))
    body)
```

binds its local variables, the  $v_i$ , in parallel, to the values of the  $x_i$ , and evaluates `body` using that binding

► For example:

```
(let ((x '(a b c))
      (y '(c d)))
  (app (app x y) (app x y)))
```

► evaluates to `(a b c c d a b c c d)`

► This saves us having to type `'(a b c)` and `'(c d)` multiple times

► Notice how the use of quotes: instead of `(list 'a 'b 'c)` we have `'(a b c)`

# Let\*

- Maybe we can avoid having to type `(app x y)` multiple times. What about?

```
(let ((x '(a b c))  
      (y '(c d))  
      (z (app x y)))  
  (app z z))
```

```
(let ((x '(a b c))  
      (y '(c d)))  
  (app (app x y) (app x y)))
```

- This does not work. Why not? Because `let` binds in parallel, so `x` and `y` in the `z` binding are not yet bound

# Let\*

- What we really want is a binding form that binds sequentially. That is what `let*` does.

```
(let* ((v1 x1)
      ...
      (vn xn))
  body)
```

binds its local variables, the  $v_i$ , sequentially, to the values of the  $x_i$ , and evaluates `body` using that binding, so this works:

```
(let* ((x '(a b c))
      (y '(c d))
      (z (app x y)))
  (app z z))
```

```
(let ((x '(a b c))
      (y '(c d)))
  (app (app x y) (app x y)))
```

- `let` and `let*` give us **abbreviation power** and **efficiency**
- Why might `let` be preferable to `let*`?

# Data Definitions

- ▶ Demo
- ▶ Singleton types
- ▶ Recognizers
- ▶ Enumerated Types
- ▶ Range Types
- ▶ Product Types
- ▶ Records
- ▶ Constructors & Accessors
- ▶ Listof Combinator
- ▶ Union Types
- ▶ Recursive Types
- ▶ Data-driven Function Definitions
- ▶ Mutually Recursive Data Types