Dynamic Functions in Dyalog APL

John Scholes – Dyalog Ltd. john@dyalog.com

A Dynamic Function (D-Fn) is a new function definition style, which bridges the gap between named function expressions such as $rank \leftarrow \rho \circ \rho$ and APL's conventional 'header' style definition. Dynamic Functions are so called because they can be defined 'on the fly' at run time.

Simple Expressions

The simplest form of D-Fn is: {expr} where expr is an APL expression containing ' α 's and ' ω 's representing the left and right argument of the function respectively. For example:

A D-Fn can be used in any function context ...

```
\{\alpha+\div\omega\}/25 p1 A Repeated fraction. 1.618033989
```

... and of course, assigned a name:

```
root \leftarrow \{\omega \star \div \alpha\} A \alpha'th root.
```

D-Fns are ambivalent. Their right (and if present, left) arguments are evaluated irrespective of whether these are subsequently referenced within the function body.

```
2 {ω}3
3
4 {α}5
```

Guards

A guard is a boolean-single valued expression followed by ':'. A simple expression can be preceded by a guard, and any number of guarded expressions can occur separated by ' \sigma' 's.

Guards are evaluated in turn (left to right) until one of them yields a 1. Its corresponding **expr** is then evaluated as the result of the D-Fn. A guard is equivalent to an If-Then-Else or Switch-Case construct.

```
\{\omega=0:'zero' \diamond \omega\neq 0:'non zero'\} 3 non zero
```

A final simple **expr** can be thought of as a default case:

The ' \diamond 's can be replaced by newlines. For readability, extra null phrases ' \diamond \diamond \diamond ...' can be included. The parity example above becomes:

```
 \{ & & \text{A Parity} \\ & 2 \mid \omega \colon \text{'odd'} & & \text{A Odd case} \\ & \text{'even'} & & \text{A Even case} \\ \} \text{ 4} \\ \text{even} \\ \end{aligned}
```

Named D-Fns can be reviewed using the system editor:) ed or $\Box CR/\Box FX$, and note that you can comment them in the normal way using ' e'.

The following example interprets a dice throw:

Local Definition

The final piece of D-Fn syntax is the local definition. An expression whose principal function is a simple or vector assignment, introduces a name that is local to the D-Fn. The name is localised dynamically as the assignment is executed. As we shall see later, this mechanism can be used to define local nested D-Fns.

```
mean←{
                                                A Arithmetic mean.
      sum←+/w
     num \leftarrow \rho \omega
     sum:num
}
roots ← {
                                               A Real roots of quadratic.
      a b c \leftarrow w
                                               A Coefficients.
     d \leftarrow (b * 2) - 4 \times a \times c
                                               A Discriminant.
     d<0: 0
                                               A No roots
     d=0: -b \div 2 \times a
                                               a One root
     d>0: (-b+^-1 \ 1\times d\times 0.5) \div 2\times a A Two roots
}
```

A nuance: the special syntax $\alpha \leftarrow \exp r$ is executed only if the D-Fn is called with no left argument. This is equivalent to, but neater than: $\Phi(0 = \Box nc' Larg') / \Box Larg \leftarrow ...$ in a conventionally defined function.

```
root \leftarrow \{
\alpha \leftarrow 2
w \star \div \alpha
\}

root 64

square root.

8

3 root 64

square root.
```

Recursion

D-Fns use recursion in place of iteration. Reference to the current function can of course use the function's name explicitly. However because we allow unnamed D-Fns, we need a special symbol to represent self-reference. 'v' does the job.

' v' has a further small advantage in that a recursive function can be renamed without having to locate and change explicit self references within the function body.

```
fact←{
                                  A Factorial.
      \omega = 0 : 1
      \omega \times \nabla \quad \omega - 1
                                                                                       Α!
}
gcd+{
                                  A Euclid's greatest common divisor.
      \omega = 0: \alpha
      ω ∇ ω | α
                                                                                       A *
}
fib←{
                                  A w'th Fibonacci number.
      Α!
}
ack←{
                                  A Ackermann's function.
      \alpha = 0: \omega + 1
      \omega = 0: (\alpha - 1) \nabla 1
                                                                                        Α *
              (\alpha-1)\nabla \alpha \nabla \omega-1
                                                                                       A *!
}
                                  A Oscillate - probably returns 1.
osc ← {
       1 = \omega: 1
      2 \mid \omega: \nabla 1 + 3 \times \omega
                                                                                        Α *
              \nabla \omega \div 2
                                                                                        Α *
}
```

These examples show that D-Fns contain a minimum of syntactic baggage - allowing the underlying algorithms to 'shine through'. For example, compare the osc example above with the equivalent coding using:

Control structures

Conventional Branching

```
∇ z+osc n
                                                                      ∇ z+osc n
[1]
                                                                [1]
         : If 1=n
                                                                         \rightarrow (1=n)/0, z\leftarrow 1
                                                               [2]
[2]
                z ←1
                                                                         \rightarrow (2|n)/odd
[3]
        :ElseIf 2|n
                                                               [3]
                                                                       \rightarrow 0, z \leftarrow osc n \div 2
[4]
                                                               [4] odd:z \leftarrow osc 1 + 3 \times n
              z \leftarrow osc 1 + 3 \times n
[5]
         :Else
               z+osc n÷2
[6]
         :End
[7]
```

A happy consequence of reducing syntax is that the interpreter has less work to do. D-Fns significantly outperform their conventionally defined counterparts.

Tail Calls

In the previous examples, the recursive calls marked (n *) are said to be **tail calls** or **tail-recursive calls** whereas those marked (n !) are not. A function call is a tail call if its result is passed back unchanged to its own calling environment.

Tail calls can be implemented in the interpreter by re-entering the current instance of the function, rather than creating a new one. This delivers a substantial performance benefit, both in terms of execution time and workspace used.

It is often possible to turn a 'stack-call' into a tail call by accumulating the result on the way into, rather than on the way out of, the recursion. In general, this technique employs an **auxiliary function** that takes an **accumulating argument**. APL's infix syntax is particularly suited to this technique as we can use the left argument exclusively to accumulate result-so-far, and the right argument to specify work outstanding. Evaluation consists of moving work from the incoming right argument into the left argument of the next recursive call. Note that in these and following examples, $\Box m1$ migration level is set to 3. In particular, $\uparrow \omega$ means first.

```
fact←{
                                                 A Tail recursive Factorial.
       1 {
              \omega = 0: \alpha
               (\alpha \times \omega) \nabla \omega - 1
                                                                                                    ρ *
       } ω
}
fib←{
                                                 A Tail recursive Fibonacci.
       0 1 {
              \omega = 0: \uparrow \alpha
              (1 \downarrow \alpha, +/\alpha) \nabla \omega - 1
                                                                                                    A *
       } ω
}
```

We can simplify the coding by expressing the auxiliary function as a dyadic case of the outer monadic function:

```
fact \leftarrow \{ \\ \alpha \leftarrow 1 \\ \omega = 0: \alpha \\ (\alpha \times \omega) \forall \omega - 1 \\ \}
sieve \leftarrow \{ \\ \alpha \leftarrow \theta \\ next \leftarrow 1 \uparrow \omega \\ mask \leftarrow xnext \mid \omega \\ (\alpha, next) \forall mask/\omega \\ \}
sieve 1 \downarrow 120
2 3 5 7 11 13 17 19
A Sieve of Eratosthenes. \\ A No primes yet. \\ A No prime and ... \\ A No multiples. \\ A No multiples, finished. \\ A Sieve out further primes. A * \\ A Sieve primes from 2 ... 20
```

It's easy to check if a call is a tail call by tracing it. Tail calls appear to re-use the current trace window, whereas stack-calls pop up a new one.

D-Ops: Dynamic Operators

The operator equivalent of a D-Fn refers to its left and right **operand** using ' $\alpha\alpha$ ' and ' $\omega\omega$ ' respectively. A D-Op is distinguished from a D-Fn by the presence of either of these symbols anywhere in the definition. A D-Op containing only ' $\alpha\alpha$'s is monadic, whereas one that contains at least one ' $\omega\omega$ ', is dyadic. The Dyalog system editor distinguishes these cases and colours the braces that surround the operator accordingly.

For recursive D-Ops, there are two kinds of self reference: "" refers to the current derived function, that is, the operator bound with its operand(s). When the operands are functions, this is the most frequently used form of self reference. However, if the operands are arrays, we often need a recursive reference to the operator itself and then we would use: "" "".

```
limit \leftarrow \{
                                        A Function power limit.
                                        Apply operand until
      z \leftarrow \alpha \alpha \omega
                                        A ... it has no effect.
      z\omega: \omega
                                        A Else, repeat.
      \nabla Z
                                                                                            A *
}
perv←{
                                       м Scalar pervasion, apply ...
      1 = \alpha \quad \omega : \quad \alpha \quad \alpha \alpha \quad \omega \\ \quad \alpha \quad \nabla \quad \omega
                                   A ... fn between simple scalars.
                                       A ... else, traverse each arg. A!
}
                                        A Simple-array-wise.
saw←{
                                        A Simple: apply operand.
A Nested: visit each sub-array A !
      1≥ω: αα ω
∇''ω
}
```

Re-writing $p \circ w$ to take its function as right operand and its count as left *operand* requires that the recursion refer to the operator $(\nabla \nabla)$ rather than its derived function:

Example: Pythagorean triples

The following sequence shows an example of combining Dynamic Functions and Operators in an attempt to find Pythagorean triples: (3 4 5) (5 12 13) ...

```
sgrt \leftarrow \{w * 0.5\}
                                                  A Square root.
       sqrt 9 16 25
3 4 5
                                                 A Hypoteneuse of triangle.
       hyp \leftarrow \{sqrt + / \supset w * 2\}
       hyp(3 +)(4 + 5)(5 + 12)
5 6.403124237 13
       intq \leftarrow \{ \omega = \lfloor \omega \}
                                                 a Whole number?
       intg 2.5 3 4.5
0 1 0
       pyth \leftarrow \{intg\ hyp\ \omega\}
                                                 n Pythagorean pair?
      pyth(3 4)(4 9)(5 12)
1 0 1
                                                  A Pairs of numbers 1..ω.
       pairs \leftarrow \{, \iota \omega \ \omega\}
       pairs 3
 1 1 1 2 1 3 2 1 2 2 2 3 3 1 3 2 3 3
       filter \leftarrow \{(\alpha\alpha \ \omega)/\omega\}
                                                  A Op: w filtered by aa.
       pyth filter pairs 12
                                                  A Pythagorean pairs 1..12
      4 3 5 12 6 8 8 6 9 12 12 5 12 9
```

```
So far, so good, but we have some duplicates: For example, (6 8) is just double (3 4).
```

We can use an operator to combine the tests:

Better, but we still have some duplicates: (3 4) (4 3).

```
less ← { </⊃w }
less (3 4) (4 3)

1 0

less and pyth and rpm filter pairs 40
3 4 5 12 7 24 8 15 9 40 12 35 20 21
```

And finally, as promised, triples:

```
{$\omega$,hyp $\omega$} iless and pyth and rpm filter pairs 40 3 4 5 5 12 13 7 24 25 8 15 17 9 40 41 12 35 37 20 21 29
```

A larger example

Tokens uses nested local D-Fns to split an APL expression into its constituent tokens. Note that all calls on the inner functions: lex, acc, and the unnamed D-Fn in each token case, are *tail calls*. In fact, the *only* stack calls are those on function: all, and the unnamed function: $\{\omega \lor 1\phi\omega\}$, within the 'Char literal' case.

```
A Lex of APL src line.
    tokens←{
          alph\leftarrow \Box A, \Box \underline{A}, '\_\Delta\underline{\Delta}', 26\uparrow 17\downarrow \Box AV
                                                            A Alphabet for names.
          all \leftarrow \{+/\land \setminus \alpha \in \omega\}
                                                              A No. of leading \alpha \in \omega.
          acc \leftarrow \{(\alpha, \uparrow/\omega) lex \supset \downarrow/\omega\}
                                                              A Accumulate tokens.
          lex←{
                                                             A Next char else finished.
                 0 = \rho \omega : \alpha \diamond hd \leftarrow \uparrow \omega
                 hd = ' : \alpha \{
                                                              A White Space.
                       size←w all' '
                       \alpha acc size \omega
                 } ω
                 hd∈alph:α{
                                                              n Name
                       size \leftarrow \omega all alph, \square D
                       \alpha acc size \omega
                 hd \in ' \square : ' : \alpha \{
                                                              A System Name / Keyword
                       size \leftarrow \omega all hd, alph
                       \alpha acc size \omega
                 } ω
                 hd = ! ! ! : \alpha \{
                                                              A Char literal
                       size \leftarrow +/ \land \setminus \{\omega \lor 1 \varphi \omega\} \neq \backslash hd = \omega
                       \alpha acc size \omega
                 } ω
                 hd \in \square D, ' - ' : \alpha \{
                                                              A Numeric literal
                       size \leftarrow \omega all \Box D, \Box D, \Box E
                       \alpha acc size \omega
                 } ω
                 hd='A':α acc(ρω)ω
                                                            a Comment
                                                             A Single char token.
                 \alpha acc 1 \omega
          (0 \rho c'') lex, \omega
    }
       display tokens'xtok+size↑srce A Next token'
```

Summary

The syntax of a D-Fn / D-Op is shown in the railway diagram:

LDEF: Definition local to the D-Fn using simple or vector assignment.

GUARD: Expression which evaluates to a Boolean single.

EXPR: Arbitrary APL expression.

Following special characters are substituted:

α: Function Left Argument.ω: Function Right Argument.

v: Function (and Derived Function) Self reference.

αα: Operator Left Operand.
 ωω: Operator Right Operand.
 ∇∇: Operator Self reference.

Phrases are evaluated in turn until an unguarded EXPR, or one whose guard evaluates to 1, is encountered. The corresponding EXPR is then evaluated as the result of the D-Fn.

Conclusion

D-Fns give us the opportunity to combine the power of expression of APL with an alternative and in some circumstances, more convenient functional framework.

They encourage (but don't compel), the programming of 'pure' functions. There is evidence to suggest that coding in such a style produces more reliable software.

D-Fns provide true local functions. They encourage the use of sub-functions that may otherwise be avoided owing to a (perceived) degradation in performance or code readability. For example, it is often tempting to replace a call on a small function applied under each (") by embedding the code directly in the calling line and peppering it with '"'s or 'o's.

Using D-Fns in this situation improves both speed and readability. For example:

To coin a phrase: "D-Fns provide a new Lo-Cal wrapper for our familiar APL expressions."

Implementation Status

These ideas were first presented in the Dyadic Vendor Forum at APL96 where they appeared to meet with general approval. D-Fns were introduced with APL/W version 8.1 release 1 in early 1997. Coding examples such as those included in this article show that they have a reasonably wide application and measurements of their performance have been particularly pleasing.

Dfns Email Group

To subscribe to an email discussion group, devoted to **D-fns**, send email to <u>dfns@dyalog.com</u>, with subject: SUBSCRIBE