Subject: lambdas
Posted by jdwastrack on Thu, 10 Mar 2016 22:48:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

My current rule for lambdas is similar to pythons. eg.

\[
g = \lambda x: x ** 2
\]

print g(8)

>> 64

I know this is a little different than in scheme/scam, in that I can technically give my function a name, so I'm asking on here to see if it's ok before I get in too deep to change it easily.

Subject: Re: lambdas
Posted by jmhossler on Fri, 11 Mar 2016 02:39:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I think it is fine. I'm implementing my anonymous functions the same way javascript does. Javascript has all functions defined by anonymous functions, which you can choose to assign to an ID or not.

The reason your implementation is fine is that, in python, you don't need to assign a lambda to a variable name in order to run it.

Subject: Re: lambdas
Posted by lusth on Mon, 14 Mar 2016 22:09:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Having only lambdas for function definitions is OK.