

Local definitions and lexical scope

Corky Cartwright

Department of Computer Science

Rice University



Definition

- BNF Syntax (cryptic inductive definition) for local
 - $exp := ... | (local (def_1 def_2 ... def_n) exp)|$
 - $def ::= (define \ var \ exp) \ | (define \ (var_1 \ var_2 \ ... \ var_n) \ exp)$

In many contexts, the names of syntactic categories are enclosed in pointy brackets rather than italicized, *e.g.* <var> instead of var

- Simple examples
 - . (define x 3) ;; Top-level variable definition
 - (define (f x) (+ x 1));; Top-level function definition
 - (define-struct entry (name zip phone));; Structure definition



Simple examples

```
(define x 3)
(local ((define x 3)) (+ x 1))
(define (f x) (+ x 1))
(local ((define x 3)
                             ;; local definition
        (define (f \times) (+ \times 1)));; local definition
       (f x)
                                 ;; body
(+ (local ((define x 3)
           (define (f x) (+ x 1))
          (f x)
   1)
   ;; local-expression as part of another expression
```



Definition

What's wrong with following expressions?

Reason 1: Avoid namespace pollution



Reason 1: Avoid namespace pollution



Reason 1: Avoid namespace pollution

```
(define (main_fun x) exp)
(define (aux_fun<sub>1</sub> ...) exp<sub>1</sub>)
(define (aux_fun<sub>2</sub> ...) exp<sub>2</sub>)
```





Reason 2: Avoid repeated computation



Reason 2: Avoid repeated computation



Reason 3: Naming complicated expressions







- Example:
 - (local ((define answer₁ 42)

 (define (f₂ x₃) (+ 1 x₄)))
 (f₅ answer₆))
- Variable occurrences: 1-6
 - Binding (or defining) occurrences: 1,2,3
 - Use occurrences: 4,5,6
- Scopes:
 - 1:?
 - · 2:?
 - . 3:?



```
• (local ((define answer<sub>1</sub> 42)
		 (define (f_2 x_3) (+ 1 x_4)))
		 (f_5 \text{ answer}_6))
```

- Variable occurrences: 1-6
 - Binding (or defining) occurrences: 1,2,3
 - Use occurrences: 4,5,6
- Scopes:
 - 1: (all of local expression)
 - 2: (all of local expression)
 - · 3: (+1 x)



 In the following code segment, what will g evaluate to?

```
(define x 0)
(define f x)
(define g (local ((define x 1)) f))
```



- What will g evaluate to?
 - (define x 0)
 (define f x)
 (define g (local ((define x 1)) f))



What will g evaluate to?

```
    (define x 0)
    (define f x)
    (define g (local ((define x 1)) f))
```



What will "g" evaluate to?

```
    (define x 0)
    (define f x)
    (define g (local ((define x 1)) f))
```



- Recall:
 - (local ((define answer₁ 42)

 (define (f₂ x₃) (+ 1 x₄)))
 (f₅ answer₆))
- Which variables can be renamed?
- Use the same name for "binding occurrence" and "use occurrence"

```
(local ((define answer 42)
          (define (f x) (+ 1 x)))
          (f answer))
```

 What name choices can be used? Any name that does not clash with variable names already visible in same scope. A "fresh" variable name.



- Which variables can be renamed?
- Use the same new name for "binding occurrence" and "use occurrences"



- Which variables can be renamed?
- Use the same name for "binding occurrence" and "use occurrence"



- Which variables can be renamed?
- Use the same name for "binding occurrence" and "use occurrence"



Definition

- How do we (hand) evaluate Racket programs with local?
- By lifting local definitions to the top level and renaming all
 of the variables that they introduce (for which they create
 binding occurrences) with fresh names to avoid any
 collisions with variables already defined at the top level.
- To express these laws we need a new format for expressing rules. Why? Because promoting local constructs revises the set of definitions that constitute the environment in which evaluation takes place.
- New format: we evaluate a sequence of define forms followed by an expression (which we formerly called the program application) which yields the answer for the computation.

Why Local Variables and Scope Renaming



To be continued ...

Definition