Local definitions and lexical scope

Readings: HtDP, Intermezzo 3 (Section 18).

Language level: Intermediate Student

Topics:

- Motivating local definitions
- Semantics of local
- Reasons to use local
- Terminology

Local definitions

The functions and special forms we’ve seen so far can be arbitrarily nested—except define and check-expect.

So far, definitions have to be made “at the top level”, outside any expression.

The Intermediate language provides the special form local, which contains a series of local definitions plus an expression using them.

(local [(define x_1 exp_1) ... (define x_n exp_n)] bodyexp)

What use is this?

Motivating local definitions

Consider Heron’s formula for the area of a triangle with sides a, b, c:

\[ \sqrt{s(s-a)(s-b)(s-c)}, \text{ where } s = (a + b + c)/2 \]

It is not hard to create a Racket function to compute this function, but it is difficult to do so in a clear and natural fashion.

We will describe several possibilities, starting with a direct implementation.
Motivation: direct translation

```
(define (t-area-v0 a b c)
  (sqrt
   (* (/ (+ a b c) 2)
      (- (/ (+ a b c) 2) a)
      (- (/ (+ a b c) 2) b)
      (- (/ (+ a b c) 2) c))))
```

The repeated computation of \( s = (a + b + c)/2 \) is awkward.

Motivation: rewrite expressions

We could notice that \( s - a = (-a + b + c)/2 \), and make similar substitutions.

```
(define (t-area-v1 a b c)
  (sqrt
   (* (/ (+ a b c) 2)
      (/ (+ (- a) b c) 2)
      (/ (+ a (- b) c) 2)
      (/ (+ a b (- c)) 2))))
```

This is slightly shorter, but its relationship to Heron’s formula is unclear from just reading the code, and the technique does not generalize.

Motivation: use a helper function (v1)

We could instead use a helper function.

```
(define (t-area-v2 a b c)
  (sqrt
   (* (s a b c)
      (- (s a b c) a)
      (- (s a b c) b)
      (- (s a b c) c))))
```

This generalizes well to formulas that define several intermediate quantities.

```
(define (s a b c)
  (/ (+ a b c) 2))
```

But the helper functions need parameters, which again makes the relationship to Heron’s formula hard to see. And there’s still repeated code and repeated computations.
> Motivation: use a helper function (v2)

We could instead move the computation with a known value of \( s \) into a helper function, and provide the value of \( s \) as a parameter.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(define } & \text{(t-area/s } a \ b \ c \ s) \\
& (\sqrt{(* \ s (- \ s \ a) (- \ s \ b) (- \ s \ c))})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(define } & \text{(t-area-v3 } a \ b \ c) \\
& (t-area/s \ a \ b \ c (/ (+ \ a \ b \ c) 2)))
\end{align*}
\]

This is more readable, and shorter, but it is still awkward.

The value of \( s \) is defined in one function and used in another.

> Motivation: use \texttt{local}

The \texttt{local} special form we introduced provides a natural way to bring the definition and use together.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(define } & \text{(t-area-v4 } a \ b \ c) \\
& (\text{(local } \begin{align*}
& (\text{(define } s (/ (+ \ a \ b \ c) 2))) \\
& (\sqrt{(* \ s (- \ s \ a) (- \ s \ b) (- \ s \ c))}))
\end{align*}\text{)})
\end{align*}
\]

This is nice and short!  
It \textit{looks} like Herron’s formula. 
No repeated code or computations. 

Since \texttt{local} is another special form (like \texttt{cond}) that results in double parentheses, we will use square brackets to improve readability. This is another \textit{convention}.

Semantics of \texttt{local}

Local definitions permit reuse of names.

This is not new to us:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(define } & n 10) \\
\text{(define } & \text{(myfn } n \text{) (+ } 2 \ n)) \\
\text{(myfn} & 6)
\end{align*}
\]

gives the answer 8, not 12.

The substitution specified in the semantics of function application ensures that the correct value is used while evaluating the last line.
Reusing names

The name of a formal parameter to a function may reuse (within the body of that function) a name which is bound to a value through `define`.

Similarly, a `define` within a `local` expression may rebind a name which has already been bound to another value or expression.

The substitution rules we define for `local` as part of the semantic model must handle this.

The resulting substitution rule for `local` is the most complicated one we will see in this course.

Informal substitution rule for `local`

The substitution rule works by replacing every name defined in the `local` with a fresh name (a.k.a. fresh identifier) – a new, unique name that has not been used anywhere else in the program.

Each old name within the `local` is replaced by the corresponding new name.

Because the new name hasn’t been used elsewhere in the program, the local definitions (with the new name) can now be “promoted” to the top level of the program without affecting anything outside of the `local`.

We can now use our existing rules to evaluate the program.

The next slide shows an example (the last version of Herron’s formula). Then we’ll state the rule more rigourously.

Example: evaluating t-area4

We’ll need a fresh identifier to replace `s`. We’ll use `s_47`, which we just made up.

```
(t-area4 3 4 5) ⇒
(local [(define s (/ (+ 3 4 5) 2))]
  (sqrt (* s (- s 3) (- s 4) (- s 5))) ⇒
  (define s_47 (/ (+ 3 4 5) 2))
  (sqrt (* s_47 (- s_47 3) (- s_47 4) (- s_47 5))) ⇒
  (define s_47 (/ 12 2))
  (sqrt (* s_47 (- s_47 3) (- s_47 4) (- s_47 5))) ⇒
  (define s_47 6)
  (sqrt (* s_47 (- s_47 3) (- s_47 4) (- s_47 5))) ⇒ ... 6
```
In general, an expression of the form
\[(\text{local} \ [(\text{define} \ x_1 \ exp_1) \ \ldots \ (\text{define} \ x_n \ exp_n)] \ \text{bodyexp})\]
is handled as follows:

- \(x_i\) is replaced with a fresh identifier (call it \(x_i\_new\)) everywhere in the \text{local} expression, for \(1 \leq i \leq n\).
- The definitions \((\text{define} \ x_1\_new \ exp_1) \ \ldots \ (\text{define} \ x_n\_new \ exp_n)\) are then lifted out (all at once) to the top level of the program, preserving their ordering.
- What remains looks like \((\text{local} \ [] \ \text{bodyexp}')\), where \text{bodyexp}' is the rewritten version of \text{bodyexp}. Replace the \text{local} expression with \text{bodyexp}'.

All of this (the renaming, the lifting, and removing the \text{local} with an empty definitions list) is a **single step**.

---

**Revising function substitution**

Our previous statement about using our existing rules isn’t quite correct. Consider the code on the right.

\[(\text{define} \ (\text{foo} \ x \ y))
(\text{local} \ [(\text{define} \ x \ y)
(\text{define} \ z \ (+ \ x \ y))]
(+ \ x \ z)))\]

\((f \ \text{v}_1 \ \ldots \ \text{v}_n) \Rightarrow \text{exp}'\) where \((\text{define} \ (f \ x_1 \ \ldots \ x_n) \ \text{exp})\) occurs to the left, and \text{exp}' is obtained by substituting into the expression \text{exp}, with all occurrences of the formal parameter \(x_i\) replaced by the value \(v_i\) (for \(i\) from 1 to \(n\)) except where \(x_1\) has been redefined within \text{exp} (e.g. **within a local**).

---

**Reasons to use local**

- Clarity: Naming subexpressions
- Efficiency: Avoid recomputation
- Encapsulation: Hiding stuff
- Scope: Reusing parameters
> Clarity: naming subexpressions

A subexpression used twice within a function body always yields the same value.

Using `local` to give the reused subexpression a name improves the readability of the code.

This was a motivating factor in `t-area`. Naming the subexpression made the relationship to Herron's Formula clear.

```scheme
(define (t-area-v4 a b c)
  (local [(define s (/ (+ a b c) 2))]
    (sqrt (* s (- s a) (- s b) (- s c)))))
```

> Clarity: mnemonic names

Sometimes we choose to use `local` in order to name subexpressions mnemonically to make the code more readable, even if they are not reused. This may make the code longer.

```scheme
(define-struct coord (x y))
(define (distance p1 p2)
  (sqrt (+ (sqr (- (coord-x p1) (coord-x p2)))
          (sqr (- (coord-y p1) (coord-y p2))))))

(define (distance p1 p2)
  (local [(define delta-x (- (coord-x p1) (coord-x p2)))
          (define delta-y (- (coord-y p1) (coord-y p2)))
          (sqrt (+ (sqr delta-x) (sqr delta-y))))])
```

> Efficiency: avoid recomputation

Recall that in lecture module 09, we saw a version of `max-list` used the same recursive application twice. The repeated computation of values caused it to be very slow, even for lists of length 25.

We can use `local` to avoid recomputation.

```scheme
(define (max-list lst)
  (local [(define max-val (if (null? lst) (neg infinity)
                                  (foldr max max-val lst))]
    max-val))
```
» Efficiency: **max-list** without local

;; (max-list lon) produces the maximum element of lon
;; max-list: (listof Num) → Num
;; requires: lon is nonempty
;; Examples:
(check-expect (max-list '(6 2 3 7 1)) 7)

(define (max-list lon)
  (cond [(empty? (rest lon)) (first lon)]
        [(> (first lon) (max-list (rest lon))) (first lon)]
        [else (max-list (rest lon))]))

» Efficiency: **max-list** with local

;; (max-list3 lon) produces the maximum element of lon
;; max-list3: (listof Num) → Num
;; requires: lon is nonempty
(define (max-list3 lon)
  (cond [(empty? (rest lon)) (first lon)]
        [else (local [(define max-rest (max-list2 (rest lon)))]
                      (cond [(> (first lon) max-rest) (first lon)]
                               [else max-rest]))]))

» Efficiency: **search-bt-path**: original

;; search-bt-path-v1: Nat BT → (anyof false (listof Sym))
(define (search-bt-path-v1 k tree)
  (cond [(empty? tree) false]
        [ (= k (node-key tree)) '()]
        [(list? (search-bt-path-v1 k (node-left tree)))
         (cons 'left (search-bt-path-v1 k (node-left tree)))]
        [(list? (search-bt-path-v1 k (node-right tree)))
         (cons 'right (search-bt-path-v1 k (node-right tree)))]
        [else false])
This new version of `search-bt-path` avoids making the same recursive function application twice, and does not require a helper function.

But it still suffers from an inefficiency: we always explore the entire binary tree, even if the correct solution is found immediately in the left subtree.

We can avoid the extra search of the right subtree using nested `locals`. 
» Efficiency: search-bt-path: with nested local

;; search-bt-path-v4: Nat BT → (anyof false (listof Sym))
(define (search-bt-path-v4 k tree)
  (cond
    [(empty? tree) false]
    [(= k (node-key tree)) '()]
    [else (local [(define left (search-bt-path-v4 k (node-left tree)))]
      (cond [(list? left) (cons 'left left)]
        [else (local [(define right (search-bt-path-v4 k (node-right tree)))]
          (cond [(list? right) (cons 'right right)]

Motivation Semantics Reasons Terminology
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> Encapsulation: hiding stuff

Encapsulation is the process of grouping things together in a “capsule”.

We have already seen data encapsulation in the use of structures.

There is also an aspect of information hiding to encapsulation which we did not see with structures.

The local bindings are not visible (have no effect) outside the local expression.

In CS 246 we will see how objects combine data encapsulation with another type of encapsulation we now discuss.

Motivation Semantics Reasons Terminology
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» Behaviour encapsulation

Local definitions can bind names to functions as well as values. Evaluating the local expression creates new, unique names for the functions just as for the values.

This is known as behaviour encapsulation.

Behaviour encapsulation allows us to move helper functions within the function that uses them, so they:

- are invisible outside the function.
- do not clutter the “namespace” at the top level.
- cannot be used by mistake.

This makes the organization of the program more obvious and is particularly useful when using accumulators.

Motivation Semantics Reasons Terminology
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» Example: sum-list

```scheme
(define (sum-list lon)
  (local [(define (sum-list/acc lst sofar)
             (cond [(empty? lst) sofar]
                   [else (sum-list/acc (rest lst) (+ (first lst) sofar))]))]
    (sum-list/acc lon 0)))
```

Making the accumulatively-recursive helper function local facilitates reasoning about the program.

HtDP (section VI) discusses reasoning with invariants. It will be discussed further in CS 245. It is important in CS 240 and CS 341.

» Example: Insertion sort

```scheme
(define (isort lon)
  (local [(define (insert n slon)
            (cond [(empty? slon) (cons n empty)]
                  [(<= n (first slon)) (cons n slon)]
                  [else (cons (first slon) (insert n (rest slon)))]))]
    (cond [(empty? lon) empty]
          [else (insert (first lon) (isort (rest lon)))]))
```

» Encapsulation and the design recipe

A function can enclose the cooperating helper functions that it uses inside a `local`, as long as these are not also needed by other functions. When this happens, the enclosing function and all the helpers act as a cohesive unit.

Here, the local helper functions require contracts and purposes, but not examples or tests. The helper functions can be tested by writing suitable tests for the enclosing function.

Make sure the local helper functions are still tested completely!
Design recipe example

;; Full Design Recipe for isort ...
(define (isort lon)
  (local 
    (define (insert n slon)
      (cond [(empty? slon) (cons n empty)]
        [(<= n (first slon)) (cons n slon)]
        [else (cons (first slon) (insert n (rest slon)))])))

  (cond [(empty? lon) empty]
    [else (insert (first lon) (isort (rest lon)))]))

Scope: reusing parameters

Making helper functions local can reduce the need to have parameters "go along for the ride".

(define (countup-to n)
  (countup-to-from n 0))

(define (countup-to-from n m)
  (cond [(> m n) empty]
    [else (cons m (countup-to-from n (add1 m)))]))

Example: countup-to

(define (countup-to-v2 n)
  (local
    (define (countup-from m)
      (cond [(> m n) empty]
        [else (cons m (countup-from (add1 m)))]))
    (countup-from 0)))

n no longer needs to be a parameter to countup-from, because it is in scope.

If we evaluate (countup-to-v2 10) using our substitution model, a renamed version of countup-from with n replaced by 10 is lifted to the top level.

Then, if we evaluate (countup-to-v2 20), another renamed version of countup-from is lifted to the top level.
We can use the same idea to localize the helper functions for `mult-table` from lecture module 08.

Recall that

\[
\text{mult-table}(3, 4) \Rightarrow \\
(\text{list } (\text{list } 0 0 0 0) \\
(\text{list } 0 1 2 3) \\
(\text{list } 0 2 4 6))
\]

The \( c^{th} \) entry of the \( r^{th} \) row (numbering from 0) is \( r \times c \).

```scheme
(define (mult-table nr nc)
  (rows-to 0 nr nc))
```

We will revisit this code again in M13.
Terminology associated with local

The **binding occurrence** of a name is its use in a definition, or formal parameter to a function.

The associated **bound occurrences** are the uses of that name that correspond to that binding.

The **lexical scope** of a binding occurrence is all places where that binding has effect, taking note of holes caused by reuse of names.

**Global scope** is the scope of top-level definitions.

Conclusions

The use of **local** has permitted only modest gains in expressivity and readability in our examples.

The language features discussed in the next module expand this power considerably.

Some other languages (C, C++, Java) either disallow nested function definitions or allow them only in very restricted circumstances.

Local variable and constant definitions are more common.

Goals of this module

- You should understand the syntax, informal semantics, and formal substitution semantics for the **local** special form.
- You should be able to use **local** to avoid repetition of common subexpressions, to improve readability of expressions, and to improve efficiency of code.
- You should understand the idea of encapsulation of local helper functions.
- You should be able to match the use of any constant or function name in a program to the binding to which it refers.