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## Motivation for local bindings

We want local bindings = a way to name things locally in functions and other expressions.

Why?

- For style and convenience
- Avoiding duplicate computations
- A big but natural idea: nested function bindings
- Improving algorithmic efficiency (not "just a little faster")
let in the
quadratic formula

$$
x=\frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^{2}-4 a c}}{2 a}
$$

```
(define (quadratic-roots a b c)
    (let {[-b (- b)]
            [sqrt-discriminant
                (sqrt (- (* b b) (* 4 a c)))]
            [2a (* 2 a)]}
        (list (/ (+ -b sqrt-discriminant) 2a)
            (/ (- -b sqrt-discriminant) 2a))))
```

> (quadratic-roots 1 -5 6)
'(3 2)
> (quadratic-roots 27 -15)
' ( $1 \frac{1}{2}-5$ )

## Formalizing let expressions

2 questions: a new keyword!

- Syntax: (let \{[id1 el] ... [idn en]\} e body)
- Each xi is any variable, and e_body and each ei are any expressions
- Evaluation:
- Evaluate each ei to vi in the current dynamic environment.
- Evaluate e_body[v1,..vn/id1,...,idn]in the current dynamic environment.
Result of whole let expression is result of evaluating e_body


## Parens vs. Braces vs. Brackets

As matched pairs, they are interchangeable.
Differences can be used to enhance readability.

```
> (let {[a (+ 1 2)] [b (* 3 4)]} (list a b))
'(3 12)
> (let ((a (+ 1 2)) (b (* 3 4))) (list a b))
'(3 12)
> (let [[a (+ 1 2)] [b (* 3 4)]] (list a b))
'(3 12)
> (let [{a (+ 1 2)} (b (* 3 4))] (list a b))
'(3 12)
```


## let is an expression

A let-expression is just an expression, so we can use it anywhere an expression can go.
Silly example:

```
(+ (let {[x 1]} x)
    (let {[y 2]
        [\begin{array}{ll}{~}&{4}\end{array}]
        (- z y)))
```


## let is just syntactic sugar!

```
(let {[id1 e1] ... [idn en]} e_body)
```

desugars to
((lambda (id1 ... idn) e_body) e1 ... en)
Example:
(let $\{[\mathrm{a}(+12)][b$ (* 3 4)]\} (list a b))
desugars to
((lambda (a b) (list a b)) (+ 1 2) (* 3 4))

## Avoid repeated recursion

Consider this code and the recursive calls it makes

- Don't worry about calls to first, rest, and null? because they do a small constant amount of work
(define (bad-maxlist xs)
(if (null? xs)
-inf. 0
(if (> (first xs) (bad-maxlist (rest xs)))
(first xs)
(bad-maxlist (rest xs)))))
(if (> (first xs) (bad-maxlist (rest xs)))
(first xs)
(bad-maxlist (rest xs)))

Fast vs. unusable
(bad-maxlist (range $500-1$ ))
$\mathrm{bm} 50, \ldots \quad \rightarrow \mathrm{bm} 49, \ldots \quad \rightarrow \mathrm{bm} \mathrm{48}, \mathrm{\ldots} \quad \rightarrow \longrightarrow \longrightarrow \mathrm{bm} 1$
(bad-maxlist (range 1 51))

bm 50

## Some calculations

Suppose one bad-maxlist call's if logic and calls to null?,
first?, rest take $10^{-7}$ seconds total

- Then (bad-maxlist (list 5049 ... 1)) takes $50 \times 10^{-7} \mathrm{sec}$
- And (bad-maxlist (list 12 ... 50)) takes $\left(1+2+2^{2}+2^{3}+\ldots+2^{49}\right) \times 10^{-7}$ $=\left(2^{50}-1\right) \times 10^{-7}=1.12 \times 10^{8} \mathrm{sec}=$ over 3.5 years
- And (bad-maxlist (list 12 ... 55)) takes over 114 years
- And (bad-maxlist (list 12 ... 100)) takes over $4 \times 10^{15}$ years.
(Our sun is predicted to die in about $5 \times 10^{9}$ years)
- Buying a faster computer won't help much $\odot$

The key is not to do repeated work!

- Saving recursive results in local bindings is essential...


## Efficient maxlist

(define (good-maxlist xs)
(if (null? xs)
-inf. 0
(let $\{[r e s t-m a x ~(g o o d-m a x l i s t ~(r e s t ~ x s))]\} ~$
(if (> (first xs) rest-max)
(first xs)
rest-max))))

gm $1, \ldots$ $\rightarrow \mathrm{gm} \mathrm{2}, \mathrm{\ldots} \longrightarrow \mathrm{gm} 3, \ldots$ $\rightarrow$

## Transforming good-maxlist

```
(define (good-maxlist xs)
    (if (null? xs)
        -inf.0
        (let {[rest-max (good-maxlist (rest xs))]}
        (if (> (first xs) rest-max)
            (first xs)
            rest-max))))
```

(define (good-maxlist xs )
(if (null? xs)
-inf. 0
(( $\lambda$ (fst rest-max) ; name fst too!
(if (> fst rest-max) fst rest-max))
(first xs)
(good-maxlist (rest xs)))))
(define (good-maxlist xs) (define (max a b)
(if (null? xs)
(if (> a b) a b))
-inf. 0
(max (first xs) (good-maxlist (rest xs)))))
and and or sugar
(and) desugars to \#t
(and e1) desugars to e1
(and e1 ...) desugars to (if e1 (and ...) \#f)
(or) desugars to \#f
(or e1) desugars to e1
(or e1 ...) desugars to
(let ((id1 e1))
(if id1 id1 (or ...))
where id1 must be fresh - i.e., not used elsewhere in the program.

- Why is let needed in or desugaring but not and?
- Why must id1 be fresh?


## Your turn: sumProdList

Given a list of numbers, sumProdList returns a pair of
(1) the sum of the numbers in the list and
(2) The product of the numbers in the list

```
(sumProdList '(5 2 4 3)) -> (14 . 120)
(sumProdList '()) -> (0 . 1)
```

Define sumProdList. Why is it a good idea to use let in your definition?

## Scope and Lexical Contours

scope $=$ area of program where declared name can be used.
Show scope in Racket via lexical contours in scope diagrams.
(define add-n ( $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{x})(+\quad n \quad x))$ )
(define add-2n ( $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathrm{y})(\operatorname{add}-\mathrm{n}(\operatorname{add}-\mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{y})))$ )
(define n 17)
(define f ( $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \quad(\mathrm{z})$
(let \{[ C (add-2n z ) ]
$\left[\begin{array}{llll}d & (-z 3)\end{array}\right]$
$(+z(* \mathrm{c} d))) \quad)$

## Declarations vs. References

A declaration introduces an identifier (variable) into a scope.

A reference is a use of an identifier (variable) within a scope.
We can box declarations, circle references, and draw a line from each reference to its declaration. Dr. Racket does this for us (except it puts ovals around both declarations and references).

An identifier (variable) reference is unbound if there is no declaration to which it refers.

## Scope and Define Sugar

```
```

(define (add-n x ) (+ n x ) )

```
```

(define (add-n x ) (+ n x ) )
(define (add-2n y ) (add-n (add-n y )) )
(define (add-2n y ) (add-n (add-n y )) )
(define n 17)
(define n 17)
(define (f z )
(define (f z )
(let {[ c (add-2n z ) ]
(let {[ c (add-2n z ) ]
[ d (- z 3) ] [
[ d (- z 3) ] [
(+z (* c d )))) )

```
                (+z (* c d )))) )
```
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                                    Local Bindings & Scope 18
```

```
                                    Local Bindings & Scope 18
```

                Local Bindings \& Scope 17
    
## Shadowing

An inner declaration of a name shadows uses of outer declarations of the same name.

```
(let {[x 2]}
    (-
    (let {[\mathbf{x (% x x | ] }}
```


## Alpha-renaming

Can consistently rename identifiers as long as it doesn't change the connections between uses and declarations.


Not OK

```
(define (f x y)
    (* x
        (let {[x (add-2n y)]
            [y (- dy)]}
            (+ y (* x y))))))
```

Scope, Free Variables, and Higher-order Functions
In a lexical contour, an identifier is a free variable if it is not defined by a declaration within that contour.
Scope diagrams are especially helpful for understanding the meaning of free variables in higher order functions.


## More sugar: let*

```
(let* {} e_body) desugarsto e_body
(let* {[id1 e1] ...} e_body)
    desugarsto (let {[id1 e1]}
        (let* {...} e_body))
    Example:
    (let {[a 3] [b 12]}
        (list a b
            (let* {[a (- b a)]
            [b (* a a)]}
            (list a b)))))
```


## Your Turn: Compare the Following

```
```

(let {[a 3] [b 12]}

```
```

(let {[a 3] [b 12]}
(list a b
(list a b
(let {[a (- b a)]
(let {[a (- b a)]
[b (* a a)]}
[b (* a a)]}
(list a b))))

```
```

                (list a b))))
    ```
```

```
(let {[a 3] [b 12]}
```

(let {[a 3] [b 12]}
(list a b
(list a b
(let {[a (- b a)]}
(let {[a (- b a)]}
(let {[b (* a a)]}
(let {[b (* a a)]}
(list a b)))))

```
                                    (list a b)))))
```


## Local function bindings with let

- Silly example:

```
(define (quad x)
    (let ([square (lambda (x) (* x x))])
            (square (square x))))
```

- Private helper functions bound locally = good style.
- But can't use let for local recursion. Why not?



## letrec to the rescue!



## Mutual Recursion with letrec

```
(define (test-even-odd num)
    (letrec {[even? (\lambda (x)
                            (if (= x 0)
                    #t
                    (not (odd? (- x 1)))))]
                [odd? (\lambda (y)
                    (if (= y 0)
                    #f
                            (not (even? (- y 1)))))]}
        (list (even? num) (odd? num))))
```

> (test-even-odd 17)
' (\#t \#f)

## Even Better

```
(define (up-to-better x)
    (letrec {[up-to-x (lambda (Irsom)
                                    if (> from x)
                                    null
                                    (cons from
                                    (up-to-x (+ from 1)))))]}
        (up-to-x 1)))
```

- Functions can use bindings in the environment where they are defined:
- Bindings from "outer" environments
- Such as parameters to the outer function
- Earlier bindings in the let-expression
- Unnecessary parameters are usually bad style
- Like to in previous example


## Local definitions are sugar for letrec

```
(define (up-to-alt2 x)
    (define (up-to-x from)
            (if (> from x)
                    null
            (cons from
                (up-to-x (+ from 1)))))
        (up-to-x 1))
(define (test-even-odd-alt num)
        (define (even? x)
            (if (= x 0) #t (not (odd? (- x 1)))))
            (define (odd? y)
            (if (= y 0) #f (not (even? (- y 1)))))
    (list (even? num) (odd? num)))
```


## Nested functions: style

- Good style to define helper functions inside the functions they help if they are:
- Unlikely to be useful elsewhere
- Likely to be misused if available elsewhere
- Likely to be changed or removed later
- A fundamental trade-off in code design: reusing code saves effort and avoids bugs, but makes the reused code harder to change later


## Local Scope in other languages

What support is there for local scope in Python? JavaScript?
Java?

You will explore this in a future pset!

## Pragmatics: Programming Language Layers



## Where We Stand

Kernel
Sugar

Built-in library functions

User-defined library functions

