```
fun append (xs,ys) =
    if xs=[]
    then ys
    else (hd xs)::append(tl xs,ys)

fun map (f,xs) =
    case xs of
       [] => []
       | x::xs' => (f x)::(map(f,xs'))

val a = map (increment, [4,8,12,16])
val b = map (hd, [[8,6],[7,5],[3,0,9]])
```

Programming Languages Dan Grossman 2013

Why Lexical Scope

Why lexical scope

- Lexical scope: use environment where function is defined
- · Dynamic scope: use environment where function is called

Decades ago, both might have been considered reasonable, but now we know lexical scope makes much more sense

Here are three precise, technical reasons

Not a matter of opinion

Why lexical scope?

Function meaning does not depend on variable names used

Example: Can change body of **f** to use **q** everywhere instead of **x**

- Lexical scope: it cannot matter
- Dynamic scope: depends how result is used

```
fun f y =
   let val x = y+1
   in fn z => x+y+z end
```

Example: Can remove unused variables

```
- Dynamic s fun f g = uses it (weird)

let val x = 3

in g 2 end
```

Jan-Mar 2013

Dan Grossman, Programming

Why lexical scope?

2. Functions can be type-checked and reasoned about where defined

Example: Dynamic scope tries to add a string and an unbound variable to 6

```
val x = 1
fun f y =
    let val x = y+1
    in fn z => x+y+z end
val x = "hi"
val g = f 7
val z = g 4
```

Why lexical scope?

- 3. Closures can easily store the data they need
 - Many more examples and idioms to come

Does dynamic scope exist?

- Lexical scope for variables is definitely the right default
 - Very common across languages
- Dynamic scope is occasionally convenient in some situations
 - So some languages (e.g., Racket) have special ways to do it
 - But most do not bother
- If you squint some, exception handling is more like dynamic scope:
 - raise e transfers control to the current innermost handler
 - Does not have to be syntactically inside a handle expression (and usually is not)