Lexical addressing

The difference between a *interpreter* and a *compiler* is really two points on a *spectrum* of possible computations that occur either “now” (compile time) or “later” (run time). The mechanics of *variable lookup* is a case in point.

When the metacircular evaluator needs to find the value of a variable \( x \), it searches through the entire environment. Our Scheme evaluator uses *static binding*: every user-defined procedure has a *fixed* place where, no matter when and where the procedure is used, all frames (created by procedure application) are attached. It turns out that *without running the program*, we can figure out *where* in the environment every binding will occur, even if we cannot know what *value* will occur in that binding.

“Knowing where” can speed up variable lookup at runtime. If variable \( x \) occurs four frames up, fifth variable in the frame, we don’t need to search the frames in between: we march up the list of frames (using \texttt{cdr} \protect\), enter the frame, march over four bindings, and—\textit{voilà}. Even if the environment is just one long list of bindings, lookup gets faster—we don’t need to check each binding.
For simplification, all procedure take exactly one argument—then the compile-time environment is just a list of variable names. (Why don’t we need frames?)

(compile '5 '())
;Value: 5

(compile 'x '(u v w x y))
;Value: (var 3)

(The variable x is three “steps” from the front of the list.)

(compile 'v '())
;Value: (var v)

(Since v doesn’t appear in the compile-time environment, we’ll leave it unchanged.)

(compile '(lambda (x) x) '(u v w x y))
;Value: (lambda (var 0))

(When the body of the procedure is evaluated, the compile-time environment will be x u v w x y.)

(compile '(lambda (x) (x w)) '(u v w x y))
;Value: (lambda ((var 0) (var 3)))

(compile '(lambda (x) (lambda (y) (x y))) '())
;Value: (lambda (lambda ((var 1) (var 0))))

(compile '(if (zero? n) 0 y) '(n y))
;Value: (if ((var zero?) (var 0)) 0 (var 1))

(compile '(enter ((+ 5) (exit z)) '(x y z u v w))
;Value: (enter (((var +) 5) (exit (var 3))))
Recursion poses a new problem. Consider this:

```lisp
(define (even? n)
  (if (= n 0) #t (odd? (- n 1))))

(define (odd? n)
  (if (= n 0) #f (even? (- n 1))))
```

Each procedure above calls the other (coroutining). When we compile each, we need to generate lexical addresses of the calls to `even?` and `odd?`. But we’re now compiling one at a time—so if we compile `even?` first, where’s the lexical address for `odd`??

(This isn’t a problem in the earlier evaluators, because there’s no evaluation inside a `lambda`—but now, there is computation inside a `lambda`.)

The solution is `letrec`, where in computing lexical addresses, we put all the names in `env-names` (the compile-time environment) first, and compile each body in the `letrec` in that new environment.

```lisp
(compile '(letrec ((inc (lambda (x) (1+ x))))
          (inc 10))
       '())
;Value: (letrec ((inc (lambda (((var 1+) (var 0)) (var 0))))
                ((var 0) 10))

(When the body of a `letrec` (a recursive `let`) is evaluated, the bindings are already in the environment.)

(compile '(letrec ((square (lambda (x) ((* x) x))))
          (decrease (lambda (y) ((- y) 1))))
          (decrease (square 5)))
       '())
;Value: 
(letrec ((square (lambda (((var *) (var 0)) (var 0))))
         (decrease (lambda (((var -) (var 0)) 1)))))
                                     ((var 1) ((var 0) 5)))
;No value
(compile
  '(letrec
      ((even? (lambda (n) (if (zero? n) true (odd? ((- n) 1)))))
        (odd? (lambda (n) (if (zero? n) false (even? ((- n) 1)))))
        (odd? 10))
    initial-names)
)

;Value: (letrec ((even?
    (lambda (if
      ((var 8) (var 0))
      (var 9)
      ((var 2)
        (((var 11) (var 0)) 1)))))
    (odd?
    (lambda (if
      ((var 8) (var 0))
      (var 10)
      ((var 1)
        (((var 11) (var 0)) 1)))))
    ((var 1) 10))
initial-names
;Value: (cons car cdr null? pair? zero? true false - * + = < 1+)

(compile 'letrec ((square (lambda (x) ((* x) x)))
    (decrease (lambda (y) ((- y) 1)))
    (decrease (square 5)))
initial-names)

;Value: (letrec ((square (lambda (((var 12) (var 0)) (var 0))))
    (decrease (lambda (((var 11) (var 0)) 1))))
    ((var 1) ((var 0) 5)))
;No value
(define (compile exp env-names)
  (cond
   ((constant? exp) exp)
   ((variable? exp)
    (list 'var (lookup-variable exp env-names)))
   ((letrec? exp)
    (compile-letrec (letrec-vars exp)
     (letrec-val exp)
     (letrec-body exp)
     env-names))
   ((lambda? exp)
    (list 'lambda
     (compile (body exp)
      (append (binders exp) env-names)))
   ((if? exp)
    (cons 'if (compile-list (cdr exp) env-names)))
   ((sequence? exp)
    (cons 'begin (compile-list (cdr exp) env-names)))
   ((enter? exp)
    (cons 'enter (compile-list (cdr exp)
     (cons '*EXIT* env-names)))
   ((exit? exp)
    (cons 'exit (compile-list (cdr exp) env-names)))
   (else ; it's an application!
    (compile-list exp env-names))))

(define (compile-list exp env-names)
  (map (lambda (e) (compile e env-names)) exp))
(define (compile-letrec vars vals body env-names)
  (let ((new-env-names (append vars env-names)))
    (let ((compiled-vals
      (map (lambda (val) (compile val new-env-names))
        vals))
      (body-code (compile body new-env-names)))
      (list 'letrec
        (zip-together vars compiled-vals)
        body-code))))

(define (zip-together vars vals)
  (if (null? vars)
    '()
    (cons (cons (car vars) (list (car vals)))
      (zip-together (cdr vars) (cdr vals)))))

(define (lookup-variable v env-names)
  (if (null? env-names)
    v
    (if (eq? v (car env-names))
      0
      (let ((a (lookup-variable v (cdr env-names))))
        (if (number? a) (1+ a) a))))

(define initial-names
  '(cons car cdr null? pair? zero? true false - * + = < 1+))
Notice the weird coding of `lookup-variable`—why?

```scheme
(define (lookup-variable v env-names)
  (if (null? env-names)
      v
      (if (eq? v (car env-names))
          0
          (let ((a (lookup-variable v (cdr env-names))))
            (if (number? a) (1+ a) a)))))

Here is something better—but we need `enter` and `exit` in the underlying Scheme system!

```scheme
(define (lookup-variable v env-names)
  (define (loop names)
    (if (null? names)
        (exit v)
        (if (eq? v (car names))
            0
            (1+ (loop (cdr names))))))
  (enter (loop env-names)))
```