

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**CSE 505, Fall 2003, Final Examination  
12 December 2003**

**Please do not turn the page until everyone is ready.**

Rules:

- The exam is open-book, open-note, closed electronics.
- Please stop promptly at **12:20**.
- You can rip apart the pages, but please write your name on each page.
- You can turn in other pieces of paper.
- There are six questions (all with subparts), worth equal amounts. The subparts are not necessarily worth equal amounts.

Advice:

- Read questions carefully. Understand a question before you start writing.
- Write down thoughts and intermediate steps so you can get partial credit.
- The questions are roughly in the order we covered the material, not necessarily order of difficulty. Skip around.
- If you have questions, ask.
- Relax. You are here to learn, not beat the mean.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Assume a typed lambda-calculus with recursive types, product types, and sum types. (You may choose the formulation of recursive types with subtyping or explicit roll/unroll. Just state your choice.)
  - (a) Give a type describing binary trees of integers. A binary tree of integers is either a leaf (which holds one integer) or a node (which holds one integer in addition to two binary (sub)trees of integers).
  - (b) Write a one-argument function that takes an integer and produces a leaf holding that integer.
  - (c) Give a full typing derivation showing that your answer to the previous part is a function from integers to binary trees of integers.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Assume a typed lambda-calculus with records, references, and subtyping. For each of the following, describe exactly the conditions under which the subtyping claim holds.

Example question:  $\{l_1:\tau_1, l_2:\tau_2\} \leq \{l_1:\tau_3, l_2:\tau_4\}$

Example answer: “when  $\tau_1 \leq \tau_3$  and  $\tau_2 \leq \tau_4$ ”

Your answer should be “fully reduced” in the sense that if you say  $\tau \leq \tau'$ , then  $\tau$  or  $\tau'$  or both should be  $\tau_i$  for some number  $i$  where  $\tau_i$  appears in the question.

(a)  $(\{l_1:\tau_1, l_2:\tau_2\}) \rightarrow \text{int} \leq (\{l_1:\tau_3, l_2:\tau_4\}) \rightarrow \text{int}$

(b)  $\{l_1:(\tau_1 \text{ ref})\} \leq \{l_1:\tau_2\}$

(c)  $(\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) \rightarrow (\tau_3 \rightarrow \tau_4) \leq (\tau_5 \rightarrow \tau_6) \rightarrow (\tau_7 \rightarrow \tau_8)$

(d)  $(\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) \text{ ref} \leq (\tau_3 \rightarrow \tau_4) \text{ ref}$

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Consider the following O’Caml code.

```
let catch_all1 t1 t2 = try t1 () with x -> t2 ()
```

```
let catch_all2 t1 t2 = try t1 () with x -> t2
```

- (a) Under what conditions, if any, does using `catch_all1` raise an exception?
- (b) Under what conditions, if any, does using `catch_all2` raise an exception?
- (c) What type does O’Caml give `catch_all1`? (You can give your answer in O’Caml notation or System-F notation.)
- (d) What type does O’Caml give `catch_all2`? (You can give your answer in O’Caml notation or System-F notation.)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Consider these definitions in a class-based OO language:

```
class Thunk {
  abstract int apply();
}
class A {
  private int y;
  int g() { <<a hard-to-compute function using self.y>> }
  unit set_y(int i) { self.y := i }
}
class B {
  int f1(int x, bool b) { if b then x else 0 }
  int f2(Thunk x, bool b) { if b then x.apply() else 0 }

  unit f(A a, bool b) {
    // line 0
    print_int(self.f1(a.g(), b)); // line 1
    // line 2 (irrelevant until part (e))
    print_int(self.f1(a.g(), b)); // line 3 (identical to line 1)
  }
}
```

- (a) Replace lines 1 and 3 with code that uses `f2` and not `f1`, but still prints the same number. You should declare a subclass of `Thunk` (outside of `class B`) and use this class (including on line 0). Your subclass should define a constructor that takes argument(s) and initializes fields appropriately. (Hint: Pass `a` to the constructor.)
- (b) Compared to the original version, when is the change you made in part (a) faster and when is it slower?
- (c) Change your subclass of `Thunk` so that the first time `apply` is called it stores the result it returns in private state. When called again, `apply` should return the stored result. Lines 1 and 3 should be the same as in part (a).
- (d) Compared to the change in part (a), does the change in part (c) make line 1 faster or slower? Does it make line 3 faster or slower?
- (e) Write a line 2 that makes the change in part (c) incorrect in the sense that `f` might print different output than in part (a).

*The next page is blank.*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

*This page intentionally blank.*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Consider these definitions in a class-based OO language:

```
class C1 {
    int g() { return 0; }
    int f() { return g(); }
}
class C2 extends C1 {
    int g() { return 1; }
}
class D1 {
    private C1 x = new C1();
    int g() { return 0; }
    int f() { return x.f(); }
}
class D2 extends D1 {
    int g() { return 1; }
}

class Main {
    int m1(C1 x) { return x.f() }
    int m2(C2 x) { return x.f() }
    int m3(D1 x) { return x.f() }
    int m4(D2 x) { return x.f() }
}
```

Assume this is not the entire program, but the rest of the program does not declare subclasses of the classes above.

**Explain your answers:**

- (a) True or false: Changing the body of `m1` to `return 0` produces an equivalent `m1`.
- (b) True or false: Changing the body of `m2` to `return 1` produces an equivalent `m2`.
- (c) True or false: Changing the body of `m3` to `return 0` produces an equivalent `m3`.
- (d) True or false: Changing the body of `m4` to `return 1` produces an equivalent `m4`.
- (e) How do your answers change if the rest of the program might declare subclasses of the classes above (excluding `Main`)?

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Consider a class-based OO language with this ill-advised addition: We can declare new classes with “`class C restricts D by m.`” If `D` is a class with a method named `m`, then this declaration creates a class `C` that inherits the fields and methods of `D` except `C` has no method `m`.
- (a) Given `class C restricts D by m`, show that `C` should not be a subtype of `D`. Give an example expression that would type-check if `C` were a subtype of `D` but that would lead to a failed method-lookup, regardless of what members `D` has (other than `m`).
  - (b) Given `class C restricts D by m`, show that `C` may be a bad type, even without subtyping. Give an example class `D` and an expression `e` that would type-check such that evaluation of `e` would lead to a failed method-lookup. (Hint: `D` (and therefore `C`) can have methods other than `m`.)
  - (c) If we have `interface I restricts J by m` instead of `class C restricts D by m`, is it wrong to allow `I ≤ J` (or does the problem from part (a) no longer apply)? Explain.
  - (d) If we have `interface I restricts J by m` instead of `class C restricts D by m`, can `I` be a bad type even without subtyping (or does the problem from part (b) no longer apply)? Explain.