CSE P505, Spring 2006, Final Examination 6 June 2006

Rules:

- Please do not turn the page until everyone is ready.
- The exam is closed-book, closed-note, except for two sides of one 8.5x11in piece of paper.
- Please stop promptly at 8:30.
- You can rip apart the pages, but please write your name on each page.
- There are **100 points** total, distributed **very unevenly** among 7 questions (most of which have multiple parts).

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 not necessarily in order of difficulty.
- Skip around and focus on the questions worth more points.
- If you have questions, ask.
- Relax. You are here to learn.

For your reference (page 1 of 2):

Name:

1. (20 points) Suppose we add *division* to our IMP expression language. In Caml, the expression syntax becomes:

```
type exp =
Int of int | Var of string | Plus of exp * exp | Times of exp * exp | Div of exp * exp
```

Our interpreter (not shown) raises a Caml exception if the second argument to Div evaluates to 0. We are ignoring statements; assume an IMP program is an expression that takes an unknown heap and produces an integer.

- (a) Write a Caml function nsz (stands for "no syntactic zero") of type exp->bool that returns false if and only if its argument contains a division where the second argument is the integer constant *θ*. Note we are not interpreting the input; nsz is not even passed a heap.
- (b) If we consider division-by-zero at run-time a "stuck state" and nsz a "type system" (where true means "type-checks"), then:
 - i. Is **nsz** sound? Explain.
 - ii. Is nsz complete? Explain.

2. (20 points) Consider this Caml code. It uses strcmp, which has type string->string->bool and the expected behavior.

```
exception NoValue
let empty = fun s -> raise NoValue
let extend m x v = fun s -> if strcmp s x then v else m s
let lookup m x = m x
```

- (a) What functionality do these three bindings provide a client?
- (b) What types do each of the bindings have?(Note: They are all polymorphic and may have more general types than expected.)

- 3. (16 points) When we added sums (syntax A e, B e, and match e_1 with A $x \to e_2 | B y \to e_3$) to the λ -calculus, we gave a small-step semantics and had exactly two constructors.
 - (a) Give sums a large-step semantics, still for exactly two constructors. That is, extend the call-by-value large-step judgment $e \downarrow v$ with new rules. (Use 4 rules.)
 - (b) Suppose a program is written with *three* constructors (A, B, and C) and match expressions that have exactly *three* cases:

match e_1 with A $x \rightarrow e_2$ |B $y \rightarrow e_3$ |C $z \rightarrow e_4$

Explain a possible *translation* of such a program into an equivalent one that uses only two constructors. (That is, explain how to *translate* the 3 constructors to use 2 constructors and how to *translate* match expressions. Do *not* write inference rules.)

4. (14 points) Consider a λ -calculus with *tuples* (i.e., "pairs with any number of fields"), so we have expressions $(e_1, e_2, ..., e_n)$ and e.i and types $\tau_1 * \tau_2 * ... * \tau_n$. For each of our subtyping rules for records, explain whether or not an analogous rule for tuples makes sense.

- 5. (14 points) Assume a class-based object-oriented language as in class, and a program that contains the call e.f((C)e1) where e1 is a (compile-time) subtype of C and the whole call type-checks.
 - (a) If calls are resolved with static overloading, is it possible that removing the cast C (i.e., changing the call to e.f(e1)) could cause the program to still type-check but behave differently? Explain.
 - (b) If calls are resolved with static overloading and we have multiple inheritance, is it possible that removing the cast C (i.e., changing the call to e.f(e1)) could cause the program to no longer type-check? Explain.
 - (c) If calls are resolved with multimethods, is it possible that removing the cast C (i.e., changing the call to e.f(e1)) could cause the program to behave differently? Explain.

6. (9 points) Here are two large-step interpreters for the untyped lambda-calculus. The one on the right uses parallelism. Recall Thread.join blocks until the thread described by its argument terminates. Only the lines between the (*------*) comments differ.

```
type exp = Var of string | Lam of string*exp | Apply of exp * exp
       let subst e1_with e2_for x = ... (* unimportant *)
       exception UnboundVar
let rec interp e =
                                          let rec interp e =
 match e with
                                            match e with
  Var _ -> raise UnboundVar
                                             Var x -> raise UnboundVar
 | Lam _ -> e
                                           | Lam _ -> e
 | Apply(e1,e2) ->
                                           | Apply(e1,e2) ->
    (*----*)
                                              (*----*)
                                              let v2r = ref (Var "dummy") in
                                              let t = Thread.create
   let v2 = interp e2 in
                                                 (fun () -> v2r := interp e2) () in
   let v1 = interp e1 in
                                              let v1 = interp e1 in
                                              Thread.join t;
                                              let v2 = !v2r in
    (*----*)
                                              (*----*)
   match v1 with
                                              match v1 with
    Lam(x,e3) -> interp(subst e3 v2 x)
                                               Lam(x,e3) -> interp(subst e3 v2 x)
   | _ -> failwith "impossible"
                                             | _ -> failwith "impossible"
```

- (a) Describe an input to these functions for which the interpreter on the right would raise an exception and the interpreter on the left would not. (Note: Evaluation of expressions may not terminate.)
- (b) Explain why moving the line "let v2r = ref (Var "dummy") in" out to the top-level (and removing the keyword "in") would make the interpreter on the right behave unpredictably (even for inputs with no free variables).

- 7. (7 points) You can do this problem in one of Caml, C, C++, Java, or C#. Your choice does not really change the problem.
 - (a) Write a short program that will exhaust memory if there is no garbage collector but take almost no space if there is a garbage-collector.
 - (b) Write a short program that will exhaust memory even if there is a garbage collector. Create only small objects.