Name:_

CSE505, Fall 2012, Final Examination December 10, 2012

Rules:

- The exam is closed-book, closed-notes, except for one side of one 8.5x11in piece of paper.
- Please stop promptly at 12:20.
- You can rip apart the pages.
- There are **100 points** total, distributed **unevenly** among **6** 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. In particular, make sure you get to all the problems.
- If you have questions, ask.
- Relax. You are here to learn.

For your reference (page 1 of 2):

 $e \to e'$

$$\begin{array}{c} \hline \hline (\lambda x. e) \ v \to e[v/x] & \hline e_1 \to e_1' \\ \hline e_1 \ e_2 \to e_1' \ e_2 & \hline v \ e_2 \to v \ e_2' & \hline fix \ e \to fix \ e' & \hline fix \ \lambda x. \ e \to e[(fix \ \lambda x. \ e)/x] \\ \hline \hline \hline \{l_1 = v_1, \dots, l_n = v_n\}.l_i \to v_i \\ \hline \hline \{l_1 = v_1, \dots, l_{i-1} = v_{i-1}, l_i = e_i, \dots, l_n = e_n\} \to \{l_1 = v_1, \dots, l_{i-1} = v_{i-1}, l_i = e_i, \dots, l_n = e_n\} \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline F \vdash e : \tau & \hline \hline \hline F \vdash e : \tau \\ \hline \hline \hline F \vdash c : int & \hline F \vdash x : \Gamma(x) & \hline F \vdash e_1 : \tau_1 \to \tau_2 & \hline F \vdash e_1 : \tau_2 \to \tau_1 & F \vdash e_2 : \tau_2 \\ \hline \hline F \vdash e_1 : \tau_1 & \dots & F \vdash e_n : \tau_n & labels \ distinct \\ \hline F \vdash \{l_1 = e_1, \dots, l_n = e_n\} : \{l_1 : \tau_1, \dots, l_n : \tau_n\} & \hline F \vdash e : \{l_1 : \tau_1, \dots, l_n : \tau_n\} & 1 \le i \le n \\ \hline \hline F \vdash e : \tau' & \hline \hline F \vdash e : \tau' \\ \hline \hline \hline F \vdash e : \tau' & \hline \end{array}$$

 $\tau_1 \le \tau_2$

$$\overline{\{l_1:\tau_1,\ldots,l_{i-1}:\tau_{i-1},l_i:\tau_i,\ldots,l_n:\tau_n\}} \le \{l_1:\tau_1,\ldots,l_i:\tau_i,l_{i-1}:\tau_{i-1},\ldots,l_n:\tau_n\}$$

		$ au_i \leq au_i'$		
$\overline{\{l_1:\tau_1,\ldots,l_n:\tau_n,l:\tau\}} \le \{l_1:\tau_1,\ldots,l_n:\tau_n\}$	$\overline{\{l_1:\tau_1,\ldots,l_i:\tau_i\}}$	$\{i_1,\ldots,l_n:\tau_n\} \le \{l_1\}$	$:\tau_1,\ldots,l_i:\tau'_i,\ldots,l_n:\tau_n\}$	
		,		
$\underline{\tau_3 \leq \tau_1 \qquad \tau_2 \leq \tau_4}$		$\underline{\tau_1 \leq \tau_2}$	$\tau_2 \le \tau_3$	
$\tau_1 \to \tau_2 \le \tau_3 \to \tau_4$	$\tau \leq \tau$	$ au_1 \leq$	$ au_3$	
$e ::= c x \lambda x:\tau. e e e$	$ \Lambda \alpha. \ e \ e[\tau]$	Γ ::=	$\cdot \mid \Gamma, x : \tau$	
$v ::= c \mid \lambda x \tau \mid e \mid \Lambda \alpha \mid e$	2.1	Δ ::=	$\cdot \mid \Delta, \alpha$	
$e \rightarrow e'$				
$e_1 \to e'_1 \qquad e_2 \to e'_2 \qquad e$	$\rightarrow e'$			
$e_1 \ e_2 \rightarrow e'_1 \ e_2 \qquad v \ e_2 \rightarrow v \ e'_2 \qquad e[\tau]$	$\rightarrow e'[\tau] \qquad (\lambda x:\tau)$. e) $v \to e[v/x]$	$(\Lambda \alpha. \ e)[\tau] \to e[\tau/\alpha]$	
$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$				
	$\Delta; \Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash e : \tau_2$	$\Delta \vdash \tau_1$	$\Delta, \alpha; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_1$	
$\overline{\Delta;\Gamma\vdash x:\Gamma(x)} \qquad \overline{\Delta;\Gamma\vdash c:int}$	$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash \lambda x : \tau_1. e$	$: \tau_1 \to \tau_2$	$\overline{\Delta;\Gamma\vdash\Lambda\alpha.\ e:\forall\alpha.\tau_1}$	
$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_1 \Delta; \Gamma \vdash$	$e_2: au_2$	$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \forall \alpha. \tau_1$	$\Delta \vdash \tau_2$	
$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e_1 \ e_2 : \tau_1$		$\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e[\tau_2] : \tau$	$1[\tau_2/\alpha]$	

For your reference (page 2 of 2):

$$e :::: ... |A(e) | B(e) | (math e with Ax. e | Bx. e) | (e, e) | e.1 | e.2$$

$$\tau ::::: ... | T_{1} + \tau_{2} | \tau_{1} + \tau_{2}$$

$$v :::: ... | A(v) | B(v) | (v, v)$$

$$e \to e'$$

$$\overline{A(e) \to A(e')} \quad \overline{B(e) \to B(e')} \quad \overline{match e with Ax. e_{1} | By. e_{2} \to match e' with Ax. e_{1} | By. e_{2}$$

$$\overline{match A(v) with Ax. e_{1} | By. e_{2} \to e_{1} | v/x |} \quad \overline{match B(v) with Ax. e_{1} | By. e_{2} \to e_{2} | v/y |}$$

$$\overline{e_{1} \to e'_{1}} \quad \underline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \underline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \underline{e \to e'} \quad \overline{e \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{1}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{1}} \quad \overline{e \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{1}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{1}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{1}} \quad \overline{e \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{1}} \quad \overline{e \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{1}} \quad \overline{e \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{1}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e_{1}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{2} \to e'_{2}} \quad \overline{e_{1} \to e'_{2$$

- 1. (20 points) Consider the language with subtyping (with the typing judgments $\Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ and $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$) on the first reference page.
 - (a) Prove this theorem: If $\cdot \vdash v : \tau_1 \to \tau_2$, then there is some x and e such that v is λx . e. Hint: You need induction and a helper lemma about subtyping that you should state carefully and prove by a second induction argument.
 - (b) Explain in 1–3 English sentences where in the proof of Type Safety we need the fact you proved in part (a).

Name:_____

- 2. (15 points) Each part of this problem considers a type in System F. For this type:
 - If no closed term has this type, explain briefly and informally why not.
 - If all closed terms of this type are equivalent, do all the following:
 - Give one such term.
 - Explain briefly and informally why all terms are equivalent.
 - Give a full typing derivation of the term you gave.
 - If there are two or more closed terms of this type that are not equivalent, then give two non-equivalent terms. (No explanation or typing derivations necessary.)
 - (a) $\forall \alpha. (\alpha \rightarrow \mathsf{int})$
 - (b) $\forall \alpha.(\mathsf{int} \to \alpha)$
 - (c) $\forall \alpha.(\mathsf{int} \to \mathsf{int})$
 - (d) $\forall \alpha. (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)$

Name:__

3. (15 points) Consider this OCaml code for appending two lists:

```
let rec append xs ys =
  match xs with
  [] -> ys
  | x::xs' -> x :: (append xs' ys)
```

- (a) What is the type of append above?
- (b) For a given call to **append** above, approximately how deep would the call-stack grow in terms of the function arguments?
- (c) Use a helper function written in continuation-passing style to give a different version of append that uses a small constant amount of stack space.
- (d) What is the type of the helper function you used in part (c)? (Note the type of append itself should still be the same as in part (a).)
- (e) For *one* "bonus point" give yet another version of **append** that uses only a small constant amount of stack space. This version will need a helper function but should not use any function closures or higher-order functions.

Name:____

- 4. (12 points) Consider shared-memory multithreading with locks. Give pseudocode for a program that:
 - Is *data-race free*. That is, it has no data races on any execution.
 - Does **not** *follow consistent locking.* That is, there are executions with at least one variable that is accessed by multiple threads without there existing a lock that the threads always hold when accessing the variable.
 - Every shared variable is written to by at least one thread on at least some execution. (This avoids the trivial solution of a program that does reads but not writes.)

Your pseudocode can look like the following wrong answer, where we have shared variables and locks and threads that run in parallel:

Shared data: x=0, y=0, lock m
Thread 1: if(x==0) { sync(m) { y++; }}
Thread 2: sync(m) { x++; } y++;

Name:

```
5. (15 points)
```

(a) In this problem, you will complete this Concurrent ML program by filling in the body for make_thingy so that it obeys the specification described below the code:

```
open Thread
open Event
let add (in1,in2) i = sync (send in1 i)
let halve (in1,in2) = sync (send in2 ())
type thingy = int channel * unit channel
let make_thingy k = (* your code here *)
```

- make_thingy should return a new "thingy" that has an initial internal "state" of zero.
- A call to add with a "thingy" adds i to the state of the "thingy".
- A call to halve with a "thingy" divides the state of the "thingy" by two.
- However, a call to halve must block unless the current state of the "thingy" is greater than or equal to k (the argument to make_thingy when the "thingy" was created).
- Every time the state changes, "thingy" prints the current state as Sum is x where x is the new state. This includes when the state is initialized, so the first thing printed will be Sum is 0.
- For full credit, do not use ML's references, but this is only worth about a point.
- (b) Give an ML signature (an .mli file) for the program in part (a). Your signature should allow the functions to be used as intended but not expose anything that allows the communication protocol or specification to be violated.

Name:__

6. (23 points) Consider a class-based OOP language with static types intended to prevent "no matching method" errors. Assume "subclassing is subtyping." For each of the following, indicate if it violates type safety. If it does violate type safety, give a short example that gets stuck. (If not, no explanation necessary.)

In your examples, assume B is a subtype of A with a method foo not in A. You can fill in this template:

```
class A { }
class B extends A { void foo() }
class C { /* put stuff here */ }
class D extends C { /* put stuff here */ }
main program: /* put stuff here */
```

- (a) When overriding a method, we can change an argument type to be a supertype of what it was in the superclass' method.
- (b) When overriding a method, we can change an argument type to be a subtype of what it was in the superclass' method.
- (c) When overriding a method, we can change the result type to be a supertype of what it was in the superclass' method.
- (d) When overriding a method, we can change the result type to be a subtype of what it was in the superclass' method.
- (e) A subclass can change the type of a (mutable) field to be a subtype of what it was in the superclass. (This is changing the type of a field, not adding a second field.)
- (f) A subclass can change the type of a (mutable) field to be a supertype of what it was in the superclass. (This is changing the type of a field, not adding a second field.)

Name:

Extra room for any problem where you might need it