CSE341, Fall 2011, Final Examination December 13, 2011

Please do not turn the page until the bell rings.

Rules:

- The exam is closed-book, closed-note, except for **both sides** of one 8.5x11in piece of paper.
- Please stop promptly at 4:20.
- You can rip apart the pages, but please staple them back together before you leave.
- There are **120 points** total, distributed **unevenly** among **8** questions (most with multiple parts).
- When writing code, style matters, but don't worry much about indentation.

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.** Make sure you get to all the problems.
- If you have questions, ask.
- Relax. You are here to learn.

- 1. (a) (8 points) Write a Racket function flip-if that behaves as follows:
 - It takes two arguments, a two-argument function **f** and an association list (a list of pairs) **xs** and returns a list.
 - For each pair in xs, if f called with the pieces of the pair does not return false, then a pair with these pieces in reverse order is in the output. Else this pair is not in the output.
 - Even though the pieces of a pair in the output are in reverse order, the pairs in the output are in the same order as the pairs in xs.

For example,

```
(flip-if (lambda (x y) (< (- x y) 2))
(list (cons 4 2) (cons 3 2) (cons 1 2) (cons 9 5)))
```

evaluates to ((2 . 3) (2 . 1)).

- (b) (5 points) Port your part (a) answer to SML to produce an ML function flip_if of type
 (('a * 'b) -> bool) * (('a * 'b) list) -> (('b * 'a) list). For example,
 flip-if ((fn (x,y) => x y < 2), [(4,2),(3,2),(1,2),(9,5)]) evaluates to [(2,3),(2,1)].</pre>
- (c) (6 points) Show example calls to flip-if in Racket and flip_if in SML such that:
 - The Racket code runs without error and produces a non-empty list.
 - The SML code is a straightforward port of the Racket call, i.e., a function that does the same thing and a list with the same contents.
 - The SML code does not type-check.

Explain in English why the SML call does not type-check.

Name:_

- 2. Recall we defined a stream to be a thunk that, when called, produces a pair of a value and another stream. Note the problems below are separate; the answer to one does not help answer another.
 - (a) (7 points) Write a Racket function partA that takes a stream and counts how many elements can be retrieved from the stream before encountering the element #f. If the first stream value is #f, the answer is 0, else if the next element is #f, the answer is 1, etc.
 - (b) (7 points) Write a Racket function partB that takes two streams and returns a stream. The n^{th} element of the output stream should be the n^{th} element of the first argument stream unless it is **#f** in which case the n^{th} element of the output stream should be the n^{th} element of the second argument stream (even if it is also **#f**).
 - (c) (3 points) (Low-point total only because it is like a challenge problem) Write a Racket function partC that takes a stream and returns a stream. The result should be like the argument except any #f values are skipped.

Name:

3. (15 points) For each of the Racket expressions below, indicate what, if anything, the expression prints (*not* what the result is) when the expression is run in the scope of these definitions:

```
(define (a-fun x)
  (let ([y x])
    (+ y x)))
(define-syntax a-macro
  (syntax-rules ()
    [(a-macro x)
     (let ([y x])
       (+ y x))]))
(define y 17)
(define z 42)
(a) (a-fun (begin (print 17) 42))
(b) (a-macro (begin (print 17) 42))
(c) (a-fun (begin (print y) z))
(d) (a-macro (begin (print y) z))
(e) (lambda() (a-fun (begin (print y) z)))
(f) (lambda() (a-macro (begin (print y) z)))
```

Name:__

4. (15 points) Suppose you are grading a student's interpreter for the MUPL assignment and you suspect that the student made the classic error of evaluting a closure's function body in the environment where the closure is used instead of where the closure is defined. Give a MUPL test program that will work as follows: If the student got closures right, then passing your answer to eval-prog will evaluate to (int 17), but if they made the classic error, it will raise an undefined-variable error.

Assume other cases of the interpreter (particularly the cases for let-expressions and variables) are correct. Here are some of the struct definitions for the MUPL language in Racket; these should be plenty to answer the problem.

Remember: The answer to the question is a MUPL program.

```
(struct var (string) #:transparent) ;; a variable, e.g., (var "foo")
(struct int (num) #:transparent) ;; a constant number, e.g., (int 17)
(struct fun (nameopt formal body) #:transparent) ;; a recursive(?) 1-argument function
(struct call (funexp actual) #:transparent) ;; function call
(struct mlet (var e body) #:transparent) ;; a local binding (let var = e in body)
```

```
(define (eval-prog p) ...)
```

Name:__

- 5. For this problem, consider the purpose of the Java type system to be ensuring that no "field missing" or "method missing" errors occur at run-time. Consider a change to Java where we allow methods to be called with too many arguments, e.g., 4 arguments to a 2-argument method. The typing rule is that any "extra" arguments must have some type, but any type is okay. The evaluation rule is that the extra arguments are evaluated and the results ignored.
 - (a) (5 points) Does this modified version of Java have a *sound* type system? Explain your answer, and include the definition of soundness.
 - (b) (5 points) Does this modified version of Java have a *complete* type system? Explain your answer, and include the definition of completeness.
 - (c) (5 points) Give one objective reason in favor and one objective reason against making this modification to Java.

Name:_

6. (12 points) This problem considers this Ruby class:

```
class A
  attr_accessor :x
  def m1
    @x = 4
  end
  def m2
    m1
    @x > 4
  end
  def m3
    Q_{\rm X} = 4
    @x > 4
  end
  def m4
    self.x = 4
    @x > 4
  end
end
```

- (a) Is it possible to define a class B such that evaluating B.new.m2 causes the method m2 defined in class A (not an override of m2) to return true? If so, define class B as such, else explain why it is not possible.
- (b) Is it possible to define a class B such that evaluating B.new.m3 causes the method m3 defined in class A (not an override of m3) to return true? If so, define class B as such, else explain why it is not possible.
- (c) Is it possible to define a class B such that evaluating B.new.m4 causes the method m4 defined in class A (not an override of m4) to return true? If so, define class B as such, else explain why it is not possible.

Name:___

7. (12 points) Ruby collection classes that include the Enumerable mixin get many methods that are implemented in Enumerable using only the each method of self, which recall takes a one-argument block. One of the methods in Enumerable is max, which returns the maximum element of the collection assuming that elements of the collection can be compared with >. Show one way that the Enumerable mixin could define max. In your implementation, raise an error if max is used on an empty collection.

The hard part of the problem is using no methods other than **each** and **>** and handling the first element correctly. The sample solution is over 15 lines, but all the lines are very short.

Name:__

8. (15 points) In this problem, suppose we add record subtyping and function subtyping to ML. Because ML records are immutable (there is no way to assign to a field after a record is created), depth subtyping is sound for records. So assume record subtyping supports width, permutation, and depth, and that function subtyping supports contravariant agruments and covariant results.

For each of the following function calls, decide if the call should type-check, answering "Yes" if it should type-check and "No" if it should not. If your answer is, "No," give a possible implementation of the relevant functions so that the call would read a field of a record that does not exist.

In your solutions, you may use e.f to read field f rather than ML's #f e syntax.

```
(* assume these variables are bound to functions with the given types; they are used below *)
val f1 : { a:int, b : { c:int, d:int } } -> { a:int } = ...
val f2 : { a:int } -> { a:int, b : { c:int, d:int } } = ...
val f3 : { a:int, b : { c:int, d:int } } -> { a:int, b : { c:int, d:int } } = ...
val f4 : (({ a:int, b : { c:int} } -> { a:int }) * int) -> { a:int } = ...
val r1 : { a:int } = { a = 1 }
val r2 : { a:int, b : { c:int} } = { a=1, b = { c=2 } }
val r3 : { a:int, b : { c:int, d:int}, e:int } = { a=1, b = { c=2, d=3}, e=4 }
val r4 : { a:int, b : { c:int, d:int, e:int }} = { a=1, b = { c=2, d=3, e=4} }
(a) f1 r1
(b) f1 r2
(c) f1 r3
(d) f1 r4
(e) f2 r1
 (f) f2 r2
(g) f2 r3
(h) f2 r4
 (i) f4(f1,42)
 (j) f4(f2,42)
(k) f4(f3,42)
```