Indian Institute of Technology Delhi Department of Computer Science and Engineering

CSL302

Programming Languages

Major Exam

1

May 4, 2007

15:30-17:30

Maximum Marks: 100

Open book and notes. Write your name, entry number and group at the top of each sheet in the blanks provided. Answer all questions in the space provided, in blue or black ink (no pencils, no red pens). Budget your time according to the marks. Do rough work on separate sheets.

- Q1. (4x3 marks) Unification. For each of the following pairs of terms, if the most general unifier exists, present it as a simultaneous substitution, or else state why it does not exist:
 - 1. g(h(X,a), h(b,X)) and g(h(b,a), h(X,Z)).
 - 2. g(h(X,a),Y) and g(Z,h(b,X)).
 - 3. g(h(X, a), Y) and g(Y, h(b, X)).
 - 4. g(h(a,b),X) and g(Y,h(a,X)).
- Q2. (3+3+4 marks) **Prolog.** A list L_1 (which may even be empty) is a prefix of L_2 if some initial part of L_2 is exactly L_1 . Likewise list L_3 is a suffix of L_4 , if some final part of L_4 is L_3 . L_5 is a sublist of L_6 if it appears somewhere within L_6 . Suppose we are given a Prolog program append (L_1, L_2, L_3) for appending lists. Write Prolog programs for
 - 1. prefix(L1, L2):-
 - 2. suffix(L1, L2):-
 - 3. sublist(L1, L2) :=

Q3. (16 marks) **Subtyping**. Type τ_1 is called a *subtype* of type τ_2 if wherever a value of type τ_2 is expected, a value of type τ_1 can safely be used. (This notion is at the core of the idea of subclass used for inheritance in Object-oriented programming). Suppose we have the following abstract grammar for types.

$$\tau ::=$$
unit | int | bool | real | $\tau_1 * \tau_2 | \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$

and wish to define a subtype relation between types defined inductively using the following rules: (a) unit is a subtype of any type; (b) int is a subtype of real; (c) τ_1 is a subtype of $\tau_1 * \tau_2$; (d) if τ_1' is a subtype of τ_1 and τ_2 is a subtype of τ_2' , then $\tau_1 \to \tau_2$ is a subtype of $\tau_1' \to \tau_2'$; (e) the subtyping relation is reflexive and transitive.

Define a Prolog program subtype (T_1, T_2) to express the subtyping relation.

Q4. (8 marks) Σ -homomorphisms. Consider signature $\Sigma = \{0^{(0)}, 1^{(0)}, +^{(2)}\}$. Let \mathcal{A} be the Σ -algebra with natural numbers as the carrier set, 0 interpreted as zero, 1 as one and + as addition on natural numbers. What should the Σ -algebra \mathcal{B} be, if the function odd: $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{B}$ is to be a Σ -homomorphism? Carrier Set =

Interpretation of 0 is

Interpretation of 1 is

Interpretation of + is

Q5. (8+6 marks) Call-by-value-result. The call-by-reference parameter passing mechanism is necessary for writing procedures (such as swap) in which the procedure is intended to change the contents of its arguments. However, this mechanism is not a "clean abstraction" in that it suffers from the problem that any assignment to a reference argument immediate changes the corresponding global variable before the completion of the execution of the procedure. A better variant of this method is call-by-value-result, in which the contents of the argument variables are copied into fresh storage in the called procedure, the assignments are made to these locations, and finally, just before exit, the contents of

-			
Λ	O	m	0
7.4	a	111	

3

these new locations are copied back into the argument variables. Suppose P is a procedure with a single call-by-value-result parameter y and whose body is command c.

1. Provide big-step operational semantics for calling procedure P with (global) variable x as argument.

$$\beta \vdash \langle P(x), \sigma \rangle \implies _$$

$$\beta(P) = \ll \beta_1, \lambda y.c \gg, \beta(x) = l,$$

2. Suppose we have an implementation of procedure calls in an imperative language for the *call by value* parameter-passing mechanism. How will you modify this by adding some code before and after call-by-value procedure calls so that call-by-value-result can be simulated? *Explain precisely by providing pseudocode*.

- Q6. (4x3 marks) Lifetime and scope. Suppose during the runtime execution of a program, an object o is created at time t_1 and is destroyed at time t_2 , whereas it is associated via a binding to name x from time t_3 (when the binding is created) to t_4 (when the binding is destroyed). Express the relation that should hold (in terms of some of t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) if
 - 1. object o is garbage:
 - 2. object o is always available (via name x):
 - 3. name x is uninitialized for some time:
 - 4. name x is a dangling reference:
- Q7. (2+10 marks) **Definite iterations.** In mathematics, we have expressions such as $\sum_{i=a}^{i=b} f(i)$ and $\prod_{i=a}^{i=b} f(i)$. By which principle should we consider a special iterator command foreach i from a to b do C od,

Name:		Entry:	Gp:	4			
when	where C is a command in which i appears as an integer variable?						
e ₁ as exec value	Provide Big-step semantics for the construct foreach i from e_1 to e_2 do C od, assuming that (i) e_1 and e_2 are evaluated first to values v_1 and v_2 respectively; (ii) if $v_2 < v_1$, the command C is not executed, (iii) otherwise, C is serially executed $v_2 - v_1 + 1$ times with a fresh variable i taking successive values from v_1 to v_2 for each iteration of C ; (iv) assume that i is only read but not otherwise changed within C , and that (v) variable i is not accessible after the end of the loop.						
	t v						
num giver	marks) λ -terms and their types. erals in the λ -calculus) are $\lambda f.\lambda x.x, \lambda f$ the same type according to the typing type be?	$\lambda x.(f x), \lambda f. \lambda x.(f ($	$(f(x)), \ldots$ If all these λ -ter	rms were			
			•				
0.	of Church Numerals:Y combinator satisfies the equation Y j	f = a f(Y f) for an	v function f. Assuming tha	t the left			
and	right sides of the equations must have the a suitable assumption about the type of	ne same type, what	type should any Y combinat	or have?			
		•					

Type of Y should be: _