

1 Concepts in Programming Languages (am21)

- (a) Algol-60 provided two parameter-passing mechanisms: call-by-value and call-by-name.
- (i) Explain these mechanisms. [2 marks]
- (ii) Justify or criticise the statement that “the former is expensive for arrays and the latter interacts badly with side effects”. [2 marks]
- (iii) What parameter-passing mechanism(s) do C and Java use, and how do such languages deal with an array being passed as a parameter? [2 marks]
- (b) A side-effect-free call-by-value language has its ML-like syntax of expressions  $e$  extended to be able to model call-by-name and (LISP-like) call-by-text:

$$e ::= \dots \mid \text{suspend } e \mid \text{force } e \quad (\text{call-by-name})$$

$$e ::= \dots \mid \text{quote } e \mid \text{eval } e \quad (\text{call-by-text})$$

Both `suspend  $e$`  and `quote  $e$`  yield an unevaluated representation of  $e$  as a value for later evaluation by `force` and `eval` respectively. Sketch two programs (differing only in whether they use `suspend` and `force` or `quote` and `eval`) which give different results. [Note: Answers using side-effecting operators can only gain partial marks.]

[4 marks]

- (c) A library defines a generic class `Foo<T>` in a Java-like language. A user’s program declares a class `C` and subclasses it as class `D`, creating variables `fc` and `fd` of types `Foo<C>` and `Foo<D>` respectively.
- (i) Construct a declaration of `Foo<T>` along with a program of the above form containing the assignment `fc=fd` which, if this statement were legal, would be the cause of a later run-time error when executed. [5 marks]
- (ii) How might the language syntax be changed to optionally express that the above assignment is to be allowed, indicating any compensating restrictions required for the declaration of `Foo<T>` or `fc` to avoid run-time errors. [3 marks]
- (iii) How do Java arrays of type `T[]` fit in with your answer to Part (c)(i)? [2 marks]