

The first three problems ask for sets of free or bound variable identifiers that occur bound in the statement above. Write the entire requested set in brackets. For example, write $\{V, W\}$, or if the requested set is empty, write $\{\}$.

1. Consider the following Oz statement in the kernel language.

```

local X in
  local Y in
    X = 3
    {MyProc X Y}
    Z = Y
  end
end

```

- (a) (4 points) [Concepts] Write the entire set of the variable identifiers that occur free in the statement above.

- (b) (4 points) [Concepts] Write the entire set of the variable identifiers that occur bound in the statement above.

2. Consider the following Oz statement.

```

Mult = proc {$ N1 N2 Res}
  case N1 of
    succ(num: Pre) then
      local Val in
        {Mult Pre N2 Val}
        {Plus N2 Val Res}
      end
    else local Assg in
      Assg = proc {$ A B R} R = A end
      {Assg zero Pre Res}
    end
  end
end

```

- (a) (6 points) [Concepts] Write the entire set of the variable identifiers that occur free in the statement above.

- (b) (9 points) [Concepts] Write the entire set of the variable identifiers that occur bound in the statement above.

3. [Concepts]

- (a) (3 points) Name a programming language that uses static type checking.

- (b) (2 points) Name a programming language that uses dynamic type checking.

4. [Concepts] Consider the following Java method declaration.

```
public void sum(int[] a, int n, int m) {  
    for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {  
        total = total + compute(a[i]);  
    }  
}
```

- (a) (3 points) Write below, in set brackets, the entire set of variable identifiers that occur free in the Java code above.

- (b) (3 points) Write below, in set brackets, the entire set of variable identifiers that occur bound in the Java code above.

5. [Concepts] Consider the following Oz code.

```

local F in
  local ToInt in
    ToInt = proc {$ N ?R}
      case N of
        %% Parts (c) and (e) ask about the call below
        succ(num: Pre) then R = 1 + {ToInt Pre}
      else R = 0
      end
    end
    F = ToInt
  end
  local Temp in
    %% Parts (b), (d), and (e) ask about the call below
    {F succ(num: succ(num: succ(num: succ(num: zero)))) Temp}
    {Browse Temp}
  end
end

```

- (a) (2 points) When the above code runs, what output, if any, appears in the browser?
- (b) (4 points) At the point of the call of F on line 14 (just below the second comment), is there a binding for ToInt in the current environment? Give a brief explanation.
- (c) (4 points) Will the call to ToInt on line 6 work properly and make a successful call? If so, briefly explain why, if not, then say what happens.
- (d) (3 points) Is the call on line 14 in the declarative kernel language? If not, briefly explain why it is not.
- (e) (3 points) Suppose Oz used dynamic scoping. In that case, would the calls on lines 14 and 6 both be successful? If so, briefly explain why, if not, then say what would happen.

6. (15 points) [Concepts] Desugar the following Oz code into kernel syntax by expanding all syntactic sugars. (Assume that the identifier `Result`, and the function identifiers `SumTo` and `SumIter` are declared elsewhere.)

```
fun {SumTo N} {SumIter N 0} end  
Result = {SumTo 7}
```

7. (10 points) [Concepts] What happens when the following code executes in Oz? Briefly explain why that happens.

```
local SetQ Q in  
  Q = 4020  
  SetQ = proc {$ V}  
    Q = V  
  end  
  {SetQ 99}  
  {Browse 'Q is '#Q}  
end
```

8. (10 points) [Concepts] What is the output, if any, of the following code in Oz? Briefly explain why that output appears.

```

local Nat V in
  Nat = node(num: int(zero) color: orange value: 0)
  V = 444
  case Nat of
    vertex(number: N color: C value: V) then {Browse first#N#C#V}
  [] node(num: N color: C value: V) then {Browse second#N#C#V}
  [] node(num: int(M) color: C value: V) then {Browse third#M#C#V}
  [] node(num: N value: V) then {Browse fourth#N#V}
  else {Browse none(V)}
  end
end

```

9. [Concepts] Both Java and C# recently expanded by adding enhanced **for** loops. These are defined by telling programmers that use of such an enhanced **for** loop expands into an iterator call, a **while** statement, the given loop body, and another call to the iterator. The expanded version of a **for** loop is thus a statement that would be legal in older versions of the language.

(a) (5 points) What is the term for this concept?

(b) (10 points) Briefly describe one advantage of extending a language in this way.