In grammars, capital letters represent nonterminals, lower case letters represent terminals. One sentence answers are sufficient for the “essay” questions.

1. (6 points) Compiler front end.
   (a) What is the primary function of the scanner and what computational mechanism is used to accomplish it?
   (b) What is the primary function of the parser and what computational mechanism is used to accomplish it?
   (c) How do you decide what should be handled by the scanner versus the parser? (Hint: think of the complexity of languages)

2. (20 points) Scanner construction.
   (a) Construct a regular expression for recognizing all non-empty strings composed of the letters a and b that do not end in b.
   (b) Convert the regular expression to an NFA using the construction algorithm given in class.
   (c) Convert the NFA to a DFA (show the sets of NFA states for each DFA state).
   (d) Minimize the DFA (show the sets of DFA states for each minimized DFA state).

3. (16 points) Consider the following grammar:
   \[ E \rightarrow E + E | a \]
   (a) When is a grammar ambiguous?
   (b) Show that the grammar is ambiguous for the string a + a + a
   (c) What happens if you write a recursive-descent parser for this grammar?
   (d) Fix the grammar to avoid this problem.

4. (16 points) Consider the following grammar:
   \[ S \rightarrow ABd \\
   A \rightarrow aA | \epsilon \\
   B \rightarrow b | CA \]
   (a) Calculate FIRST, FOLLOW for S, A, B:
   (b) Construct its recursive-descent parser (with lookahead), given the following functions:

5. (6 points) Consider the following ACTION/GOTO tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>$$$</th>
<th>Goto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>shift 1</td>
<td>reduce</td>
<td>$ \rightarrow \epsilon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>shift 3</td>
<td>reduce</td>
<td>A $ \rightarrow a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>accept</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>shift 1</td>
<td>accept</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Show the contents of the stack and input buffer for the shift-reduce parse of "a", assuming State 0 is the start state:

6. (20 points) Consider the following augmented grammar:
   \[ P1 \quad S \rightarrow E \\
   P2 \quad E \rightarrow E + E \\
   P3 \quad | \rightarrow a \]
   (a) Derive the canonical sets of LR(1) items
   (b) Build the LR(1) parse table
   (c) For each shift/reduce or reduce/reduce conflict you find (if any), describe what would happen for the different ways to resolve the conflict(s).

7. (16 points) Consider the following sets of LR(1) items in the states of a LR(1) parser:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State 0:</th>
<th>State 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ [ A \rightarrow \bullet a , b ] , [ A \rightarrow a , c ] ]</td>
<td>[ [ A \rightarrow \bullet a , b ] , [ A \rightarrow a , b ] ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ [ A \rightarrow a \bullet , c ] , [ A \rightarrow a \bullet , b ] ]</td>
<td>[ [ A \rightarrow a \bullet , b ] , [ B \rightarrow \bullet a , b ] ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ [ B \rightarrow \bullet a \bullet , b ] , [ B \rightarrow \bullet a \bullet , a ] ]</td>
<td>[ [ B \rightarrow \bullet a \bullet , b ] , [ B \rightarrow \bullet a \bullet , a ] ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State 1:</th>
<th>State 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ [ A \rightarrow \bullet a , a ] , [ A \rightarrow \bullet a , b ] ]</td>
<td>[ [ A \rightarrow \bullet a , a ] , [ A \rightarrow \bullet a , b ] ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ [ A \rightarrow \bullet a , b ] , [ A \rightarrow \bullet a , b ] ]</td>
<td>[ [ A \rightarrow \bullet a , b ] , [ B \rightarrow \bullet a , b ] ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ [ B \rightarrow \bullet a \bullet , b ] , [ B \rightarrow \bullet a \bullet , a ] ]</td>
<td>[ [ B \rightarrow \bullet a \bullet , b ] , [ B \rightarrow \bullet a \bullet , a ] ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Find all conflicts, listing state, pair of LR(1) items, and lookahead(s) causing conflict.
(b) List states that would be merged in a LALR(1) parser.
(c) List additional conflicts in the LALR(1) parser, if any.
(d) What are the advantages of LALR over LR parsers?
8. Syntax-directed translation.
   (a) What are the main differences between attribute grammars and ad-hoc, syntax-directed translation?
   (b) Name one advantage and disadvantage of each.

9. Type checking.
   (a) Consider the following C code.
       ```c
       int foo(char *x, int bar[4]);
       ```
       What is the type expression for `foo`?
   (b) Consider the following grammar productions. Assume you have an attribute `const.odd` which is set to either true or false. How can we then extend the type checker to determine whether an expression is odd (or even)?
       ```
       E  ->  const  { E.odd = ?; }
       |   E1 + E2  { E.odd = ?; }
       ```
       Give the actions for both productions.

10. Symbol table, run-time environments.
    Consider the following program in a lexically-scoped language such as C.
    ```c
    int x,y;
    int f(int p) { int y,z;
    {
        int i,j;
        /* Point A */
        }
        /* Point B */
    } /* Point C */
    ```
    (a) How can the compiler organize symbol table information at compile time to handle nested scoping? Draw the logical state of the symbol table(s).
    (b) What symbols are visible at points A and B?