


# CMSC 330 Exam 2 Spring 2022


## Q2. NFA and DFA

Q2.1. Consider the NFA given below. Is this NFA also a DFA?



Yes/No


Q2.2. Which strings will be accepted by the following NFA?




- aaabbb
- aa
- aaaaab
- bbaaaa

### Q3. NFA to DFA

Consider the following NFA:



When converted to a DFA using the subset construction algorithm from Project 3, we get the following DFA:



Where **X**, **Y** and **Z** are states you'll have to fill in.

- Q3.1. In this DFA, which states from the original NFA make up the state X? 0, 1, 2, 3
- Q3.2. In this DFA, which states from the original NFA make up the state Y? 0, 1, 2, 3
- Q3.3. In this DFA, which states from the original NFA make up the state Z? 0, 1, 2, 3
- Q3.4. Which state(s) in the new DFA are final? X, Y, Z
- Q3.5. Provide a regex for the NFA / DFA:

## Q4. CFG

To represent  $\epsilon$  in the CFG, you can either copy and paste the symbol  $\epsilon$ , type the word **epsilon** or just type the letter **e**.

Q4.1. Define a CFG that describes the language

$a^x b^y c^z$  where  $z \leq x + 2y$ .

Q4.2. Given the following ambiguous CFG, modify it so that it produces the same strings but is not ambiguous.

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow SaS \mid T \\ T &\rightarrow bT \mid V \\ V &\rightarrow c \mid \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Q4.3. Is the below CFG right recursive?

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow N + S \mid N * S \mid N \\ N &\rightarrow 1 \mid (S) \end{aligned}$$

Yes/No

## Q5. Can it be parsed?

Indicate if each of the following grammars can be parsed by a recursive descent parser. If not, choose the reason for why it cannot.

Q5.1. Can the below grammar be parsed by a recursive-descent parser?

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow S * S \mid T \\ T &\rightarrow 1 \mid 2 \mid 3 \mid (S) \end{aligned}$$

- Yes
- No, because the grammar is ambiguous i.e., it has more than one leftmost derivation
- No, because the grammar is left recursive
- No, because the grammar is ambiguous and left recursive

Q5.2. Can the below grammar be parsed by a recursive-descent parser?

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow cS \mid A \\ A &\rightarrow aA \mid \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

- Yes
- No, because the grammar is ambiguous i.e., it has more than one leftmost derivation
- No, because the grammar is left recursive
- No, because the grammar is ambiguous and left recursive

Q5.3. Can the below grammar be parsed by a recursive-descent parser?

```
S → Sa | U
U → Uu | ε
```

- Yes
- No, because the grammar is ambiguous i.e., it has more than one leftmost derivation
- No, because the grammar is left recursive
- No, because the grammar is ambiguous and left recursive

## Q6. Writing a Parser

**Note:** For your reference, we have included the non-imperative definitions for the helper functions you will need to implement the parser.

```
let lookahead toks = match toks with
| [] -> failwith "no more tokens!"
| h::_ -> h
```

```
let match_token tok toks = match toks with
| h::t when h = tok -> t
| _ -> failwith "match error!"
```

Consider the following grammar.

```
Exp → IfZero | N
IfZero → ifzero N then Exp else Exp
N → 0 | 1
```

We are assuming that a working lexer (or tokenizer) exists and can convert string input into a list of tokens (similar to Project 4a). The goal is to implement a **non-imperative recursive-descent parser** to parse the grammar described above. To do so, we will define our tokens and the corresponding AST as follows:

```
type token =
| Tok_ifzero
| Tok_then
| Tok_else
| Tok_0
| Tok_1
```

```
type expr =
| Num of int
| IfZero of expr * expr * expr
```

**Examples:**

```
"0" |> tokenizer |> parse_Exp
(* Num(0) *)
```

```
"ifzero 0 then 1 else 0" |> tokenizer |> parse_Exp
(* IfZero(Num(0), Num(1), Num(0)) *)
```

```
"ifzero 0 then ifzero 1 then 0 else 1 else 0" |> tokenizer |> parse_Exp
(* IfZero(Num(0), IfZero(Num(1), Num(0), Num(1)), Num(0)) *)
```

### Notes:

- parse\_Exp must return type token list \* expr.
- You don't have to check if the list is empty at the end of parsing.
- You can use failwith to handle exceptions.

```
let rec parse_Exp toks =
```

```
and parse_IfZero toks =
```

```
and parse_N toks =
```

## Q7. Operational Semantics

Q7.1. What is the difference between lexical/static and dynamic scoping in OpSem?

- Static scoping is for closures and dynamic scoping is for hypotheses.
- Static scoping evaluates a closure with respect to the existing environment, dynamic scoping evaluates a closure on its own.
- Static scoping evaluates the environment from left to right, dynamic scoping evaluates the environment from right to left.

Q7.2. Consider the following semantics that uses a mystery **magic** operator ?.

$$\frac{\frac{}{A; e_1 \Rightarrow v_1} \quad \frac{A; e_2 \Rightarrow (A', \lambda x. e) \quad A', x : v_1; e \Rightarrow v_2}{A; e_2 v_1 \Rightarrow v_2}}{A; e_1 ? e_2 \Rightarrow v_2}$$

Describe what this **magic** operator does.

**Hint:** Recall closures from OCaml.

Q7.3. Using the given rules, fill in the blanks the complete the derivation below:

$$\frac{}{A; n \Rightarrow n} \quad \frac{A(x) = v}{A; x \Rightarrow v}$$

$$\frac{A; e_1 \Rightarrow v_1 \quad v_2 \text{ is true if } v_1 \text{ is 0, otherwise } v_2 \text{ is false}}{A; \text{equals0 } e_1 \Rightarrow v_2}$$

$$\frac{A; e_1 \Rightarrow \text{true} \quad A; e_2 \Rightarrow v_1}{A; \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 \Rightarrow v_1} \quad \frac{A; e_1 \Rightarrow \text{false} \quad A; e_3 \Rightarrow v_1}{A; \text{if } e_1 \text{ then } e_2 \text{ else } e_3 \Rightarrow v_1}$$

$$\frac{A; e_1 \Rightarrow v_1 \quad A; e_2 \Rightarrow v_2 \quad v_3 \text{ is } v_1 + v_2}{A; e_1 + e_2 \Rightarrow v_3}$$

$$\frac{\frac{(\#3)}{A, (\#1); x \Rightarrow 5} \quad \text{true if } 5 \text{ is 0, otherwise false}}{A, (\#1); \text{equals0 } x \Rightarrow (\#2)} \quad \frac{\frac{(\#3)}{A, (\#1); x \Rightarrow 5} \quad \frac{A, (\#1); 5 \Rightarrow 5}{A, (\#1); (\#4) \Rightarrow (\#6)} (\#5)}{A, (\#1); \text{if equals0 } x \text{ then } 21 \text{ else } x + 5 \Rightarrow (\#6)}$$

**Notes:**

- If (#5) is not visible, please scroll to the right to ensure the entire LaTeX is visible.
- The blanks refer to the part of derivation (judgement/hypothesis) that **should** exist in the position of the blank.

**Blank #1:**

**Blank #2:**

**Blank #3:**

**Blank #4:**

**Blank #5:**

**Blank #6:**

## Q8. Lambda Calculus

To represent  $\lambda$ , you may either copy and paste the symbol  $\lambda$  or just type the characters L or \ in your solutions.

Q8.1. Which of the following are free variables in the lambda calculus expression?

$\lambda a. b \lambda y. y x \lambda p. p y$

- a
- b
- y
- x
- p

Q8.2. Consider the following lambda calculus expression,

$(\lambda x. y \lambda y. x y \lambda x. x y) (\lambda z. z) (\lambda z. w)$

Make parentheses explicit in the above expression.

Give a valid  $\alpha$ -conversion for the expression.

Q8.3. Reduce the following lambda calculus expression to the  $\beta$ -normal form using both CBN and CBV.

$(\lambda x. (\lambda y. y a) x) ((\lambda x. x) (\lambda y. y b))$

Show each step, including any  $\beta$ -reduction or  $\alpha$ -conversion. If there is infinite recursion, write "Infinite Recursion".

**Call-by-name:**

**Call-by-value:**

Q8.4. Consider the following encodings,

$\text{true} = (\lambda x. \lambda y. x)$

$\text{false} = (\lambda x. \lambda y. y)$

$\text{not} = (\lambda x. x \text{ false true})$

$\text{or} = (\lambda x. \lambda y. x \text{ true } y)$

Prove that  $\text{not} (\text{or false true}) = \text{false}$

**Hint:** Replace the bindings for their lambda-calculus expressions and show that the left side reduces to false, which is  $(\lambda x. \lambda y. y)$ .