University of Pretoria ■ EBIT Faculty ■ **Department of Computer Science** ■ Academic Year **2023**

COS**341 Compiler** Construction ■ Semester **Test**

	RESULT
STUDENT	RESOLI
First Name:	
Family Name:	
StudNumber:	

This question-booklet must be filled in and returned together with the answer-booklet.

Course Lecturer: Prof. S.Gruner Quality Control: Dr. L.Marshall



INSTRUCTIONS:

Read each question carefully before writing your answers *neatly* into the answer-booklet provided. Please **avoid** (as far as possible) to fill the answer-booklet with irrelevant rough-scribbles: instead, use your own rough-scribble pad for such purposes.

Wait until the invigilators give the start-signal before you begin to work.

FORBIDDEN:

- Any kind of academic dishonesty (as defined by the rule book of the University of Pretoria);
- Any electronic or computational devices such as portable computers, "smart" cell-phones, "smart" wrist-watches, e-book display devices (e.g.: "Kindle"), and the like;
- The textbook as a whole;
- Large-quantity bulk-prints of 3rd-party digital materials which you have not authored, also
 including: the E-book version of our textbook, the PDF lecture slides, any internet wikipedia
 web-pages, any scientific papers from GoogleScholar, etc.;
- Direct prints of any JPG/GIF/photos taken with cameras from the lecturer's chalk-board.
- Writing with pencil that can be erased with a rubber-gum.

ALLOWED:

- Student's own self-made (self-authored) crib-notes in unlimited quanity (typed or written);
- *Manually re-written scribbles* of the JPG/GIF/photos which were taken with cameras from the lecturer's chalk-board;
- Manually re-written sections or paragraphs of the Textbook which are difficult to remember (including mathematical formulae with cumbersome symbols, important definitions, important explanations and illustrative examples, and the like);
- Manually re-written sections or paragraphs from the PDF Lecture Slides (again with special focus on anything that is difficult to remember, such as cumbersome mathematical formulae, and the like).

Time Advice (applicable to "regular" students without time concession letter)	MARKING
Question A: 30 minutes	[12 Points]
Question B : 20 minutes	[7 Points]
Question C: 20 minutes	[8 Points]
•	[8 Points]
Question D : 20 minutes	[35 Points]
Total Time: 90 minutes	[35 Politis]

Question A.

SCENARIO: Two undergraduate students, Natasha Naidoo and her study-buddy Vanessa Venter, have constructed the following two context-free grammars for describing Branching-Programs (with *PROG* as the start *Non-Terminal*). Now the students are quarreling which grammar is "better":

Natasha's CFG for Branching Programs	Vanessa's CFG for Branching Programs
1. PROG → INSTR; SEQ 2. SEQ → PROG 3. SEQ → 4. INSTR → command 5. INSTR → BRANCH 6. BRANCH → if (bool) { PROG } 7. BRANCH → if (bool) { SEQ } else { PROG }	1. PROG → INSTR; PROG 2. PROG → 3. INSTR → command 4. INSTR → BRANCH 5. BRANCH → if(bool) { PROG } ELSE 6. ELSE → else { PROG } 7. ELSE →

The *languages* produced by these two grammars are obviously very similar, though *not the same:* Vanessa allows for programs to be completely empty, whereas Natasha insists that programs must contain at least one instruction. Whilst this difference is perhaps merely "a matter of taste", the two students also want to find out whether any of their two grammars is "easier" for Parser-construction.

A.1

[3 Points]

Analyse by way of the Look-Ahead-Set method (and the additional special rule $S \rightarrow PROG$ \$) whether **Natasha**'s grammar is in **LL1**.

A.2

[7 Points]

Analyse by way of the Look-Ahead-Set method (and the additional special rule $S \rightarrow PROG$ \$) whether **Vanessa**'s grammar is in *LL1*.

For the next two sub-questions:

Given is now the sentence

command ; if(bool) {} else { command ; } ;

A.3

[1 Point]

Draw the complete (concrete) syntax tree of the given sentence w.r.t. Natasha's grammar.

A.4

[1 Point]

Draw the complete (concrete) syntax tree of the given sentence w.r.t. Vanessa's grammar.

-----*_____*____

Question B.

[7 Points]

SCENARIO: Mbali Motsepe (another one of Natasha's study buddies) now wants to use Natasha's grammar (from Question A) for the construction of an SLR parser, but she is not exactly sure about how to begin. Construct the Control-NFA (with ε transitions) for Mbali from Natasha's grammar.



Turn the page

In the meantime, student Vanessa Venter has designed the following CFG for Looping-Programs

1. PROG	· INSTR : PROG
2. PROG	- mank
3. INSTR	→ variable := EXPR
4. INSTR	→ while (BOOL) (PROG)
5. EXPR	- yariable number true false
6. EXPR 7. EXPR	 numOp(EXPR , EXPR) boolOp(EXPR , EXPR)
8. BOOL	→ EXPR

Question C.

[8 Points]

Help Vanessa with the *semantic attribution* of her grammar for the purpose of *Type Analysis*, such that 1 suitable Type Analysis Rule is "attached" to each 1 of the given grammar's 8 syntactic rules. The semantic rules must be presented in a "functional" style (similar to the style shown in textbook) and must also include the printing of *error messages* for any Looping-Program which (albeit correct in its syntax) happens to be found to be semantically inconsistent.

Question D.

[8 Points]

Help Vanessa with the *semantic attribution* of her grammar for the purpose of *Intermediate Code Generation*, such that 1 suitable Code Generator Rule is "attached" to each 1 of her grammar's 8 syntactic rules. The semantic rules must be presented in a "functional" style (similar to the style in our textbook).

Additional Advice:

- For the 2nd Syntax Rule of the grammar given above, you may <u>assume</u> that the intermediate language also offers a NOP command which means "no operation" (do nothing).
- For grammar lines 5-8 you must define TransExp. For grammar lines 1-4 you must define TransStat. In grammar lines 3-4 the TransStat function must also use help from TransExp.



