1. [20] Consider the following grammar G:

$$E \rightarrow TE'$$

$$E' \rightarrow +TE' \mid \epsilon$$

$$T \rightarrow FT'$$

$$T' \rightarrow *FT' \mid \epsilon$$

$$F \rightarrow id$$

- (a) Is G LL(1)? If yes, show the parse table. Otherwise, show why.
- (b) Is G SLR(1)? If yes, show the parse table. Otherwise, show why.
- 2. [20] Consider the following grammar G:

$$S' \rightarrow S$$

 $S \rightarrow Aa \mid bAc \mid dc \mid bda$
 $A \rightarrow d$

- (a) Is G SLR(1)? If yes, show the parse table. Otherwise, show why.
- (b) Is G LALR(1)? If yes, show the parse table. Otherwise, show why.
- 3. Consider the following grammar G:

$$S' \rightarrow S$$

$$S \rightarrow (S)S \mid \epsilon$$

- (a) [10] Construct the collection of sets of LR(0) items for G
- (b) [10] Construct an NFA in which each state is an LR(0) item from (a)
- (a) [10] Show that the goto graph of the sets of LR(0) items in (a) is the same as the DFA contructed from the NFA in (b)
- 4. [10] The following grammar for if-then-else statement is proposed to remedy the dangling-else ambiguity:

Show that this grammar is still ambiguous.

- 5. [10] Translate the expression -(a+b)*(c+d)+(a+b+c) into
 - (a) a syntax tree
 - (b) postfix notation
 - (c) tree-address code
- 6. Consider the follow extended assignment statement in C

$$id_1$$
, $id_2 = expr_1$, $expr_2$

It has the same meaning as

$$id_1 = expr_r$$
; $id_2 = expr_2$

Note that these two statements are executed simultaneously, not sequentially.

(a) [10] Write down the semantic rules for intermediate code generation of the following grammar

$$S \rightarrow id, id = E, E$$

 $E \rightarrow E + E \mid E * E \mid id$

- (b) [5] Translate a, b = b, a to 3-address code based on (a)
- (c) [5] Translate a, b = a + b + 10, a + b + 1 to 3-address code based on (a)