

1. Solⁿ:

```
do {  
  if (j > 50) continue;  
  j = i + j;  
  if (j < 10) break;  
  i += 2; } while (i < 100);
```

The operational semantics for the above program is:

```
loop: if expr1 > 50 continue  
      expr2;  
      If expr3 < 10 goto out  
      expr4;  
      while expr4 < 100  
out:  
      ....
```

2. Compute the weakest precondition for the following sequence of assignment statements with the given postcondition. If the given precondition is $\{b < -10\}$, does the following code have the desired semantics?

Solⁿ:

```
a = 20 + 2 * b;  
if (a > 0)  
    b = a * 5 + 10;  
else  
    b = a * -5 - 10;  
{b > 10}
```

Case (i)

```
    b > 10  
or,   a * 5 + 10 > 10  
or,   a > 0  
or,   20 + 2 * b > 0  
or,   b > -20 / 2  
or,   b > -10
```

Case (ii)

```
    b > 10  
or,   a * -5 - 10 > 10  
or,   a < -4  
or,   20 + 2b < -4  
or,   b < -24 / 2  
or,   b < -12
```

Therefore the required answer is $b > -10 \vee b < -12$

No. If precondition is $b < -10$, the code doesn't have the desired semantics.
(if we take $b = -11$, we do not end up with the required postcondition)

3. Write the denotational semantics mapping function $M_l(\text{do } L \text{ while } B, s)$ for Java do-while statements. You can (and should) use M_{sl} and M_b of the meaning in Section 3.5.2.5.

Solⁿ:

M_{sl} maps lists and states to states

M_b maps boolean expn. to boolean values

Denotational semantics mapping function $M_l(\text{do } L \text{ while } B, s)$:

```

 $M_l(\text{do } L \text{ while } B, s) \Delta =$  if  $M_{sl}(L, s) == \text{error}$ 
                                then error
                                else
                                   $s' = M_{sl}(L, s)$ 
                                  if  $M_b(B, s) == \text{undef}$ 
                                    then error
                                  else if  $M_b(B, s) == \text{false}$ 
                                    then  $s'$ 
                                  else  $M_l(\text{do } L \text{ while } B, s')$ 

```

4. Show the output of the lexical analyzer (as in the example on page 171) of front.c in Section 4.2 of the textbook for the expression $(100 + j) / i$.

Solⁿ:

$(100 + j) / i :$

```

Next token is: 25 Next lexeme is (
Next token is: 10 Next lexeme is 100
Next token is: 21 Next lexeme is +
Next token is: 11 Next lexeme is j
Next token is: 26 Next lexeme is )
Next token is: 24 Next lexeme is /
Next token is: 11 Next lexeme is i
Next token is: -1 Next lexeme is EOF

```

5. Consider the following grammar.

a) Modify the recursive-descent program on page 176 ~ 178 in the textbook so that it can parse the expressions generated by the grammar given below. Show the subprograms for the nonterminals and `<term>` and `<bool>`.

b) Show the output of the program (as in the example on page 178) for parsing the expression of $a \wedge b * c$.

Use the following macro definitions for the `&` and `^` operator.

```
#define AND_OP 27
```

```
#define XOR_OP 28
```

Note: the parentheses in the last rule are terminal symbols, while those in other rules are metasymbols.

```
<expr> → <term> { (+ | -) <term>}  
<term> → <bool> { (& | ^) } <bool> }  
<bool> → <factor> { (* | /) } <factor> }  
<factor> → id | int_constant | ( <expr> )
```

Solⁿ:

a.

Here is the complete recursive-descent program (I found the instructions little ambiguous, so modified the whole thing to be on the safe side)

```
void expr () {  
    printf("Enter <expr>\n");  
    term();  
    while (nextToken == ADD_OP || nextToken == SUB_OP) {  
        lex();  
        term();  
    }  
    printf("Exit <expr>\n");  
}  
  
void term() {  
    printf("Enter <term>\n");  
    bool();  
    while (nextToken == AND_OP || nextToken == XOR_OP) {  
        lex();  
        bool();  
    }  
    printf("Exit <term>\n");  
}  
  
void bool() {  
    printf("Enter <bool>\n");  
    factor();  
    while (nextToken == MULT_OP || nextToken == DIV_OP) {  
        lex();  
        factor();  
    }  
}
```

```

        printf("Exit <bool>\n");
    }

void factor() {
    printf("Enter <factor>\n");
    if (nextToken == IDENT || nextToken == INT_LIT)
        lex();
    else {
        if (nextToken == LEFT_PAREN) {
            lex();
            expr();
            if (nextToken == RIGHT_PAREN)
                lex();
            else
                error();
        } else
            error();
    }
    printf("Exit <factor>\n");
}

```

b.

Parsing output for expr: $a \wedge b * c$:

```

Next token is: 11 Next lexeme is a
Enter <expr>
Enter <term>
Enter <bool>
Enter <factor>
Next token is: 27 Next lexeme is ^
Exit <factor>
Exit <bool>
Next token is: 11 Next lexeme is b
Enter <bool>
Enter <factor>
Next token is: 23 Next lexeme is *
Exit <factor>
Next token is: 11 Next lexeme is c
Enter <factor>
Next token is -1 Next lexeme is EOF
Exit <factor>
Exit <bool>
Exit <term>

```

Exit <expr>

6. Remove left recursion in the following BNF grammar.

<id> → <str><sep><bin>
<str> → <str2><char> | <str><char> | <char>
<str2> → <str><char>
<char> → x | y | z
<sep> → * | #
<bin> → <bin> 0 | <bin> 1 | 0 | 1

Solⁿ:

By inspection, the only rules that have the left recursion problem are highlighted in bold:

<str> → <str2><char> | <str><char> | <char>

Group:

=> <str> → <str><char> | <str><char><char> | <char>

Replace:

<str> → <char><str'>
<str'> → <char><str'> | <char><char><str'> | ε

<bin> → <bin> 0 | <bin> 1 | 0 | 1

Group:

<bin> → <bin> 0 | <bin> 1 | 0 | 1

Replace:

<bin> → 0 <bin'> | 1 <bin'>
<bin'> → 0 <bin'> | 1 <bin'> | ε

Hence the new grammar is:

<id> → <str><sep><bin>
<str> → <char><str'>
<str'> → <char><str'> | <char><char><str'> | ε
<char> → x | y | z
<sep> → * | #
<bin> → 0 <bin'> | 1 <bin'>
<bin'> → 0 <bin'> | 1 <bin'> | ε

7. Does the nonterminal C in the following grammar pass the pairwise disjointness test? Why or

why not? (a, b, c are terminal symbols)

$$\begin{aligned}A &\rightarrow aCB \mid ba \\ B &\rightarrow bBC \mid cba \\ C &\rightarrow Abc \mid BaC \mid c\end{aligned}$$

Solⁿ:

Here for C:

$$\text{FIRST}(\alpha_i) = \{a, b\}$$

$$\text{FIRST}(\alpha_j) = \{b, c\}$$

$$\text{FIRST}(\alpha_i) \cap \text{FIRST}(\alpha_j) = \{b\}$$

Hence, C doesn't pass the pairwise disjointness test. [the intersection is not empty above]

8. Revise the following grammar so that it can pass the pairwise disjointness test.

$$\begin{aligned}S &\rightarrow aAB \mid bBC \\ A &\rightarrow aA \mid x \\ B &\rightarrow bB \mid bC \mid b \\ C &\rightarrow aB \mid AC \mid c\end{aligned}$$

Solⁿ:

Here, rewriting the above grammar, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}S &\rightarrow aAB \mid bBC \\ A &\rightarrow aA \mid x \\ B &\rightarrow bB \mid bC \mid b \\ C &\rightarrow aB \mid aAC \mid xC \mid c\end{aligned}$$

Using left refactoring method, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}S &\rightarrow aAB \mid bBC \\ A &\rightarrow aA \mid x \\ B &\rightarrow bB' \\ B' &\rightarrow B \mid C \mid \epsilon \\ C &\rightarrow aC' \mid xC \mid c \\ C' &\rightarrow B \mid AC \mid \epsilon,\end{aligned}$$

which is the required grammar.