

Your Grammar Is Bad

We can repair it... we have the technology

Troels Henriksen (athas@sigkill.dk)

September 18, 2014

Agenda

Last lecture, you saw how writing parsers can actually be fun. Today we tone it down a notch and make it slightly less fun, although still better than yacc. We will talk about:

- ▶ Left recursion
- ▶ Operator priority
- ▶ Tokenisation

Read this at home

Grammars and parsing with Haskell Using Parser Combinators, *by Ken Friis Larsen and Peter Sestoft*

Available on Absalon.

From grammar to parser

- ▶ $E ::= T + E$
 | $T - E$
 | T

$T ::= \text{int}$

- ▶ An example string

$1 - 2 + 3$

- ▶ By the grammar, this has only the single parse

$1 - (2 + 3)$

- ▶ How can we make sure we make the right decision in the rule for E ?

Left factorisation

- ▶ $E ::= T E_{opt}$
 $E_{opt} ::= + T E_{opt}$
 $| - T E_{opt}$
 $|$
 $T ::= int$

- ▶ Now all choices between productions can be made by looking at the next symbol in the input.

From Grammar to Parser Skeleton

- ▶ Make a function (parser) for each non-terminal, replace choice | with the combinator <|>, use the string combinator for terminals, and use do-notation for sequences.

```
▶ I e = do t
        eopt
        return ()
eopt = (do string "-"
         t
         eopt
         return ()) <|>
      (do string "-"
         t
         eopt
         return ()) <|>
      return ()
t = do integer
    return ()
```

Left-recursion

- ▶ $E ::= E + T$
 | $E - T$
 | T
 $T ::= \text{int}$

- ▶ Parses $1 + 2 - 3$ as $(1 + 2) - 3$.

- ▶ We can left-factorise...

$$\begin{aligned} E &::= T E_{\text{opt}} \\ E_{\text{opt}} &::= + E E_{\text{opt}} \\ &\quad | - E E_{\text{opt}} \\ &\quad | \epsilon \\ T &::= \text{int} \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ This now parses $1 + 2 - 3$ as $1 + (2 - 3)$. We will need to rewrite the parse tree... sounds hard.

We have the technology!

- ▶ Enter:

```
chainl1 :: Parser a
        -> Parser (a -> a -> a)
        -> Parser a
```

- ▶ The parser `chainl1 prim op` parses `prims` separated by `ops`.

```
data Exp = Con Int | Add Exp Exp | Sub Exp Exp
e = chainl1 t op
t = do x <- integer
    return (Con x)
op = (do string "+"
        return Add) <|>
     (do string "-"
        return Sub)
```

- ▶ Always does leftmost derivation.

Operator priority

- ▶ Operators with differing priority

$$\begin{aligned} E ::= & E + T \\ & | E - T \\ & | E * T \\ & | E / T \\ & | T \end{aligned}$$
$$T ::= \text{int}$$

- ▶ This we solve by adding multiple levels of nonterminals.

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 ::= & E_0 + T \\ & | E_0 - T \\ & | E_1 \end{aligned}$$
$$\begin{aligned} E_1 ::= & E_1 * T \\ & | E_1 / T \\ & | T \end{aligned}$$
$$T ::= \text{int}$$

Operator priority

Now we can use chainl1 like before.

```
data Exp = Con Int | Add Exp Exp | Sub Exp Exp
          | Mul Exp Exp | Div Exp Exp

e0 = chainl1 e1 op0
e1 = chainl1 t op1
t = do x <- integer
    return (Con x)
op0 = (do string "+"
        return Add) <|>
      (do string "-"
        return Sub)
op1 = (do string "/"
        return Div) <|>
      (do string "*"
        return Mul)
```

Whitespace

- ▶ In most parsers, we want to ignore whitespace between tokens.
- ▶ `spaces = many (satisfy isSpace)`
- ▶ Where to use spaces? Common solution: Litter it all over the place like some sacrifice to eldritch parser spirits.
- ▶ Better solution:

```
token :: Parser a -> Parser a
token p = do x <- p
            spaces
            return x
```

Maximum munch

► $E0 ::= E0 + T$

 | $E0 - T$

 | $E1$

$E1 ::= E1 * T$

 | $E1 / T$

 | T

$T ::= \text{int}$

 | $\text{if } E0 \text{ then } E0 \text{ else } E0$

 | var

- We want to ensure that the string `ifxthenyelsez` is parsed as a variable name.
- We want to ensure that `then` is not parsed as a variable name.
- Solution: `notFollowedBy/munch` and some ad-hoc hackery.

Summary

- ▶ Basic transformation of grammars to combinator-based parsers.
- ▶ Handle left-recursion with `chainl1`.
- ▶ Handle operator priority through grammar transformation.
- ▶ Have a principled approach to whitespace handling and munching.