

Introduction to Parsing

Lecture 5

Instructor: Fredrik Kjolstad

Slides based on slides designed by Prof. Alex Aiken

Outline

- Regular languages revisited
- Parser overview
- Context-free grammars (CFG's)
- Derivations
- Ambiguity

Languages and Automata

- Formal languages are very important in CS
 - Especially in programming languages
- Regular languages
 - The weakest formal languages widely used
 - Many applications
- We will also study context-free languages, tree languages

Beyond Regular Languages

- Many languages are not regular
- Strings of balanced parentheses are not regular:

$$\{()^i \mid i \geq 0\}$$

What Can Regular Languages Express?

- Languages requiring counting modulo a fixed integer
- Intuition: A finite automaton that runs long enough must repeat states
- Finite automaton can't remember # of times it has visited a particular state

The Functionality of the Parser

- **Input:** sequence of tokens from lexer
- **Output:** parse tree of the program
(But some parsers never produce a parse tree . . .)

Example


- Cool

if x = y then 1 else 2 fi

- Parser input

IF ID = ID THEN INT ELSE INT FI

- Parser output



Comparison with Lexical Analysis

<i>Phase</i>	<i>Input</i>	<i>Output</i>
Lexer	String of characters	String of tokens
Parser	String of tokens	Parse tree

The Role of the Parser

- Not all strings of tokens are programs . . .
- . . . parser must distinguish between valid and invalid strings of tokens
- We need
 - A language for describing valid strings of tokens
 - A method for distinguishing valid from invalid strings of tokens

Context-Free Grammars

- Programming language constructs have recursive structure
- An **EXPR** is
 - if EXPR then EXPR else EXPR fi
 - while EXPR loop EXPR pool
 - ...
- Context-free grammars are a natural notation for this recursive structure

CFGs (Cont.)

- A CFG consists of
 - A set of *terminals* T
 - A set of *non-terminals* N
 - A *start symbol* S (a non-terminal)
 - A set of *productions*

$$X \rightarrow Y_1 Y_2 \dots Y_n$$

where $X \in N$ and $Y_i \in T \cup N \cup \{e\}$

Notational Conventions

- In these lecture notes
 - Non-terminals are written upper-case
 - Terminals are written lower-case
 - The start symbol is the left-hand side of the first production

Examples of CFGs

A fragment of Cool:

EXPR → if EXPR then EXPR else EXPR fi
 | while EXPR loop EXPR pool
 | id

Examples of CFGs (cont.)

Simple arithmetic expressions:

$$\begin{array}{l} E \rightarrow E * E \\ \quad | \quad E + E \\ \quad | \quad (E) \\ \quad | \quad \text{id} \end{array}$$

The Language of a CFG

Read productions as rules:

$$X \rightarrow Y_1 \dots Y_n$$

means X can be replaced by $Y_1 \dots Y_n$

Key Idea

1. Begin with a string consisting of the start symbol “ S ”
2. Replace any non-terminal X in the string by a the right-hand side of some production

$$X \rightarrow Y_1 \dots Y_n$$

3. Repeat (2) until there are no non-terminals in the string

The Language of a CFG (Cont.)

More formally, write

$$X_1 \dots X_{i-1} X_i X_{i+1} \dots X_n \rightarrow X_1 \dots X_{i-1} Y_1 \dots Y_m X_{i+1} \dots X_n$$

if there is a production

$$X_i \rightarrow Y_1 \dots Y_m$$

The Language of a CFG (Cont.)

Write

$$X_1 \dots X_n \rightarrow^* Y_1 \dots Y_m$$

if

$$X_1 \dots X_n \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Y_1 \dots Y_m$$

in 0 or more steps

The Language of a CFG

Let G be a context-free grammar with start symbol S . Then the language of G is:

$\{a_1 \dots a_n \mid S \rightarrow^* a_1 \dots a_n \text{ and every } a_i \text{ is a terminal}\}$

Terminals

- Terminals are so-called because there are no rules for replacing them
- Once generated, terminals are permanent
- Terminals ought to be tokens of the language

Examples

$L(G)$ is the language of CFG G

Strings of balanced parentheses $\{()^i \mid i \geq 0\}$

Two grammars:

$$S \rightarrow (S)$$

$$S \rightarrow \varepsilon$$

OR

$$S \rightarrow (S)$$

$$S \rightarrow \varepsilon$$

Cool Example

A fragment of COOL:

```
EXPR  →  if EXPR then EXPR else EXPR fi  
      |  while EXPR loop EXPR pool  
      |  id
```

Cool Example (Cont.)

Some elements of the language

id

if id then id else id fi

while id loop id pool

if while id loop id pool then id else id fi

if if id then id else id fi then id else id fi

Breakout: All these expressions will parse, but
which one will not typecheck?

Arithmetic Example

Simple arithmetic expressions:

$$E \rightarrow E + E \mid E * E \mid (E) \mid \text{id}$$

Some elements of the language:

id	id + id
(id)	id * id
(id) * id	id * (id)

Notes

The idea of a *CFG* is a big step. But:

- Membership in a language is “yes” or “no”
 - We also need a parse tree of the input
- Must handle errors gracefully
- Need an implementation of *CFG*'s (e.g., bison)

More Notes

- Form of the grammar is important
 - Many grammars generate the same language
 - Tools are sensitive to the grammar
- Note: Tools for regular languages (e.g., flex) are sensitive to the form of the regular expression, but this is rarely a problem in practice

Derivations and Parse Trees

A *derivation* is a sequence of productions

$$S \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow d \dots$$

A derivation can be drawn as a tree

- Start symbol is the tree's root
- For a production $X \rightarrow Y_1 \dots Y_n$ add children $Y_1 \dots Y_n$ to node X

Derivation Example

- Grammar


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

- String

$$id * id + id$$

Derivation Example (cont.)

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




Derivation in Detail (1)

E

E


Derivation in Detail (2)

E
 $\rightarrow E+E$




Derivation in Detail (3)

E
 $\rightarrow E + E$
 $\rightarrow E * E + E$




Derivation in Detail (4)

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




Derivation in Detail (5)

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



Derivation in Detail (6)

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



Notes on Derivations

- A parse tree has
 - Terminals at the leaves
 - Non-terminals at the interior nodes
- An in-order traversal of the leaves is the original input
- The parse tree shows the association of operations, the input string does not

Left-most and Right-most Derivations

- The example is a *left-most* derivation
 - At each step, replace the left-most non-terminal

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

- There is an equivalent notion of a *right-most* derivation


Right-most Derivation in Detail (1)

E

E


Right-most Derivation in Detail (2)

E
 $\rightarrow E+E$




Right-most Derivation in Detail (3)

E
 $\rightarrow E + E$
 $\rightarrow E + id$




Right-most Derivation in Detail (4)

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




Right-most Derivation in Detail (5)

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



Right-most Derivation in Detail (6)

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



Derivations and Parse Trees

- Note that right-most and left-most derivations have the same parse tree
- The difference is the order in which branches are added

Summary of Derivations



- We are not just interested in whether $s \in L(G)$
 - We need a parse tree for s
- A derivation defines a parse tree
 - But one parse tree may have many derivations
- Left-most and right-most derivations are important in parser implementation

Ambiguity

- Grammar $E \rightarrow E + E \mid E * E \mid (E) \mid id$
- String $id * id + id$

Ambiguity (Cont.)

This string has two parse trees



Ambiguity (Cont.)

- A grammar is *ambiguous* if it has more than one parse tree for some string
 - Equivalently, there is more than one right-most or left-most derivation for some string
- Ambiguity is **BAD**
 - Leaves meaning of some programs ill-defined

Dealing with Ambiguity

- There are several ways to handle ambiguity
- Most direct method is to rewrite grammar unambiguously

$$E \rightarrow E' + E \mid E'$$

$$E' \rightarrow \text{id} * E' \mid \text{id} \mid (E) * E' \mid (E)$$



- Enforces precedence of $*$ over $+$

Ambiguity in Arithmetic Expressions

- Recall the grammar

$$E \rightarrow E + E \mid E * E \mid (E) \mid \text{int}$$

- The string $\text{int} * \text{int} + \text{int}$ has two parse trees:



Ambiguity: The Dangling Else



- Consider the grammar
$$\begin{array}{l} E \rightarrow \text{if } E \text{ then } E \\ \quad | \text{if } E \text{ then } E \text{ else } E \\ \quad | \text{OTHER} \end{array}$$
- This grammar is also ambiguous

The Dangling Else: Example

- The expression

if E_1 then if E_2 then E_3 else E_4

has two parse trees



- Typically we want the second form

The Dangling Else: A Fix

- `else` matches the closest unmatched `then`
- We can describe this in the grammar

$E \rightarrow \text{MIF}$ $\text{/* all then are matched */}$
 $| \text{UIF}$ $\text{/* some then is unmatched */}$


$\text{MIF} \rightarrow \text{if } E \text{ then MIF else MIF}$
 $| \text{OTHER}$

$\text{UIF} \rightarrow \text{if } E \text{ then } E$
 $| \text{if } E \text{ then MIF else UIF}$


- Describes the same set of strings

The Dangling Else: Example Revisited

- The expression `if E1 then if E2 then E3 else E4`



- A valid parse tree (for a **UIF**)



- Not valid because the **then** expression is not a **MIF**

Ambiguity



- No general techniques for handling ambiguity
- Impossible to convert automatically an ambiguous grammar to an unambiguous one
- Used with care, ambiguity can simplify the grammar
 - Sometimes allows more natural definitions
 - We need disambiguation mechanisms

Precedence and Associativity Declarations

- Instead of rewriting the grammar
 - Use the more natural (ambiguous) grammar
 - Along with disambiguating declarations
- Most tools allow precedence and associativity declarations to disambiguate grammars
- Examples ...

Associativity Declarations



- Consider the grammar $E \rightarrow E + E \mid \text{int}$
- Ambiguous: two parse trees of $\text{int} + \text{int} + \text{int}$



- Left associativity declaration: `%left +`

Precedence Declarations

- Consider the grammar $E \rightarrow E + E \mid E * E \mid \text{int}$
 - And the string $\text{int} + \text{int} * \text{int}$



- Precedence declarations: $\%left +$
 $\%left *$