

# Toward Language-Independent Sugar Libraries

ELTON M. CARDOSO

Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto  
Ouro Preto, Minas Gerais, Brazil

RODRIGO G. RIBEIRO

Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto  
Ouro Preto, Minas Gerais, Brazil

LEONARDO V. S. REIS

Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora  
Juiz de Fora, Minas Gerais, Brazil  
lvsreis@ice.ufjf.br

## ABSTRACT

## KEYWORDS

PEG, parsing, semantics

### ACM Reference Format:

ELTON M. CARDOSO, RODRIGO G. RIBEIRO, and LEONARDO V. S. REIS.  
2021. Toward Language-Independent Sugar Libraries. In *Proceedings of XXV  
BRAZILIAN SYMPOSIUM ON PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES (SBLP2021)*.  
ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2 pages.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

## 2 DEFINITION OF THE PARSING GRAMMAR EXPRESSIONS AND THE ABSTRACT MACHINE

The parsing expressions syntax is given by the grammar of the  
Figure 1, as defined by [1].

**Figure 1** Grammar for Parsing Expression

$\langle e \rangle ::=$	$a$
	$\epsilon$
	$e e$
	$e/e$
	$e^*$
	$!e$
	$v$

The parsing expression grammar  $G$  is a set of pairs  $(V, e)$  whose  
 $V$  is a variable. The evaluation context for a PEG is defined by the  
grammar of the Figure 2.

**Figure 2** Grammar for evaluation context

$\langle m \rangle ::=$	$a$
	$\epsilon$
	$\odot e$
	$e \odot$
	$\oslash e$
	$e \oslash$
	$\star$
	$\neg$

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or  
classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed  
for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation  
on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM  
must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish,  
to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a  
fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

SBLP2021, September 23–27, 2021, Brazil

© 2021 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00

The machine state is described by 5-upla  $(G, e, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle)$ , where  
 $G$  is a Peg Grammar,  $e$  is a peg expression,  $\Gamma$  is an evaluation context,  
the  $\langle z \bullet w \rangle$  is a zipper describing on the input string, where  $z$  is the  
consumed portion of the input and  $w$  is the reminder of the input.  
The empty input, represented by  $\lambda$ . Failed computations fail, the  
zipper will be subscripted, becoming a  $\langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp}$ .

At any moment one or more marked symbols can be present  
in the input, such symbols are indicated with a ring above  $\hat{a}$ . The  
last recently created mark will be represented by  $x\hat{a}z$  where  $z$  is an  
arbitrary, possibly empty, string.

The parsing expression  $e$  will be preceded by a  $\downarrow$ , to indicate  
that the processing of that expression is to be started, or by an  $\uparrow$  to  
indicate that the processing of that expression is to be finished.

The  $\Gamma$  context is managed as a stack, the empty context is written  
 $[]$ . A non-empty context is written  $m : \Gamma$ , where  $m$  is a context  
expression.

A PEG grammar  $G$  is a set of pairs  $(\mathcal{V}, e)$  and denotes a rule  
 $\mathcal{V} \leftarrow e$  where  $\mathcal{V}$  is a variable. For simplicity reasons it is assumed  
that there is only one variable  $\mathbb{V}$  in  $G$ .

## 3 SMALL STEP SEMANTICS

The semantics relation has the form  $(G, e, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, e, \Gamma, \langle z' \bullet w' \rangle)$  where  $G$  is a Parsing Expression Grammars,  $e$  is an expression,  
 $\Gamma$  is a stack of  $m$  expr,  $z$  is the consumed input and  $w$  is the input.

The rule 1 displayed in Figure 3 shows that when beginning  
processing the empty PEG,  $\downarrow \epsilon$ , the result is a state where the empty  
peg finished without consuming any input string. This rule always  
succeeds.

**Figure 3** Rules for a simple terminal

$$(1) (G, \downarrow \epsilon, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \uparrow \epsilon, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle)$$

The rule 1 displayed in Figure 3 shows that when beginning  
processing the empty PEG,  $\downarrow \epsilon$ , the result is a state where the empty  
peg finished without consuming any input string. This rule always  
succeeds.

**Figure 4** Rules for a simple terminal

$$(2) (G, \downarrow a, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet aw \rangle) \triangleright (G, \uparrow a, \Gamma, \langle za \bullet w \rangle)$$
$$(3) (G, \downarrow a, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet bw \rangle) \triangleright (G, \uparrow a, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet bw \rangle_{\perp})$$
$$(4) (G, \downarrow a, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet \lambda \rangle) \triangleright (G, \uparrow a, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet \lambda \rangle_{\perp})$$

Rules 2 through 4 determine the behavior on a single terminal.  
Rule 2 states that a single terminal is accepted if it matches the first  
symbol at the current input. Rule ?? states that a terminal will fail  
if the first symbol of the current input rule does not match it and 4  
states that a terminal will always fail on an empty input.

Rules 5 through 9 determine the behavior on a sequence construction. Rule 5 states that the result of processing sequence  $e_1e_2$  is to begin the processing of the sub-expression  $e_1$  pushing the expression  $\odot e_2$  to the top of the evaluation context. Rule 6 shows that in a state where the processing of sub-expression  $e_1$  has succeeded and  $\odot e_2$  is on top of the evaluation stack the result state is to replace the top of evaluation context with  $e_1\odot$  and proceed to evaluate  $e_2$ . Rule 7 states that in a context where  $e_1\odot$ , i.e.  $e_1$  has succeeded  $e_2$  also has succeeded then the whole expression  $e_1e_2$  succeeds. Rule 8 and ?? establishes that if any of the expressions on a concatenation fails, the whole concatenation fails.

**Figure 5** Rules for sequence

- (5)  $(G, \downarrow e_1e_2, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \downarrow e_1, \odot e_2 : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle)$
- (6)  $(G, \uparrow e_1, \odot e_2 : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \downarrow e_2, e_1\odot : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle)$
- (7)  $(G, \uparrow e_2, e_1\odot : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1e_2, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle)$
- (8)  $(G, \uparrow e_1, \odot e_2 : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp}) \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1e_2, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp})$
- (9)  $(G, \uparrow e_2, e_1\odot : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp}) \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1e_2, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp})$

Rules 10 through 14, seen in Figure 6, defines the behavior of the alternative expression. Rule 10 states that at the beginning of an alternative a mark is placed on the next input of the string and then the sub-expression  $e_1$  begins to be processed. Rule 11 states that whenever the left side of an alternative expression succeeds the whole alternative succeeds dismissing the last mark made on the consumed input string. Rule 12 states that whenever the left sub-expression of an alternative fails, the consumed input is back-tracked until the last mark, which is kept on the input, and the processing of sub-expression  $e_2$  begins. Rule 13 states that whenever  $e_2$  succeeds the whole alternative succeeds, dismissing the last mark recorded. Rule 14 states that whenever the right side of an alternative fails, the whole alternative fails restoring the input.

**Figure 6** Rules for alternative

- (10)  $(G, \downarrow e_1/e_2, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet aw \rangle) \triangleright (G, \downarrow e_1, \odot e_2 : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet \dot{a}w \rangle)$
- (11)  $(G, \uparrow e_1, \odot e_2 : \Gamma, \langle x\dot{a}z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1/e_2, \Gamma, \langle xaz \bullet w \rangle)$
- (12)  $(G, \uparrow e_1, e_2\odot : \Gamma, \langle x\dot{a}z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp}) \triangleright (G, \downarrow e_2, e_1\odot : \Gamma, \langle x \bullet \dot{a}zw \rangle)$
- (13)  $(G, \uparrow e_2, e_1\odot : \Gamma, \langle x\dot{a}z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1/e_2, \Gamma, \langle xaz \bullet w \rangle)$
- (14)  $(G, \uparrow e_2, e_1\odot : \Gamma, \langle x\dot{a}z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp}) \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1/e_2, \Gamma, \langle x \bullet aw \rangle_{\perp})$

Figure 5

**Figure 7** Rules for not

- (10)  $(G, \downarrow !e, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \downarrow e, \neg : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp})$
- (11)  $(G, \uparrow e, \neg : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp}) \triangleright (G, \uparrow !e, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle)$

**Figure 8** Rules for klenee

- (10)  $(G, \downarrow e_1e_2, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \downarrow e_1, \odot e_2 : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle)$
- (11)  $(G, \uparrow e_1, \odot e_2 : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \downarrow e_2, e_1\odot : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle)$
- (12)  $(G, \uparrow e_2, e_1\odot : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle) \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1e_2, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle)$
- (13)  $(G, \uparrow e_1, \odot e_2 : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp}) \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1e_2, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp})$
- (14)  $(G, \uparrow e_2, e_1\odot : \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp}) \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1e_2, \Gamma, \langle z \bullet w \rangle_{\perp})$

$$\begin{array}{ll} (G, \downarrow e, \Gamma, z \bullet w) & \triangleright (G, \uparrow e, \Gamma, z \bullet w) \\ (G, \downarrow e_1/e_2, \Gamma, z \bullet w) & \triangleright (G, \uparrow e_1, \odot e_2 : \Gamma, z \bullet w) \end{array}$$

## 4 HASKELL IMPLEMENTATION

## 5 RELATED WORK

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the CNPq – Brazil under grant No.: 426232/2016.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bryan Ford. 2004. Parsing Expression Grammars: A Recognition-Based Syntactic Foundation. *SIGPLAN Not.* 39, 1 (Jan. 2004), 111â122. <https://doi.org/10.1145/982962.964011>