



Universiteit Utrecht

[Faculty of Science
Information and Computing Sciences]

Parser Memoisation

Marcelo Barbosa de Sousa

January 24, 2011

Roadmap

Motivation

YAPL - Yet Another Parsing Library

Memoisation

Conclusion



Roadmap

Motivation

YAPL - Yet Another Parsing Library

Memoisation

Conclusion



Research Problem

Currently all parsing libraries will parse a piece of text twice with the same non-terminal if the grammar has various way of reaching the same point in the input. One approach to solving this problem is to use memoisation techniques. It is however not entirely clear how to do this in a online, typeful way.



Research Problem

*Currently all parsing libraries will parse a piece of text twice with the same non-terminal if the grammar has various way of reaching the same point in the input. One approach to solving this problem is to use **memoisation** techniques. It is however not entirely clear how to do this in a **online**, **typeful** way.*



Parser Combinators



Context free grammars

$$\langle N, \Sigma, P, S \rangle$$

- ▶ N : Set of non-terminals
- ▶ Σ : Set of terminals, e.g. *Char*
- ▶ P : Set of productions ($A \in N, \alpha \in V^*$)
- ▶ S : Set of start symbols, $S \in N$
- ▶ $V = N \cup \Sigma$: Set of symbols
- ▶ $N \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$



Parser Type

type *Parser* *s a* = [*s*] \rightarrow *a*
type *Parser* *s a* = [*s*] \rightarrow (*a*, [*s*])
type *Parser* *s a* = [*s*] \rightarrow [*a*]
type *Parser* *s a* = [*s*] \rightarrow [(*a*, [*s*])]
type *Parser* *a* = *String* \rightarrow [(*a*, *String*)]



Basic Parser Combinators Types

$pSym :: Eq\ s \Rightarrow s \rightarrow Parser\ s\ s$
 $pRet :: a \rightarrow Parser\ s\ a$
 $< | > :: Parser\ s\ a \rightarrow Parser\ s\ a \rightarrow Parser\ s\ a$
 $< * > :: Parser\ s\ (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow Parser\ s\ b \rightarrow Parser\ s\ a$



Basic Parser Combinators

$pSym :: Eq\ s \Rightarrow s \rightarrow Parser\ s\ s$
 $pSym\ c = \lambda inp \rightarrow \mathbf{case\ inp\ of}$
 $(s : ss) \mid c \equiv s \rightarrow [(s, ss)]$
 $otherwise \rightarrow []$

$pRet :: a \rightarrow Parser\ s\ a$
 $pRet\ x = \lambda inp \rightarrow [(x, inp)]$



Basic Parser Combinators

$pSym :: Eq\ s \Rightarrow s \rightarrow Parser\ s\ s$
 $pSym\ c = \lambda inp \rightarrow \mathbf{case}\ inp\ \mathbf{of}$
 $(s : ss) \mid c \equiv s \rightarrow [(s, ss)]$
 $otherwise \rightarrow []$

$pRet :: a \rightarrow Parser\ s\ a$
 $pRet\ x = \lambda inp \rightarrow [(x, inp)]$



Basic Parser Combinators

infixr 3 < | >

$(< | >) :: \text{Parser } s \ a \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ a \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ a$

$p < | > q = \lambda \text{inp} \rightarrow p \text{ inp} ++ q \text{ inp}$

infixl 5 < * >

$(< * >) :: \text{Parser } s \ (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ b \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ a$

$p < * > q = \lambda \text{inp} \rightarrow [(b2a \ b, rr) \mid (b2a, r) \leftarrow p \text{ inp},$
 $(b, rr) \leftarrow q \ r]$



Basic Parser Combinators

infixr 3 < | >

$(< | >) :: \text{Parser } s \ a \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ a \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ a$

$p < | > q = \lambda \text{inp} \rightarrow p \text{ inp} ++ q \text{ inp}$

infixl 5 < * >

$(< * >) :: \text{Parser } s \ (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ b \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ a$

$p < * > q = \lambda \text{inp} \rightarrow [(b2a \ b, rr) \mid (b2a, r) \leftarrow p \text{ inp},$
 $(b, rr) \leftarrow q \ r]$



Derived Parser Combinators

infix 7 $< \$ >$

$(< \$ >) :: (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ b \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ a$
 $f < \$ > q = p\text{Ret } f < * > q$

infixl 3 'opt'

$\text{opt} :: \text{Parser } s \ a \rightarrow a \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ a$
 $p \text{ 'opt' } v = p < | > p\text{Return } v$

$p\text{Many} :: \text{Parser } s \ a \rightarrow \text{Parser } s \ [a]$

$p\text{Many } p = (:) < \$ > p < * > p\text{Many } p \text{ 'opt' } []$



The Research Problem

Grammars are not always left factorized which results in inefficient parsing.

$s :: \text{Parser Char String}$
 $s = f < | > g$

$f = fsem < \$ > pSym 'a' < * > p < * > q$

$g = h < * > p < * > r$
 $h = gsem < \$ > pSym 'a'$



The Research Problem

Grammars are not always left factorized which results in inefficient parsing.

$s :: \text{Parser Char String}$
 $s = f < | > g$

$f = fsem < \$ > pSym 'a' < * > p < * > q$

$g = h < * > p < * > r$
 $h = gsem < \$ > pSym 'a'$



The Research Problem

Grammars are not always left factorized which results in inefficient parsing.

| $s :: \text{Parser Char String}$
| $s = f < | > g$

| $f = fsem < \$ > pSym 'a' < * > p < * > q$

| $g = h < * > p < * > r$
| $h = gsem < \$ > pSym 'a'$



The Research Problem

$s :: \text{Parser Char String}$
 $s = f < | > g$

$f = fsem < \$ > pSym 'a' < * > p < * > q$

$g = h < * > p < * > r$
 $h = gsem < \$ > pSym 'a'$

The inefficiency results of our implementation of the choice combinator.

In the case of parser s , $pSym 'a' < * > p$ could be shared among both branches.



Roadmap

Motivation

YAPL - Yet Another Parsing Library

Memoisation

Conclusion



Goals

- ▶ Left-factorization for free
- ▶ Full control on parsing, online parsing, error control
- ▶ Same representation as previous parser combinators



Defunctionalizing Parsers

We can represent parsers with GADTs:

data *Parser* :: * \rightarrow * **where**

Sym :: *Char* \rightarrow *Parser Char*

Ret :: *a* \rightarrow *Parser a*

Alt :: *Parser a* \rightarrow *Parser a* \rightarrow *Parser a*

Seq :: *Parser (b \rightarrow a)* \rightarrow *Parser b* \rightarrow *Parser a*



Continuations as a Stack of Parsers

We can represent the parsers yet to be analyzed as a stack.

data *Pending* :: * → * **where**

Done :: *Pending* ()

Stack :: *Parser a* → *Pending b* → *Pending (a, b)*

- ▶ *Done* represents the end of our parser.
- ▶ *Stack* contains the current parser to be processed and the rest of the stack.

```
Ret (:[[]]) 'Seq' Sym 'a'  
↪ Stack (Ret (:[[]])) (Stack (Sym 'a') Done)  
:: Pending (a → [a], (Char, ()))
```



Continuations as a Stack of Parsers

We can represent the parsers yet to be analyzed as a stack.

data *Pending* :: * → * **where**

Done :: *Pending* ()

Stack :: *Parser* *a* → *Pending* *b* → *Pending* (*a*, *b*)

- ▶ *Done* represents the end of our parser.
- ▶ *Stack* contains the current parser to be processed and the rest of the stack.

```
Ret (:[:]) 'Seq' Sym 'a'  
~> Stack (Ret (:[:])) (Stack (Sym 'a') Done)  
:: Pending (a → [a], (Char, ()))
```



Continuations as a Stack of Parsers

We can represent the parsers yet to be analyzed as a stack.

data *Pending* :: * → * **where**

Done :: *Pending* ()

Stack :: *Parser a* → *Pending b* → *Pending (a, b)*

- ▶ *Done* represents the end of our parser.
- ▶ *Stack* contains the current parser to be processed and the rest of the stack.

```
Ret (:[:]) 'Seq' Sym 'a'
~> Stack (Ret (:[:])) (Stack (Sym 'a') Done)
:: Pending (a → [a], (Char, ()))
```



Parsing as a State Machine

data *State* *a* = $\forall b \circ \text{State } (b \rightarrow a) \text{ (Pending } b)$
type *States* *a* = [*State* *a*]

The use of existential types in *State* is crucial as we will see next.

Our interface function *runParser* simply builds the first state given a parser.

runParser :: *Parser* *a* \rightarrow [*Char*] \rightarrow [*a*]
runParser *p* = *parse* [*State* *fst* (*Stack* *p* *Done*)]



Parsing as a State Machine

We can define the *parse* function *iteratively*:

```
parse :: States a → [Char] → [a]
parse states [] = evalStates states
parse states (x : xs) = (transition states x) 'parse' xs
```

For simplicity, I've consider [a] as the result of *evalStates*

```
evalStates :: States a → [a]
evalStates [] = []
evalStates ((State f Done) : rest) = (f ()) : evalStates rest
evalStates (_ : rest) = error "parse error"
```

The parsing result type is flexible, and in *evalStates* we can do some error reporting although limited.



Parsing as a State Machine

We can define the *parse* function *iteratively*:

```
parse :: States a → [Char] → [a]
parse states [] = evalStates states
parse states (x : xs) = (transition states x) 'parse' xs
```

For simplicity, I've consider [a] as the result of *evalStates*

```
evalStates :: States a → [a]
evalStates [] = []
evalStates ((State f Done) : rest) = (f ()) : evalStates rest
evalStates (_ : rest) = error "parse error"
```

The parsing result type is flexible, and in *evalStates* we can do some error reporting although limited.



Parsing as a State Machine

```
transition :: States a → Char → States a  
transition states char =  
  let unFoldNtStates = concatMap unFoldNtAtHeads states  
  in foldl (reduce char) [] unFoldNtStates
```

In each *transition* we unfold non-terminals, which are parsers and put them on the stack until we have on top of the stack a parser that consumes the current input position.

For simplicity we consider that the input is a String.



Reducing Terminals

```
reduce :: Char → States a → State a → States a
reduce char states (State f (Stack (Sym c) rest))
  | c ≡ char = (State (λrest → f (char, rest)) rest) : states
  | otherwise = states
reduce _ states s@(State f Done) = s : states
reduce _ states _ = states
```

At this point we are consuming the input character and generating a new list of states. We can introduce error reporting as well.



Unfolding Non Terminals

$unFoldNtAtHeads :: State\ a \rightarrow States\ a$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ Done) = [s]$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ (Stack\ (Sym\ c)\ rest)) = [s]$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Ret\ f)\ rest)) =$
 $unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ (\lambda rest \rightarrow r\ (f, rest))\ rest)$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Seq\ p\ q)\ rest)) =$
 $unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ (\lambda (pr, (qr, rest)) \rightarrow r\ ((pr\ qr), rest))$
 $(Stack\ p\ (Stack\ q\ rest)))$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Alt\ p\ q)\ rest)) =$
 $let\ statesp = unFoldNtAtHeads\ \$\ State\ r\ (Stack\ p\ rest)$
 $statesq = unFoldNtAtHeads\ \$\ State\ r\ (Stack\ q\ rest)$
 $in\ statesp\ ++\ statesq$



Unfolding Non Terminals

$unFoldNtAtHeads :: State\ a \rightarrow States\ a$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ Done) = [s]$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ (Stack\ (Sym\ c)\ rest)) = [s]$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Ret\ f)\ rest)) =$
 $unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ (\lambda rest \rightarrow r\ (f, rest))\ rest)$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Seq\ p\ q)\ rest)) =$
 $unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ (\lambda (pr, (qr, rest)) \rightarrow r\ ((pr\ qr), rest))$
 $(Stack\ p\ (Stack\ q\ rest)))$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Alt\ p\ q)\ rest)) =$
 $let\ statesp = unFoldNtAtHeads\ \$\ State\ r\ (Stack\ p\ rest)$
 $statesq = unFoldNtAtHeads\ \$\ State\ r\ (Stack\ q\ rest)$
 $in\ statesp\ ++\ statesq$



Unfolding Non Terminals

$unFoldNtAtHeads :: State\ a \rightarrow States\ a$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ Done) = [s]$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ (Stack\ (Sym\ c)\ rest)) = [s]$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Ret\ f)\ rest)) =$
 $unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ (\lambda rest \rightarrow r\ (f, rest))\ rest)$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Seq\ p\ q)\ rest)) =$
 $unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ (\lambda (pr, (qr, rest)) \rightarrow r\ ((pr\ qr), rest))$
 $(Stack\ p\ (Stack\ q\ rest)))$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Alt\ p\ q)\ rest)) =$
 $let\ statesp = unFoldNtAtHeads\ \$\ State\ r\ (Stack\ p\ rest)$
 $statesq = unFoldNtAtHeads\ \$\ State\ r\ (Stack\ q\ rest)$
 $in\ statesp ++ statesq$



Unfolding Non Terminals

$unFoldNtAtHeads :: State\ a \rightarrow States\ a$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ Done) = [s]$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ (Stack\ (Sym\ c)\ rest)) = [s]$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Ret\ f)\ rest)) =$
 $unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ (\lambda rest \rightarrow r\ (f, rest))\ rest)$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Seq\ p\ q)\ rest)) =$
 $unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ (\lambda(pr, (qr, rest)) \rightarrow r\ ((pr\ qr), rest))$
 $(Stack\ p\ (Stack\ q\ rest)))$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (State\ r\ (Stack\ (Alt\ p\ q)\ rest)) =$
let $statesp = unFoldNtAtHeads\ \$\ State\ r\ (Stack\ p\ rest)$
 $statesq = unFoldNtAtHeads\ \$\ State\ r\ (Stack\ q\ rest)$

in $statesp ++ statesq$



Running example

$pChar :: Char \rightarrow Parser\ String$
 $pChar\ c = Ret\ (:[]) 'Seq' Sym\ c$

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "a"  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "ab"  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a' 'Alt' pChar 'b') "a"  
["a"]  
> runParser (pChar 'a' 'Alt' pChar 'b') "b"  
["b"]
```



Running example

$pChar :: Char \rightarrow Parser\ String$
 $pChar\ c = Ret\ (:[])\ 'Seq'\ Sym\ c$

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "a"  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "ab"  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a' 'Alt' pChar 'b') "a"  
["a"]  
> runParser (pChar 'a' 'Alt' pChar 'b') "b"  
["b"]
```



Running example

$pChar :: Char \rightarrow Parser\ String$
 $pChar\ c = Ret\ (:[]) 'Seq' Sym\ c$

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "a"  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "ab"  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a' 'Alt' pChar 'b') "a"  
["a"]  
> runParser (pChar 'a' 'Alt' pChar 'b') "b"  
["b"]
```



Running example

$pChar :: Char \rightarrow Parser\ String$
 $pChar\ c = Ret\ (:[]) 'Seq' Sym\ c$

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "a"  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "ab"  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a' 'Alt' pChar 'b') "a"  
["a"]  
> runParser (pChar 'a' 'Alt' pChar 'b') "b"  
["b"]
```



Running example

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "b"  
[]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') ""  
*** Exception: parse error
```

```
> runParser (Ret "a") ""  
*** Exception: parse error
```



Running example

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "b"  
[]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') ""  
*** Exception: parse error
```

```
> runParser (Ret "a") ""  
*** Exception: parse error
```



Running example

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') "b"  
[]
```

```
> runParser (pChar 'a') ""  
*** Exception: parse error
```

```
> runParser (Ret "a") ""  
*** Exception: parse error
```



The Ret Problem

Since the Ret combinator does not require any input to succeed we need an extra step on evaluation:

$$\text{evalStates } ((\text{State } f (\text{Stack } (\text{Ret } x) \text{ Done})) : \text{rest}) = \\ (f (x, ())) : \text{evalStates rest}$$

```
> runParser (Ret "a") ""  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (Alt (Ret "b") (Ret "a")) ""  
["b", "a"]
```



The Ret Problem

Since the Ret combinator does not require any input to succeed we need an extra step on evaluation:

$$\text{evalStates } ((\text{State } f (\text{Stack } (\text{Ret } x) \text{ Done})) : \text{rest}) = \\ (f (x, ())) : \text{evalStates rest}$$

```
> runParser (Ret "a") ""  
["a"]
```

```
> runParser (Alt (Ret "b") (Ret "a")) ""  
["b", "a"]
```



Simple extensions

It's easy to extend the library with other simple combinators such as `pSatisfy`.

We need to extend our *Parser* GADT

| $Sat :: (Char \rightarrow Bool) \rightarrow Parser\ Char$

Since *Sat* consumes input we do not unfold anything

| $unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ (Stack\ (Sat\ f)\ rest)) = [s]$

Finally we need to create a new state in the reduce step

| $reduce\ char\ states\ (State\ f\ (Stack\ (Sat\ s)\ rest))$
| $\quad | s\ char = (State\ (\lambda rest \rightarrow f\ (char, rest))\ rest) : states$
| $\quad | otherwise = states$



Simple extensions

It's easy to extend the library with other simple combinators such as `pSatisfy`.

We need to extend our *Parser* GADT

| $Sat :: (Char \rightarrow Bool) \rightarrow Parser\ Char$

Since *Sat* consumes input we do not unfold anything

| $unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ (Stack\ (Sat\ f)\ rest)) = [s]$

Finally we need to create a new state in the reduce step

| $reduce\ char\ states\ (State\ f\ (Stack\ (Sat\ s)\ rest))$
| $\quad | s\ char = (State\ (\lambda rest \rightarrow f\ (char, rest))\ rest) : states$
| $\quad | otherwise = states$



Simple extensions

It's easy to extend the library with other simple combinators such as `pSatisfy`.

We need to extend our *Parser* GADT

| $Sat :: (Char \rightarrow Bool) \rightarrow Parser\ Char$

Since *Sat* consumes input we do not unfold anything

| $unFoldNtAtHeads\ s@(State\ r\ (Stack\ (Sat\ f)\ rest)) = [s]$

Finally we need to create a new state in the reduce step

| $reduce\ char\ states\ (State\ f\ (Stack\ (Sat\ s)\ rest))$
| $s\ char = (State\ (\lambda rest \rightarrow f\ (char, rest))\ rest) : states$
| $otherwise = states$



Simple extensions

$pDigit :: \text{Parser Char}$

$pDigit = \text{Sat } (\lambda x \rightarrow '0' \leq x \wedge x \leq '9')$

$pDigitAsInt :: \text{Parser Int}$

$pDigitAsInt = \text{Ret } (\lambda c \rightarrow \text{fromEnum } c - \text{fromEnum } '0')$
 $\quad 'Seq' pDigit$

```
> runParser pDigitAsInt "1"  
[1]
```

```
> runParser pDigitAsInt "92"  
[9]
```



Simple extensions

$pDigit :: \text{Parser Char}$

$pDigit = \text{Sat } (\lambda x \rightarrow '0' \leq x \wedge x \leq '9')$

$pDigitAsInt :: \text{Parser Int}$

$pDigitAsInt = \text{Ret } (\lambda c \rightarrow \text{fromEnum } c - \text{fromEnum } '0')$
 $\quad \text{'Seq' } pDigit$

```
> runParser pDigitAsInt "1"  
[1]
```

```
> runParser pDigitAsInt "92"  
[9]
```



Functionalizing again

We can represent our initial parsers combinators with our new library

$pReturn :: a \rightarrow Parser\ a$

$pReturn = Ret$

$pSym :: Char \rightarrow Parser\ Char$

$pSym = Sym$

$(< | >) :: Parser\ a \rightarrow Parser\ a \rightarrow Parser\ a$

$p < | > q = p\ 'Alt'\ q$

$(< * >) :: Parser\ (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow Parser\ b \rightarrow Parser\ a$

$p < * > q = p\ 'Seq'\ q$



Functionalizing again

We can represent our initial parsers combinators with our new library

$pReturn :: a \rightarrow Parser\ a$

$pReturn = Ret$

$pSym :: Char \rightarrow Parser\ Char$

$pSym = Sym$

$(< \mid >) :: Parser\ a \rightarrow Parser\ a \rightarrow Parser\ a$

$p < \mid > q = p\ 'Alt'\ q$

$(< * >) :: Parser\ (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow Parser\ b \rightarrow Parser\ a$

$p < * > q = p\ 'Seq'\ q$



Functionalizing again

We can represent our initial parsers combinators with our new library

$pReturn :: a \rightarrow Parser\ a$

$pReturn = Ret$

$pSym :: Char \rightarrow Parser\ Char$

$pSym = Sym$

$(< \mid >) :: Parser\ a \rightarrow Parser\ a \rightarrow Parser\ a$

$p < \mid > q = p\ 'Alt'\ q$

$(< * >) :: Parser\ (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow Parser\ b \rightarrow Parser\ a$

$p < * > q = p\ 'Seq'\ q$



Functionalizing again

```
pManyA :: Parser String
pManyA = pMany (pSym 'a')

pManyAb :: Parser String
pManyAb = (λas b → as ++ [b])
          < $ > pManyA < * > pSym 'b'
```

```
> runParser pManyA ""
[""]
```

```
> runParser pManyA "a"
["", "a"]
```



Functionalizing again

```
pManyA :: Parser String
pManyA = pMany (pSym 'a')

pManyAb :: Parser String
pManyAb = (λas b → as ++ [b])
          < $ > pManyA < * > pSym 'b'
```

```
> runParser pManyA ""
[""]
```

```
> runParser pManyA "a"
["", "a"]
```



Functionalizing again

```
> runParser pManyA "aaaa"  
["a","aaa","aaaa","aa",""]
```

```
> runParser pManyAb "aaaa"  
*** Exception: parse error
```

```
> runParser pManyAb "aaaab"  
["aaaab"]
```



State of art of our library

- ▶ suited for left-factorization
- ▶ easily extensible
- ▶ online parsing
- ▶ easy implementable control error
- ▶ easy to use



Roadmap

Motivation

YAPL - Yet Another Parsing Library

Memoisation

Conclusion



The Equality Problem



Equality on Parsers

Since we have a clear representation of parsers we define equality parsers in a natural way.

instance $Eq\ a \Rightarrow Eq\ (Parser\ a)$ **where**

$$Sym\ c \equiv Sym\ d = c \equiv d$$

$$Ret\ a \equiv Ret\ b = a \equiv b$$

$$Alt\ p\ q \equiv Alt\ r\ s = p \equiv r \wedge q \equiv s$$

$$Seq\ f\ p \equiv Seq\ g\ q = f \equiv g \wedge p \equiv q$$

Unfortunately this won't type check, because in our *Parser* representation we loose the type of the type variable *b* in *Seq*.



Recursive descent parsing

Even if it type checked the following evaluation would not terminate.

```
> pManyA == pManyA
```

pManyA :: Parser String
pManyA = pMany (pSym 'a')

Having recursive parsers difficulties equality.



Stable Pointers

A stable pointer is a reference to a Haskell expression that is guaranteed not to be affected by garbage collection, i.e., it will neither be deallocated nor will the value of the stable pointer itself change during garbage collection (ordinary references may be relocated during garbage collection). Consequently, stable pointers can be passed to foreign code, which can treat it as an opaque reference to a Haskell value.



Equality on Parsers with Stable Pointers

There is a predefined `Eq` instance for `(StablePtr a)` which helps with the equality of stable pointers, but unfortunately stable pointers live in the IO world. Furthermore the comparison of parsers in different states requires us to help the compiler to recognize that two parsers have the same type.

```
data Equal :: * → * → * where  
  Eq :: Equal a a
```

```
eq :: Parser a → Parser b → Maybe (Equal a b)  
eq p q = let pptr = unsafePerformIO $ castParser p  
          qptr = unsafePerformIO $ newStablePtr q  
  in if pptr ≡ qptr  
    then Just $ unsafeCoerce Eq  
    else Nothing
```



Equality on Parsers with Stable Pointers

There is a predefined `Eq` instance for `(StablePtr a)` which helps with the equality of stable pointers, but unfortunately stable pointers live in the IO world. Furthermore the comparison of parsers in different states requires us to help the compiler to recognize that two parsers have the same type.

```
data Equal :: * → * → * where
```

```
  Eq :: Equal a a
```

```
eq :: Parser a → Parser b → Maybe (Equal a b)  
eq p q = let pptr = unsafePerformIO $ castParser p  
          qptr = unsafePerformIO $ newStablePtr q  
  in if pptr ≡ qptr  
    then Just $ unsafeCoerce Eq  
    else Nothing
```



Equality on Parsers with Stable Pointers

```
castParser :: Parser a → IO (StablePtr (Parser b))
castParser p =
  do sptr ← newStablePtr p
  return $ castPtrToStablePtr $ castStablePtrToPtr sptr
```

We can now define the *Eq* instance for *Parser*.

```
instance Eq (Parser a) where
  p ≡ q = case p 'eq' q of
    Nothing → False
    Just Eq → True
```



Left factorization

We want to be able to merge states that have common parsers in their stack.

First we modify our transition function to be able to unfold and merge states

```
transition :: States a → Char → States a
transition states char =
  let unFoldNtStates = unFoldAndMerge states
  in foldl (reduce char) [] unFoldNtStates
```



Left factorization

unFoldAndMerge :: States a → States a

unFoldAndMerge states

| *termination states = states*

| *otherwise = unFoldAndMerge \$ unFoldNtAtHeads states*

termination :: States a → Bool

termination xs = all isFolded xs

isFolded :: State a → Bool

isFolded (State r Done) = True

isFolded (State r (Stack (Sym c) rest)) = True

isFolded _ = False



Left factorization

To be able to merge we need to add new constructors to our *Pending* structure

| $Split :: Pending\ r1 \rightarrow Pending\ r2 \rightarrow Pending\ (Either\ r1\ r2)$

and generalize our semantic function

| $data\ State\ a = \forall b \circ State\ (Func\ b\ a)\ (Pending\ b)$

| $data\ Func\ b\ a\ where$

$Single :: (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow Func\ b\ a$

$Two :: (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow Func\ b\ a$



Left factorization

To be able to merge we need to add new constructors to our *Pending* structure

| $Split :: Pending\ r1 \rightarrow Pending\ r2 \rightarrow Pending\ (Either\ r1\ r2)$

and generalize our semantic function

| **data** $State\ a = \forall b \circ State\ (Func\ b\ a)\ (Pending\ b)$

data $Func\ b\ a$ **where**

$Single :: (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow Func\ b\ a$

$Two :: (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow a) \rightarrow Func\ b\ a$



Left factorization

We need to modify *unFoldNtAtHeads* to implement sharing

unFoldNtAtHeads :: *States a* → *States a*
unFoldNtAtHeads [] = []

unFoldNtAtHeads (s@(State func (Stack (Ret f) rest))) : states =
 let ns = *unFoldRetAtHead* s
 in *unFoldNtAtHeads* \$ ns : states

unFoldRetAtHead :: State a → State a
unFoldRetAtHead (State (Single r) (Stack (Ret f) rest)) =
 State (Single (λrest → r (f, rest))) rest
unFoldRetAtHead (State (Two f1 f2) (Stack (Ret f) rest)) =
 State (Two (λr1 → f1 (f, r1)) (λr2 → f2 (f, r2))) rest



Left factorization

We need to modify *unFoldNtAtHeads* to implement sharing

unFoldNtAtHeads :: *States a* → *States a*
unFoldNtAtHeads [] = []

unFoldNtAtHeads (s@(State func (Stack (Ret f) rest))) : states =
 let ns = *unFoldRetAtHead* s
 in *unFoldNtAtHeads* \$ ns : states

unFoldRetAtHead :: *State a* → *State a*
unFoldRetAtHead (State (Single r) (Stack (Ret f) rest)) =
 State (Single (λrest → r (f, rest))) rest
unFoldRetAtHead (State (Two f1 f2) (Stack (Ret f) rest)) =
 State (Two (λr1 → f1 (f, r1)) (λr2 → f2 (f, r2))) rest



Left factorization

We need to modify *unFoldNtAtHeads* to implement sharing

$unFoldNtAtHeads :: States\ a \rightarrow States\ a$
 $unFoldNtAtHeads\ [] = []$

$unFoldNtAtHeads\ (s@(State\ func\ (Stack\ (Ret\ f)\ rest))) : states =$
let $ns = unFoldRetAtHead\ s$
in $unFoldNtAtHeads\ \$\ ns : states$

$unFoldRetAtHead :: State\ a \rightarrow State\ a$
 $unFoldRetAtHead\ (State\ (Single\ r)\ (Stack\ (Ret\ f)\ rest)) =$
 $State\ (Single\ (\lambda rest \rightarrow r\ (f,\ rest)))\ rest$
 $unFoldRetAtHead\ (State\ (Two\ f1\ f2)\ (Stack\ (Ret\ f)\ rest)) =$
 $State\ (Two\ (\lambda r1 \rightarrow f1\ (f,\ r1))\ (\lambda r2 \rightarrow f2\ (f,\ r2)))\ rest$



Left factorization

We can now share equal choices

```
unFoldNtAtHeads (s@(State func (Stack (Alt p q) rest))) : states) =  
  let optState = unFoldAltAtHead s  
  in optState ++ unFoldNtAtHeads states  
  
unFoldAlt :: Parser a → [Parser a]  
unFoldAlt (Alt p q) = unFoldAlt p ++ unFoldAlt q  
unFoldAlt p          = [p]  
  
unFoldAltAtHead :: State a → States a  
unFoldAltAtHead (State r (Stack altParser rest)) =  
  let lstAltParsers      = unFoldAlt altParser  
      uniqueAltParsers = nub lstAltParsers  
  in map ( $\lambda p \rightarrow \text{State } r \text{ (Stack } p \text{ rest)}$ ) uniqueAltParsers
```



Left factorization

The interesting case and real value of sharing occurs when we sequence

```
unFoldNtAtHeads (s@(State func (Stack (Seq p q) rest)) : states) :  
  let (optState, nst) = unFoldSeqAtHead s states  
      optStates = unFoldNtAtHeads nst  
  in optState : optStates
```



Left factorization

The interesting case and real value of sharing occurs when we sequence

```
unFoldSeqAtHead :: State a → States a → (State a, States a)
unFoldSeqAtHead v@(State (Single r) (Stack (Seq p q) r1))
  (k@(State (Single s) (Stack (Seq t u) r2)) : states) =
  case p 'eq' t of
    Just Eq → let opts = State
      (Two (λ(pr, Left (qr, r1)) → r (pr qr, r1))
        (λ(pr, Right (qu, r2)) → s (pr qu, r2))
        (Stack p (Split (Stack q r1) (Stack u r2))))
      in (opts, states)
    Nothing → let (nst, nsts) = unFoldSeqAtHead v states
      in (nst, k : nsts)
```



Left factorization

Once we encounter *Split* we split the current state

```
unFoldNtAtHeads (s@(State (Two fl fr) (Split pl pr)) : states) =  
  let sleft  = State (Single (λr1 → fl (Left  r1))) pl  
      sright = State (Single (λr2 → fr (Right r2))) pr  
  in sleft : sright : states
```



Left factorization

$$\begin{array}{l} f = (\lambda x z \rightarrow x : z : []) < \$ > Sym \text{ 'x' } \\ s = f < * > Sym \text{ 'y' } \\ < | > \\ f < * > Sym \text{ 'z' } \end{array}$$

[Stack s Done]
 \rightsquigarrow [Stack (f < * > Sym 'y') Done, Stack (f < * > Sym 'z') Done]
 \rightsquigarrow [Stack f (Split (Stack (Sym 'y') Done) (Stack (Sym 'z') Done)))]
 \rightsquigarrow [Split (Stack (Sym 'y') Done) (Stack (Sym 'z') Done))]
 \rightsquigarrow [Stack (Sym 'y') Done, Stack (Sym 'z') Done]
 \rightsquigarrow [Done]



Going further - LazyShare

```
unFoldSeqAtHead :: State a → States a → (State a, States a)
unFoldSeqAtHead v@(State (Single r) (Stack (Seq p q) r1))
  (k@(State (Single s) (Stack (Seq t u) r2)) : states) =
  case p `eq` t of
    Just Eq → let opts = State
      (Two (λ(pr, Left (qr, r1)) → r (pr qr, r1))
        (λ(pr, Right (qu, r2)) → s (pr qu, r2))
        (Stack p (Split (Stack q r1) (Stack u r2))))
      in (opts, states)
    Nothing → let (nst, nsts) = unFoldSeqAtHead v states
      in (nst, k : nsts)
```

Here we can also check for the equality of q and u and create a state where we represent future sharing between that state and another.



Going further - LazyShare

Extend *Pending* again

| $\text{LazyShare} :: \text{Parser } p \rightarrow \text{Pending } r \rightarrow \text{Pending } (\text{Share } p \ r)$

We need to semantically distinguish between *Stack* and *LazyShare*

| **data** $\text{Share } p \ r$ **where**
 $\text{Share} :: p \rightarrow r \rightarrow \text{Share } p \ r$



Going further - LazyShare

$$\begin{aligned} xOrz &= Sat ((\equiv 'x') \vee (\equiv 'z')) \\ s &= f < \$ > xOrz < * > q < * > r \\ &< | > \\ &g < \$ > Sym 'x' < * > q < * > s \end{aligned}$$



Going further - LazyShare

```
[Stack s Done]
> [Stack (f <$> xOrz <*> q <*> r) Done,
    Stack (g <$> Sym 'x' <*> q <*> s) Done]
> [Stack (f <$> xOrz <*> q) (Stack r Done),
    Stack (g <$> Sym 'x' <*> q) (Stack s Done)]
> [Stack (f <$> xOrz) (Sharing q (Stack r Done)),
    Stack (g <$> Sym 'x') (Sharing q (Stack s Done))]
> [Stack f (Stack xOrz (Sharing q (Stack r Done))),
    Stack g (Stack (Sym 'x') (Sharing q (Stack s Done)))]
> [Stack xOrz (Sharing q (Stack r Done)),
    Stack (Sym 'x') (Sharing q (Stack s Done))]
> [Sharing q (Stack r Done), Sharing q (Stack s Done)]
> [Stack q (Split (Stack r Done) (Stack s Done))]
> [Split (Stack r Done) (Stack s Done)]
> [Stack r Done, Stack s Done]
> [Done]
```



Generalization

So far we have achieved sharing between two branches of choice, however generalizing it to N branches should be easily done as long as we can map a function in *Func* to a *Pending*.

| $Split :: Pending\ r1 \rightarrow Pending\ r2 \rightarrow Pending\ (Pair\ r1\ r2)$

| **data** *Pair* $r1\ r2$ **where**

$Pair :: r1 \rightarrow r2 \rightarrow Pair\ r1\ r2$

Our new State representation could be

| **data** *State* $a = \forall b \circ State\ [(b \rightarrow a)]\ (Pending\ b)$



Roadmap

Motivation

YAPL - Yet Another Parsing Library

Memoisation

Conclusion



Conclusion

Advantages

- ▶ Sharing
- ▶ Natural languages grammars
- ▶ Full parsing control (online parsing, error reporting)
- ▶ Easy to use
- ▶ *Almost* well typed

Disadvantages

- ▶ Inefficiency
- ▶ Parser equality
- ▶ Some combinators might be difficult to implement efficiently



Conclusion

Advantages

- ▶ Sharing
- ▶ Natural languages grammars
- ▶ Full parsing control (online parsing, error reporting)
- ▶ Easy to use
- ▶ *Almost* well typed

Disadvantages

- ▶ Inefficiency
- ▶ Parser equality
- ▶ Some combinators might be difficult to implement efficiently



Future work

- ▶ Generalization for N branches
- ▶ Results
- ▶ Try other approaches to parser equality
- ▶ Left recursive grammars
- ▶ Monadic parsers

