

## Fixing Grammars

In practice, the two key obstacles which will prevent you from generating top-down parsers are ambiguity and left-recursion. Let's talk about working around these. (see pp. 82–86 of text)

**Ambiguity part 1: expressions.** We saw how to get rid of ambiguity for expressions by stratifying that grammar into expressions, terms and factors. That is a fairly common fix. There are other fixes (e.g. `bison` supports explicit precedence declarations, or you can provide custom code to do precedence in your ANTLR grammar), but they are beyond the scope of this class.

**Ambiguity part 2: dangling else.** The other common source of ambiguity is the “dangling else” problem. What are the two possible parse trees for this input?

`if (e1) then if (e2) then S1 else S2`

I have to tell you about the standard grammar-rewriting fix. But no one actually uses it.

```
stmt := balanced_stmt | unbalanced_stmt
balanced_stmt := if cond then balanced_stmt else balanced_stmt
                | other_stmt
unbalanced_stmt := if cond then stmt
                  | if cond then balanced_stmt else unbalanced_stmt
```

You still can't parse this grammar top-down with finite lookahead because of the common prefix between the productions (but ANTLR can!). And it makes the grammar harder to understand and maintain.

**Real Fixes.** Perhaps the best fix is to avoid including such ambiguity in your grammar; for instance, you can require an explicit `end` after every `if`.

If you don't get that choice, then you can feed the ambiguous grammar to your favourite parser generator. It'll give a warning, but then it'll do the right thing (match the closest `if`). `bison` will give a shift-reduce warning, while ANTLR says the grammar is ambiguous.

You can allegedly suppress the warning in ANTLR by giving an option:

```
stmt : 'if' expr 'then' stmt
      (options {greedy=true;} : 'else' stmt)?
      | ... ;
```

or you can tell it how to resolve the conflict with its look ahead in this case:

```
stmt : 'if' expr 'then' stmt
      (('else') => 'else' stmt)?
      | ... ;
```

but I won't really explain these.

**Left-recursion.** The second big problem is left-recursion, which is never good for top-down parsers. For instance,

$$\begin{aligned} id\_list &:= id\_list\_prefix \\ id\_list\_prefix &:= id\_list\_prefix \text{ ', ' } id \mid id \end{aligned}$$

is left-recursive because the *id\_list\_prefix* may itself lead to an *id\_list\_prefix*. A recursive-descent implementation would loop infinitely.

Indirect left-recursion is also possible, e.g.  $A := B; B := A$ .

We can remove left-recursion by rewriting the productions. Unlike for ambiguous grammars, we often rewrite to eliminate left-recursion in practice. This equivalent grammar is not left-recursive:

$$\begin{aligned} id\_list &:= id \ id\_list\_suffix \\ id\_list\_suffix &:= \text{ ', ' } id \ id\_list\_suffix \mid \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

**Common prefixes.** A non-problem with ANTLR is common prefixes. We've manually implemented parsers with one token of lookahead—LL(1). However, the following grammar requires LL(2). That is, two tokens of lookahead suffice to top-down parse the following grammar.

$$\begin{aligned} stmt &:= id \text{ '=' } expr \\ &\mid id \text{ '(' } argument\_list \text{ ')' } \end{aligned}$$

However, no fixed amount of lookahead suffices for this (artificial) grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} stmt &:= id * \text{ '=' } expr \\ &\mid id * \text{ '(' } argument\_list \text{ ')' } \end{aligned}$$

ANTLR allows infinite look-ahead (LL(\*)) using a DFA.