UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

Implementing incremental and parallel parsing

A subtitle that can be rather long

Master of Science Thesis in Computer Science

Tobias Olausson

University of Gothenburg
Chalmers University of Technology
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Göteborg, Sweden, April 2014

Implementing incremental and parallel parsing
A subtitle here that can be quite long

Tobias Olausson

Examiner: Patrik Jansson

University of Gothenburg
Chalmers University of Technology
Department of Computer Science and Engineering
SE-412 96 Göteborg
Sweden
Telephone + 46 (0)31-772 1000

Cover: an image that is used as a cover image

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Göteborg, Sweden, April 2014

Abstract

This is an abstract

Contents

1 Background **3**
- 1.1 Introduction . . . 3
  - 1.1.1 Divide-and-conquer . . . 3
  - 1.1.2 Incrementality . . . 3
  - 1.1.3 Parallelism . . . 3
  - 1.1.4 Parsing . . . 3
  - 1.1.5 Motivation . . . 4
- 1.2 Lexing . . . 4
- 1.3 Context-free grammars . . . 4
  - 1.3.1 Chomsky Normal Form . . . 4
- 1.4 Parsing . . . 4
  - 1.4.1 CYK algorithm . . . 4
  - 1.4.2 Valiant . . . 4
  - 1.4.3 Improvement by Bernardy & Claessen . . . 4
- 1.5 Dependently typed programming . . . 5
  - 1.5.1 Kinds, Types and Values . . . 5

2 Implementation **6**
- 2.1 Finger trees . . . 6
- 2.2 Measuring and Monoids . . . 6
  - 2.2.1 Pipeline of measures . . . 6
- 2.3 Lexing . . . 6
  - 2.3.1 LexGen – Alex discrepancy . . . 6
  - 2.3.2 Position information . . . 6
- 2.4 Parsing . . . 6
  - 2.4.1 BNFC . . . 6
  - 2.4.2 Dependently typed programming with charts . . . 6
  - 2.4.3 Oracle and unsafePerformIO . . . 6

3 Results **7**
3.1 Final product 7
3.1.1 Testing 7
3.2 Measurements 7

4 Discussion **8**
4.1 Pitfalls 8
4.1.1 Too many result branches 8
4.1.2 Position information 8
4.2 Future work 8

Chapter 1

Background

1.1 Introduction

The topic of this thesis is to do **parsing** in an **incremental** fashion that can easily be **parallelizable**, using a **divide-and-conquer approach**. In this section, I will give a brief explanation of the topics covered, and end with a motivation for why this is interesting to do in the first place.

1.1.1 Divide-and-conquer

Add stuff here from section 2 in parparse paper.

1.1.2 Incrementality

Doing something incrementally means that one does it step by step, and not longer than neccessary.

1.1.3 Parallelism

Why is parallelism interesting and how does it apply in this case?

1.1.4 Parsing

To parse is a to check if some given input corresponds to a certain language's grammar, and in this thesis it will use **context-free grammars** for programming languages.

H	A	→	BC	A variable, B and C productions
	A	→	a	A variable, a nonterminal

1.1.5 Motivation

In compilers, lexing and parsing are the two first phases. The output of these is an abstract syntax tree (AST) which is fed to the next phase of the compiler. But an AST could also provide useful feedback for programmers, already in their editor, if the code could be lexed and parsed fast enough. With a lexer and parser that is incremental and that can also be parallelized could real-time feedback in the form of an AST easily be provided to the programmer. Most current text editors give syntax feedback based on regular expressions, which does not yield any information about depth or the surrounding AST.

Something something about connecting to a type-checker.

1.2 Lexing

* Describe what lexing is * Shortly describe LexGen and its relevance.

1.3 Context-free grammars

What are context-free grammars? Perhaps something about LBNF and BNFC?

1.3.1 Chomsky Normal Form

Chomsky Normal Form (CNF) is a subset of context-free grammars that was first described by linguist Noam Chomsky. Productions in CNF are restricted to the following forms:

1.4 Parsing

1.4.1 CYK algorithm

1.4.2 Valiant

1.4.3 Improvement by Bernardy & Claessen

Running time analysis. Oracle for list.

1.5 Dependently typed programming

What is dependently typed programming, and how can it be used in Haskell. How about an example using vectors (standard example, sort of).

1.5.1 Kinds, Types and Values

Describe how kinds relate to types as types relate to values.

Chapter 2

Implementation

2.1 Finger trees

What are they?

2.2 Measuring and Monoids

2.2.1 Pipeline of measures

An illustration would be good here

2.3 Lexing

2.3.1 LexGen – Alex discrepancy

2.3.2 Position information

2.4 Parsing

2.4.1 BNFC

2.4.2 Dependently typed programming with charts

2.4.3 Oracle and unsafePerformIO

Chapter 3

Results

3.1 Final product

3.1.1 Testing

3.2 Measurements

How fast is it? What is the complexity?

Chapter 4

Discussion

4.1 Pitfalls

Look through the LOG to remember whatever happened. Describe sort of chronologically?

4.1.1 Too many result branches

Describe the reason for this, with the merge stuff.

4.1.2 Position information

* Tuple of monoids? * RingP instance? * Newtype for tuples?

4.2 Future work

Bibliography