An Introduction To Parse::RecDescent

Abram Hindle

Victoria Perl Mongers

abez@abez.ca

August 17, 2004

This Presentation

- What should you expect from this presentation?
 - Tutorial on writing a grammar for Parse::RecDescent
 - Recommended Action plans for a interpretter
 - Tips regarding grammars and what to avoid
 - Some introduction into into Parse::RecDescent special features.
 - How do deal with newlines.

This Presentation

- What should you NOT expect from this presentation?
 - A Course of Compilers and Interpretters
 - In depth discussion of grammars why some things don't work
 - Theory of Grammars and parsing. Just remember that it's quite complex.

- What is Parse::RecDescent?
 - Generate Recursive-Descent Parsers [Con97]
 - Can Produces a parse tree
 - Parses a grammar recursively.
 - * It can handle things like (x + y * (x + y * (x + y * (x + y * (x)))))
 - Can parse input text into a Concrete Syntax Tree and modify into a Abstract Syntax Tree (manually)
 - Similar to Yacc, Bison, Lex, SableCC

Terminology

- Language a formal definition of the structure of text we want to parse
- Grammar The definition of a language (not all languages have appropriate grammars compatible with Parse::RecDescent)
- Recursive multiple levels multiple calls
- Parser a program which reads in text in a language and produces some output (usually more program friendly)
- ullet Semantic Analysis Makes sure what was written in the language makes sense allows us to have easier grammars e.g. should (x+y).length() be allowed?
- Expression a statement in a language which has a value
- Statement a command in a language doesn't necessarily return a value.

Languages

- Why parse languages?
 - Read formatted data.
 - Read human formatted data or provide a human interface to a complex problem.
 - Create a source code analyzers
 - Create a interpretter
 - Create a compiler

- Grammars are built from rules
 - A rule is given a name and then a '—' delimited list of possible matches to the rule. Regular expressions are allowed.
 - It is recommended you seperate elements into easily parsable blocks

- Grammars are built from rules
 - Rules can be Right recursive

- Grammars are built from rules
 - Rules can but not necessary left recursive (it is possible just you have to be very careful).
 - # won't work

```
identifier : /[a-z] w+/
```

binops : '+'|'-'|'*'

number : $/(\d+|\d*\.\d+)/$

expression : expression binops identifier

expression binops number

identifier

number

• Lets take a look at a simple grammar

```
- typeID : /[A-Z]\w+/
attribID : /[a-z]\w+/
quotedstring : /"(([^"]*)(\\")?)*"/

startrule : definition
definition : typeID '{' statement(s) '}'
statement : attribID quotedstring <skip:'[_\t]*'>
    newline
newline : "\n"
```

• What can Grammar1 parse? Eg..

```
- statement
  name "White_Mana"
- startrule
  Energy {
        name "White_Mana"
        id "white"
  }
```

• Lets refine our grammar a bit..

```
/[A-Z]\w*/
- typeID
                        /[a-z]\w*/
 attribID
 quotedstring : /"(([^"]*)(\\")?)*"/
  identifier :
                        /[a-zA-Z] \w*/
 startrule
                        definition
 definition
                 :
                        typeID '{' statement(s) '}'
                        attribID quotedstring <skip:'[..\t]*'>
  statement
      newline
                          attribID codeblock
 newline
                        "\n"
 codeblock
                        '{' expression(s) '}'
 expression
                        methodcall
                        property
                        identifier
                        functioncall
 methodcall
                        identifier '.' identifier '(' expression(s
```

- What can Grammar2 parse?
 - The previous Grammar 1 examples as well as

```
(x.getChildren()).has(flying)
}
```

- What where some added features?
 - expression(s) this means 1 or more expressions
 - expression(s? /,/) 0 or more expressions delimited by commas
 - the skip directive changed the characters that we were skip over whitespace is always skipped unless you are explicit with skip. We took out
 newlines so we could use it as a delimiter.

• Lets refine our grammar a bit more. Lets add binary operators.

```
- number
                     /(d+|d*\.d+)/
         :
       : /[A-Z]\w*/
 typeID
 attribID : /[a-z]\w^*/
 quotedstring : /"(([^"]*)(\\")?)*"/
 identifier : /[a-zA-Z]\w^*/
                    {[@item]}
           : '->' | '==' | '>=' | /<=>?/ | '>' | '<' | '
 lbinops
     ! = '
            : '+' | '-' | '/' | '*'
 nbinops
                     definition
 startrule :
 definition
                     typeID '{' statement(s) '}'
              :
                     {[@item] }
                     attribID quotedstring <skip:'[..\t]*'>
 statement
     newline
                     {[@item] }
                     attribID codeblock
```

```
{[@item] }
newline
                         "\n"
                :
codeblock
                        '{' expline(s?) '}'
                        {[@item] }
expline
                        expression
expression
                        or expr
sexpression
                        functioncall
                        loop
                        conditional
                        property
                        number
                         identifier
                        and_expr '||' or_expr {[@item] }
or_expr
                        and_expr
                        lbinop_expr '&&' and_expr {[@item] }
and_expr
                        lbinop_expr
                        nbinop_expr lbinops lbinop_expr {[@item] }
lbinop_expr
                        nbinop_expr
nbinop_expr
                        not_expr nbinops nbinop_expr {[@item] }
                        not_expr
```

```
'!' expression {[@item] }
not expr
                       methodcall
                       brack_expr
                       sexpression
                       '(' expression ')' { [@item[0,2]] }
brack_expr
                       foreach
loop
                       while
conditional :
                       ifstatement
elseifstatement :
                      'else' 'if' '(' expression ')' codeblock
                       {[@item]}
                       'else' codeblock
elsestatement :
                       {[@item]}
             : 'if' '(' expression ')' codeblock
ifstatement
    elseifstatement(s?) elsestatement(?)
                       {[@item]}
methodcall :
                       identifier '.' identifier '(' expression(s
    ? /,/) ')'
                       {[@item] }
```

```
brack_expr '.' identifier '(' expression(s
                     ? /,/) ')'
                        {[@item] }
                        identifier '.' identifier
property
                        {[@item] }
                        methodcall
callable
                :
                        property
functioncall
                        identifier '(' expression(s? /,/) ')'
                        {[@item] }
                        'foreach' '(' expression ')' '{' expression
foreach
     (0..) '}'
                        {[@item] }
                        'foreach' '(' expression ')' 'st' '('
                     expression ')' '{' expression(0..) '}'
                        {[@item] }
                        'foreach' identifier '(' expression ')' '{'
                      expression(0..) '}'
                        {[@item] }
                        'foreach' identifier '(' expression ')' 'st
                     ' '(' expression ')' '{' expression(0..) '}'
```

- What where some added features?
 - We told the parser what to keep and what not to keep.

 $\{[@item]\}\$ #this copies all the parse elements into an array ref.

- We added precedence. See the or_expr coming before add_expr.
- Notice the large chain.. That was created to deal with precedence and composing expressions of expressions.

• This is what we expect our new grammar to parse.

```
- definition
 Attribute {
               "flying"
          name
          blockable { x.has(flying) }
- Attribute {
                "trample"
          name
          event(attack.end) {
                  a = self.getAttacks
                  foreach (a) {
                          a.targetPlayer.mDamage(max(0,self.attack -
                               a.blockedTotal))
```

```
- definition
  Attribute {
          name
                "flying"
          blockable {
                  x.has()
                  x.has(flying)
                  y.has(flying)
                  functioncall1(flying)
                  functioncall2()
- statement
  blockable {
          x.has()
- statement
  blockable {
          x.has()
```

```
x.has(flying)
          y.has(flying)
          functioncall1(flying)
          functioncall2()
- codeblock
                  x.has()
                  x.has(flying)
                  y.has(flying)
                  functioncall1(flying)
                  functioncall2()
- codeblock
          what + what
          what - what
          what - what + func(what)
```

Grammar Optimization

- But it's so slow!
 - Simplify your grammar. Make the parser do less and less checking and be smarter how you parse your tree.
 - My method calls are extremely slow those could be greatly improved in speed by abstracting the method call operator '.' into a binary op.
 - REMEMBER your semantic check can be used to filter out the bad cases.
 The only problem is that by the semantic check usually you've lost the line numbers.

- How do we use it?
 - Here's an example

```
#!/usr/bin/perl
use Parse::RecDescent;
use Data::Dumper;
$::RD TRACE = 1 if $ARGV[3];
$::RD AUTOACTION = q { print "[", join("][",@item),"]",$/; [@item
     ] } if $ARGV[2];
open(FILE, $ARGV[0]) or die "$ARGV[0] not found";
my @grammar = <FILE>;
close(FILE);
open(FILE, $ARGV[1]) or die "$ARGV[0], not, found";
my @input = <FILE>;
close(FILE);
my $startrule = shift @input;
chomp($startrule);
my $parser = new Parse::RecDescent("@grammar");
```

```
print Dumper( $parser->$startrule("@input") );
```

- How do we use it?
 - Parse your grammar as a scalar...
 - Input your text into it as a starting rule. In this case startrule is a rule in the grammar.

```
- use Parse::RecDescent;
my $parser = Parse::RecDescent->new($grammar);
my $out = $parser->startrule($input);
```

- How do we debug it?
 - Turn on

```
::RD_TRACE = 1;
```

- How do we get data out?
 - We want to prune the tree or get the tree?
 - A simple way to generate a tree is AUTOACTION

```
$::RD_AUTOACTION = q { print "[", join("][", @item),"]",$/; [@item] }
```

- I have my tree.. what do I do now?
 - Semantic Analysis
 - Pruning (remove unnecessary nodes)
 - Store it
 - Bind to objects (recursively descend and generate an executable tree)
 - Binds to objects who output code (compiler)
 - Remember you'll probably need a symbol table.

- Why Semantic Analysis?
 - Typechecking and symbol checking
 - * x = y + z what if z is an object and x an integer?
 - Imagine a methodcall hack
 - *x.retInt().length() if retInt returns an int primitive maybe length can't be called on it.
 - Maybe you want to limit syntax?

- Tree ← Object
 - Recursive Function
 - Use composite pattern where you ask for values from child objects.
 - Assign objects in a tree using a composite pattern.
 - * have a composite base class for these objects
 - * have a recursive composite method to execute the children

- Misc Problems
 - Left associativity
 - Precedence
 - ambigous grammar
 - Left Recursion

Help!

- How to get help?
 - perIdoc Parse::RecDescent
 - PerlMonks
 - Resources about writing compilers using Yacc, Bison, SableCC etc.
 - SableCC is quite similar to the Parse::RecDescent

Summary

- Make your grammar but be careful
- Either bind your grammar to objects or parse your AST.
- After parsing the tree you should attach it to objects and execute that or compile
- Interpretters are easy, compilers are much harder.

References

[Con97] Damian Conway. Parse::recdescent - generate recursive-descent parsers. 1997.