

• [HOME](#) • [UP](#) •

[Top/Top-down parsing/Conflicts](#)

## 8.5. Parsing Conflicts

Let's build the top-down parsing table for a slightly different grammar.

$$1. L \rightarrow \epsilon$$

$$2. L \rightarrow N$$

$$3. N \rightarrow E$$

$$4. N \rightarrow E, N$$

$$5. E \rightarrow n$$

$$L \rightarrow \epsilon, n$$

$$N \rightarrow n$$

$$E \rightarrow n$$

The FIRST and FOLLOW sets for that grammar are:

$X$	$L$	$N$	$E$
<b>FIRST(<math>X</math>)</b>	$\{n, \epsilon\}$	$\{n\}$	$\{n\}$
<b>FOLLOW(<math>X</math>)</b>	$\{\$ \}$	$\{\$ \}$	$\{., \$ \}$

The parsing table is as follows.

Table D			
	$n$	,	$\$$
$L$	2		1
$N$	3,4		
$E$	6		

Same LHS +  
Same RHS FIRST.

The algorithm adds two productions to one of the cells in the table. When that happens, it is called a *parsing conflict*.

The problem is that the parser cannot know whether to use production  $N \rightarrow E$  or  $N \rightarrow E, N$ , based on a single-token lookahead. That decision depends on whether the  $E$  is followed by a comma, and that would require a longer lookahead.

• [HOME](#) • [UP](#) •

[Top/Top-down parsing/Conflicts](#)

