CSE 401/M501 – Compilers

Parsing & Context-Free Grammars

Hal Perkins

Spring 2018

Administrivia

- Reminders:
  - Project partner signup. Please fill out the form with your and your partner's names and cse netids
    - Only one form per group, please; +1 point each if it's right
    - Please finish by tomorrow, 11 pm
    - Who's still looking for a partner? 401? M501?
  - hw1 due Thur. night (regexps, etc.)
  - Use cse401-staff@cs… if you need to send email – helps us keep organized. Thanks.

Agenda for Today

- Parsing overview

- Context free grammars

- Ambiguous grammars

- Reading: Cooper & Torczon 3.1-3.2
  - Dragon book is also particularly strong on grammars and languages

Syntactic Analysis / Parsing

- Goal: Convert token stream to an abstract syntax tree

- Abstract syntax tree (AST):
  - Captures the structural features of the program
  - Primary data structure for next phases of compilation

- Plan
  - Study how context-free grammars specify syntax
  - Study algorithms for parsing and building ASTs

Context-free Grammars

- The syntax of most programming languages can be specified by a context-free grammar (CGF)
- Compromise between
  - REs: can't nest or specify recursive structure
  - General grammars: too powerful, undecidable
- Context-free grammars are a sweet spot
  - Powerful enough to describe nesting, recursion
  - Easy to parse; but also allow restrictions for speed
- Not perfect
  - Cannot capture semantics, like "must declare every variable" or "must be `int`" – requires later semantic pass
 - Can be ambiguous

Derivations and Parse Trees

- Derivation: a sequence of expansion steps, beginning with a start symbol and leading to a sequence of terminals

- Parsing: inverse of derivation
  - Given a sequence of terminals (aka tokens) want to recover (discover) the nonterminals and structure, i.e., the parse (concrete syntax) tree

Old Example

$$G \begin{cases} program ::= statement \mid program\ statement \\ statement ::= assignStmt \mid ifStmt \\ assignStmt ::= id = expr\ ; \\ ifStmt ::= \text{if } (\ expr\ )\ statement \\ expr ::= id \mid int \mid expr + expr \\ id ::= a \mid b \mid c \mid i \mid j \mid k \mid n \mid x \mid y \mid z \\ int ::= 0 \mid 1 \mid 2 \mid 3 \mid 4 \mid 5 \mid 6 \mid 7 \mid 8 \mid 9 \end{cases}$$

w → a = 1 ; if (a + 1) b = 2 ;

Parsing

- Parsing: Given a grammar *G* and a sentence *w* in *L(G)*, traverse the derivation (parse tree) for *w* in some *standard order* and do *something useful* at each node
  - The tree might not be produced explicitly, but the control flow of the parser will correspond to a traversal

"Standard Order"

- For practical reasons we want the parser to be *deterministic* (no backtracking), and we want to examine the source program from *left to right*.
  - (i.e., parse the program in linear time in the order it appears in the source file)

Common Orderings

- Top-down
  - Start with the root
  - Traverse the parse tree depth-first, left-to-right (leftmost derivation)
  - LL(k), recursive-descent
- Bottom-up
  - Start at leaves and build up to the root
    - Effectively a rightmost derivation in reverse(!)
  - LR(k) and subsets (LALR(k), SLR(k), etc.)

"Something Useful"

- At each point (node) in the traversal, perform some semantic action
  - Construct nodes of full parse tree (rare)
  - Construct abstract syntax tree (AST) (common)
  - Construct linear, lower-level representation (often produced by traversing initial AST in later phases of production compilers)
  - Generate target code on the fly (used in 1-pass compiler; not common in production compilers)
    - Can't generate great code in one pass, but useful if you need a quick 'n dirty working compiler

Context-Free Grammars

- Formally, a *grammar* G is a tuple <N,Σ,P,S> where
  - *N* is a finite set of *non-terminal* symbols
  - Σ is a finite set of *terminal* symbols (alphabet)
  - *P* is a finite set of *productions*
    - A subset of $N \times (N \cup \Sigma)^*$
  - *S* is the *start symbol*, a distinguished element of *N*
    - If not specified otherwise, this is usually assumed to be the non-terminal on the left of the first production

Standard Notations

a, b, c   elements of Σ

w, x, y, z   elements of Σ^*

A, B, C   elements of N

X, Y, Z   elements of $N \cup \Sigma$

α, β, γ elements of $(N \cup \Sigma)^*$

A $\rightarrow \alpha$ or A ::= α if <A, α> in P

Derivation Relations (1)

- $\alpha A \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \beta \gamma$ iff $A ::= \beta$ in P
  - derives

- $A \Rightarrow^* \alpha$ if there is a chain of productions starting with A that generates α
  - transitive closure

Derivation Relations (2)

- $w \, A \, \gamma \Rightarrow_{lm} w \, \beta \, \gamma$ iff $A ::= \beta$ in P
  - derives leftmost

- $\alpha \, A \, w \Rightarrow_{rm} \alpha \, \beta \, w$ iff $A ::= \beta$ in P
  - derives rightmost

- We will only be interested in leftmost and rightmost derivations – not random orderings

Languages

- For A in *N*, define *L*(A) = { w | A =>* w }

- If *S* is the start symbol of grammar *G,* define *L*(*G*) = *L*(*S*)

  - Nonterminal on left of first rule is taken to be the start symbol if one is not specified explicitly

Reduced Grammars

- Grammar *G* is *reduced* iff for every production $A ::= \alpha$ in *G* there is a derivation

    S =>* x A z => x α z =>* xyz

    – i.e., no production is useless

- Convention: we will use only reduced grammars

    – There are algorithms for pruning useless productions from grammars – see a formal language or compiler book for details

Ambiguity

- Grammar G is *unambiguous* iff every w in L(G) has a unique leftmost (or rightmost) derivation
  - Fact: unique leftmost or unique rightmost implies the other
- A grammar without this property is *ambiguous*
  - Note that other grammars that generate the same language may be unambiguous
- We need unambiguous grammars for parsing

Example: Ambiguous Grammar for Arithmetic Expressions

expr ::= *expr* + *expr* | *expr* - *expr*
    | *expr* * *expr* | *expr* / *expr* | *int*

int ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

- Exercise: show that this is ambiguous

  - How? Show two different leftmost or rightmost derivations for the same string

  - Equivalently: show two different parse trees for the same string

Example (cont)

expr ::= *expr + expr* | *expr - expr*
    | *expr * expr* | *expr / expr* | *int*
int ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

- Give a leftmost derivation of 2+3*4 and show the parse tree

Example (cont)

expr ::= *expr + expr | expr - expr*
| *expr * expr | expr / expr | int*
int ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

- Give a different leftmost derivation of 2+3*4 and show the parse tree

Another example

- Give two different derivations of 5+6+7

What's going on here?

- The grammar has no notion of precedence or associatively

- Traditional solution
  - Create a non-terminal for each level of precedence
  - Isolate the corresponding part of the grammar
  - Force the parser to recognize higher precedence subexpressions first
  - Use left- or right-recursion for left- or right-associative operators (non-associative operators are not recursive)

Classic Expression Grammar
(first used in ALGOL 60)

expr ::= *expr* + *term* | *expr* – *term* | *term*

term ::= *term* * *factor* | *term* / *factor* | *factor*

factor ::= *int* | (*expr*)

int ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

Check:
Derive 2 + 3 * 4

expr ::= *expr + term | expr – term | term*

term ::= *term * factor | term / factor | factor*

factor ::= *int | (expr)*

int ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

Check:
Derive 5 + 6 + 7

expr ::= *expr + term* | *expr – term* | *term*
term ::= *term * factor* | *term / factor* | *factor*
factor ::= *int* | (*expr*)
int ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

- Note interaction between left- vs right-recursive rules and resulting associativity

Check:
Derive 5 + (6 + 7)

expr ::= *expr* + *term* | *expr* – *term* | *term*

term ::= *term* * *factor* | *term* / *factor* | *factor*

factor ::= *int* | (*expr*)

int ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

Another Classic Example

- Grammar for conditional statements

stmt ::= if (*cond*) *stmt*

       | if (*cond*) *stmt* else *stmt*

- Exercise: show that this is ambiguous
  - How?

One Derivation

$$stmt ::= \text{if (} cond \text{) } stmt$$
$$| \text{ if (} cond \text{) } stmt \text{ else } stmt$$

if (*cond*)   if (*cond*)   *stmt*   else   *stmt*

Another Derivation

$$stmt ::= \text{if } (\; cond \;) \; stmt$$
$$| \text{ if } (\; cond \;) \; stmt \; \text{else } stmt$$

if (*cond*) if (*cond*) *stmt*   else   *stmt*

Solving "if" Ambiguity

- Fix the grammar to separate if statements with else clause and if statements with no else
  - Done in Java reference grammar
  - Adds lots of non-terminals
- or, Change the language
  - But it'd better be ok to do this
- or, Use some ad-hoc rule in the parser
  - "else matches closest unpaired if"

Resolving Ambiguity with Grammar (1)

Stmt ::= MatchedStmt | UnmatchedStmt

MatchedStmt   ::= ... |

     if (Expr) MatchedStmt **else** MatchedStmt

UnmatchedStmt ::= ... |

     if (Expr) Stmt |

     if (Expr) MatchedStmt **else** UnmatchedStmt

– formal, no additional rules beyond syntax

– can be more obscure than original grammar

Check

Stmt   ::= MatchedStmt | UnmatchedStmt
MatchedStmt   ::= … |
     if (Expr) MatchedStmt **else** MatchedStmt
UnmatchedStmt ::= **if** (Expr) Stmt |
     if (Expr) MatchedStmt **else** UnmatchedStmt

if (*cond*) if (*cond*) *stmt*   else   *stmt*

Resolving Ambiguity with Grammar (2)

- If you can (re-)design the language, just avoid the problem entirely

  Stmt ::= … |
      if Expr **then** Stmt **end** |
      if Expr **then** Stmt **else** Stmt **end**

  – formal, clear, elegant
  – allows sequence of Stmts in then and else branches, no { , } needed
  – extra end required for every if
      (But maybe this is a good idea anyway?)

Parser Tools and Operators

- Most parser tools can cope with ambiguous grammars
  - Makes life simpler if used with discipline
- Usually can specify precedence & associativity
  - Allows simpler, ambiguous grammar with fewer nonterminals as basis for parser – let the tool handle the details (but only when it makes sense)
    - (i.e., expr ::= expr+expr | expr*expr | … with assoc. & precedence declarations can be the best solution)
- Take advantage of this to simplify the grammar when using parser-generator tools

Parser Tools and Ambiguous Grammars

- Possible rules for resolving other problems
  - Earlier productions in the grammar preferred to later ones (danger here if parser input changes)
  - Longest match used if there is a choice (good solution for dangling if)
- Parser tools normally allow for this
  - But be sure that what the tool does is really what you want
    - And that it's part of the tool spec, so that v2 won't do something different (that you *don't* want!)

Coming Attractions

- Next topic: LR parsing
  - Continue reading ch. 3