CSE 401 – Compilers

Parsing & Context-Free Grammars

Hal Perkins

Winter 2009

Agenda for Today

- Parsing overview
- Context free grammars
- Ambiguous grammars
- Reading: Cooper & Torczon 3.1-3.2

Syntactic Analysis / Parsing

- Goal: Convert token stream to abstract syntax tree
- Abstract syntax tree (AST):
  - Captures the structural features of the program
  - Primary data structure for remainder of compilation
- Three Part Plan
  - Study how context-free grammars specify syntax
  - Study algorithms for parsing / building ASTs
  - Study the miniJava Implementation

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, as in, "variable must be declared," requiring later semantic pass
  - Can be ambiguous
- EBNF, Extended Backus Naur Form, is popular notation

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 (a\k\a tokens) want to recover the nonterminals representing structure
- Can represent derivation as a parse tree, that is, the concrete syntax tree

Example Derivation

G

program ::= *statement* | *program statement*
statement ::= *assignStmt* | *ifStmt*
assignStmt ::= *id* = *expr* ;
ifStmt ::= if (*expr*) *stmt*
expr ::= *id* | *int* | *expr* + *expr*
Id ::= a | b | c | i | j | k | n | x | y | z
int ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9

program

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 a parser corresponds 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)
- 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 (common)
  - Construct linear, lower-level representation (more common in later parts of a modern compiler)
  - Generate target code on the fly (1-pass compiler; not common in production compilers – can’t generate very good code in one pass – but great if you need a quick ‘n dirty working compiler)

Context-Free Grammars

- Formally, a grammar G is a tuple $<N,\Sigma,P,S>$ where
  - N a finite set of non-terminal symbols
  - Σ a finite set of terminal symbols
  - P a finite set of productions
    - A subset of $N \times (N \cup \Sigma)^*$
  - S 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 $A ::= \alpha$ if $\langle A, \alpha \rangle$ in P

Derivation Relations (1)

- $\alpha \; A \; \gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \; \beta \; \gamma$ iff A ::= β in *P*
  - derives
- A =>* w if there is a chain of productions starting with A that generates w
  - transitive closure

Derivation Relations (2)

- $w\ A\ \gamma =>_{lm} w\ \beta\ \gamma$ iff $A ::= \beta$ in P
  - derives leftmost
- $\alpha\ A\ w =>_{rm} \alpha\ \beta\ w$ 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, $L(A) = \{ w \mid A \Rightarrow^* w \}$
- If S is the start symbol of grammar G, define $L(G) = L(S)$

Reduced Grammars

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

  $$S =>^* x\ A\ z => x\ \alpha\ z =>^* xyz$$

  - i.e., no production is useless
- Convention: we will use only reduced grammars

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

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

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

Example (cont)

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

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

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

Example (cont)

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

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

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

Another example

- Give two different derivations of 5+6+7

What's going on here?

- The grammar has no notion of precedence or associatively
- 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

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

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

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

int ::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 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

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

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

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)

Another Classic Example

- Grammar for conditional statements

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

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

  - Exercise: show that this is ambiguous
    - How?

ifStmt ::= if (*cond*) *stmt*
| if (*cond*) *stmt* else *stmt*

One Derivation

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

ifStmt ::= if (*cond*) *stmt*
| if (*cond*) *stmt* else *stmt*

Another Derivation

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
- Change the language
  - But it’d better be ok to do this
- Use some ad-hoc rule in 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
- sometimes obscures 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, 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
- Typically one can specify operator precedence & associativity
  - Allows simpler, ambiguous grammar with fewer nonterminals as basis for generated parser, without creating problems

Parser Tools and Ambiguous Grammars

- Possible rules for resolving other problems
  - Earlier productions in the grammar preferred to later ones
  - Longest match used if there is a choice
- Parser tools normally allow for this
  - But be sure that what the tool does is really what you want

Coming Attractions

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