

CSE 401/M501 – Compilers

LR Parser Construction

Hal Perkins

Fall 2023

Administrivia (1)

- HW1 sample solutions handed out after class today. Might be some use finishing up scanner project. Grades/feedback out soon.
- Scanners due Thursday, 11 pm – how’s it going?
 - Must read MiniJava overview as well as scanner assignment & reread *again* when you think you’re “done”
 - Be sure to implement both kinds of comments
 - Be sure to look carefully at MiniJava grammar to discover tokens
 - Anything “quoted” in the MiniJava project grammar should be treated as a reserved word (token) in MiniJava, even if it’s not that in full Java
 - Scanner should continue after “invalid input character” errors
 - Be sure to terminate with correct System.exit code (0=ok, 1=errors)
 - Take advantage of JFlex regexp operations that go beyond basic regexps presented in class and on hw1 if they are useful
 - Don’t implement the parser just yet – plenty of time for that...
 - Reminder: you have a partner(!) – be sure to take advantage
 - Discussion board/email: never “I have a question” or “I am confused”
 - Rather: “We are confused” or “We have a question” 😊

Administrivia (2)

- Upcoming attractions:
 - Today/Wednesday and in sections this week: LR parsing and LR parser construction
 - HW2 (written questions on grammars, LR parsing) out shortly, due next Thur.
 - Friday/Monday lectures: LR parsing conflicts, first/follow, abstract syntax trees and visitor pattern
 - Next part of the project, Parser + AST visitors, out early next week, due a week and a half later
 - More details in lectures and sections next week

New Administrivia (added Wed.)

- Handout today at the front of the room:
 - A few slides for reference during lecture
- Written hw2 due a week from Thursday.
Covers LR parsing and parser construction.
- Reminder: scanners due tomorrow night, 11pm. Try not to burn a late day on this one.

Agenda

- LR(0) state construction
- FIRST, FOLLOW, and nullable
- Variations: SLR, LR(1), LALR

LR State Machine

- Idea: Build a DFA that recognizes handles
 - Language generated by a CFG is generally not regular, but
 - Language of viable prefixes for a CFG is regular
 - So a DFA can be used to recognize handles
 - LR Parser reduces when DFA accepts a handle

Prefixes, Handles, &c (review)

- If S is the start symbol of a grammar G ,
 - If $S \Rightarrow^* \alpha$ then α is a *sentential form* of G
 - γ is a *viable prefix* of G if there is some derivation $S \Rightarrow_{rm}^* \alpha A w \Rightarrow_{rm} \alpha \beta w$ and γ is a prefix of $\alpha \beta$
 - These are the strings that can appear on the LR parser stack
 - The occurrence of β in $\alpha \beta w$ is the right side of a *handle* of $\alpha \beta w$
- An *item* is a marked production (a $.$ at some position in the right hand side)
 - $[A ::= . X Y]$ $[A ::= X . Y]$ $[A ::= X Y .]$

Building the LR(0) States

- Example grammar

$S' ::= S \$$

$S ::= (L)$

$S ::= x$

$L ::= S$

$L ::= L , S$

- We add a production S' with the original start symbol S followed by end of file ($\$$)
 - We accept if we reach the end of S in this production
- Question: What language does this grammar generate?


Start of LR Parse

0. $S' ::= S \$$
1. $S ::= (L)$
2. $S ::= x$
3. $L ::= S$
4. $L ::= L, S$

- Initially
 - Stack is empty
 - (except for start state number usually)
 - Input is the right hand side of S' , i.e., $S \$$
 - Initial configuration is $[S' ::= . S \$]$
 - But, since position is just before S , we are also just before anything that can be derived from S

Initial state


0. $S' ::= S \$$
1. $S ::= (L)$
2. $S ::= x$
3. $L ::= S$
4. $L ::= L, S$



- A state is just a set of items
 - Start: an initial set of items
 - Completion (or closure): additional productions whose left-hand side nonterminal appears immediately following a dot in some item already in the state

Shift Actions (1)


0. $S' ::= S \$$
1. $S ::= (L)$
2. $S ::= x$
3. $L ::= S$
4. $L ::= L, S$



- To shift past the x , add a new state with appropriate item(s), including their closure
 - In this case, a single item; the closure adds nothing
 - This state will lead to a reduction since no further shift is possible

Shift Actions (2)


0. $S' ::= S \$$
1. $S ::= (L)$
2. $S ::= X$
3. $L ::= S$
4. $L ::= L , S$



- If we shift past the (, we are at the beginning of L
- The closure adds all productions that start with L
 - and that requires adding all productions starting with S

Goto Actions

0. $S' ::= S \$$
1. $S ::= (L)$
2. $S ::= x$
3. $L ::= S$
4. $L ::= L, S$



- Once we reduce S , we'll pop the rhs from the stack exposing a previous state. Add a *goto* transition on S for this (i.e., if we back up into this state having reduced a rhs to S , then we need a goto transition on S to another state).

Basic Construction Operations

- *Closure* (S)
 - Adds all items implied by items already in S
- *Goto* (I, X)
 - I is a set of items
 - X is a grammar symbol (terminal or non-terminal)
 - *Goto* moves the dot past the symbol X in all appropriate items in set I

Closure Algorithm

- *Closure* (S) =
 - repeat
 - for any item $[A ::= \alpha . B \beta]$ in S
 - for all productions $B ::= \gamma$
 - add $[B ::= . \gamma]$ to S
 - until S does not change
 - return S
- Classic example of a fixed-point algorithm

Goto Algorithm

- $Goto(I, X) =$
 - set new to the empty set
 - for each item $[A ::= \alpha . X \beta]$ in I
 - add $[A ::= \alpha X . \beta]$ to new
 - return $Closure(new)$
- This may create a new state, or may return an existing one

LR(0) Construction

- First, augment the grammar with an extra start production $S' ::= S \$$
- Let T be the set of states
- Let E be the set of edges
- Initialize T to *Closure* ($[S' ::= . S \$]$)
- Initialize E to empty

LR(0) Construction Algorithm

repeat

 for each state I in T

 for each item $[A ::= \alpha . X \beta]$ in I

 Let new be $Goto(I, X)$

 Add new to T if not present

 Add $I \xrightarrow{X} new$ to E if not present

until E and T do not change in this iteration


- Footnote: For the marker $\$$, we don't compute $goto(I, \$)$; instead, we make this an *accept* action.

Example: States for

0. $S' ::= S\$$
1. $S ::= (L)$
2. $S ::= x$
3. $L ::= S$
4. $L ::= L, S$

Example: States for

- 0. $S' ::= S \$$
- 1. $S ::= (L)$
- 2. $S ::= x$
- 3. $L ::= S$
- 4. $L ::= L , S$



Building the Parse Tables (1)

- For each edge $I \xrightarrow{X} J$
 - if X is a terminal, put sj in column X , row I of the action table (shift to state j)
 - If X is a non-terminal, put gj in column X , row I of the goto table


Building the Parse Tables (2)

- For each state I containing an item $[S' ::= S . \$]$, put *accept* in column $\$$ of row I
- Finally, for any state containing $[A ::= \gamma .]$ put action *rn* (reduce) in every column of row I in the table, where n is the *production* number
 - i.e., when it reaches this state, the DFA has discovered that $A ::= \gamma$ is a *handle*, so the parser should reduce γ to A

Example: Tables for

- 0. $S' ::= S \$$
- 1. $S ::= (L)$
- 2. $S ::= x$
- 3. $L ::= S$
- 4. $L ::= L , S$


	()	x	,	\$	S	L
0							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							



Example: Tables for

0. $S' ::= S \$$
1. $S ::= (L)$
2. $S ::= x$
3. $L ::= S$
4. $L ::= L , S$

	()	x	,	\$	S	L
0					acc		
1	s3		s2				g0
2	r2	r2	r2	r2	r2		
3	s3		s2				g4 g5
4	r3	r3	r3	r3	r3		
5			s6		s7		
6	r1	r1	r1	r1	r1		
7	s3		s2				g8
8	r4	r4	r4	r4	r4		



Where Do We Stand?

- We have built the LR(0) state machine and parser tables
 - No lookahead yet
 - Different variations of LR parsers add lookahead information, but basic idea of states, closures, and edges remains the same
- A grammar is LR(0) if its LR(0) state machine (equiv. parser tables) has no shift-reduce or reduce-reduce conflicts.

A Grammar that is not LR(0)

- Build the state machine and parse tables for a simple expression grammar

$$E' ::= E \$$$


$$E ::= T + E$$

$$E ::= T$$

$$T ::= x$$

LR(0) Parser for



0. $E' ::= E \$$
1. $E ::= T + E$
2. $E ::= T$
3. $T ::= x$



	x	+	\$	E	T
1	s5			g2	g3
2			acc		
3	r2	s4,r2	r2		
4	s5			g6	g3
5	r3	r3	r3		
6	r1	r1	r1		

- State 3 is has two possible actions on +
 - shift 4, or reduce 2
- \therefore Grammar is not LR(0)

How can we solve conflicts like this?

- Idea: look at the next symbol after the handle before deciding whether to reduce
- Easiest: SLR – Simple LR. Reduce only if next input terminal symbol could follow resulting nonterminal
 - Suppose we've reached $[A ::= \beta .]$ and the next input is x
 - Don't reduce unless Ax can appear in some sentential form
 - This is the   idea!
- More complex: LR and LALR. Store lookahead symbols in individual items to keep track of what can follow a *particular instance* of a reduction
 - LALR used by YACC/Bison/CUP; we won't examine in detail

SLR Parsers

- Idea: Use information about what can follow a non-terminal to decide if we should perform a reduction; don't reduce if the next input symbol can't ever follow the resulting non-terminal
- To decide, for each non-terminal A , we need to know $\text{FOLLOW}(A)$ – the set of terminal symbols that can follow A in some possible derivation
 - i.e., t is in $\text{FOLLOW}(A)$ if there is some possible derivation that contains At
 - To compute this, we need to compute $\text{FIRST}(\gamma)$ for strings γ that can follow A

Calculating FIRST(γ)

- Sounds easy... If $\gamma = X Y Z$, then FIRST(γ) is FIRST(X), right?
 - But what if we have the rule $X ::= \epsilon$?
 - In that case, FIRST(γ) includes anything that can follow X , i.e. FOLLOW(X), which includes FIRST(Y) and, if Y can derive ϵ , FIRST(Z), and if Z can derive ϵ , ...
 - So computing FIRST and FOLLOW involves knowing FIRST and FOLLOW for other nonterminals, as well as which ones can derive ϵ

FIRST, FOLLOW, and nullable

- **nullable(X)** is true if X can derive the empty string
- Given a string γ of terminals and non-terminals, **FIRST(γ)** is the set of terminals that can begin strings derived from γ
 - For SLR we only need this for single terminal or non-terminal symbols, not arbitrary strings γ
- **FOLLOW(X)** is the set of terminals that can immediately follow X in some derivation
- All three of these are computed together
- Footnote: Textbook doesn't use a separate nullable(X) attribute, instead it indicates nullable by including ϵ in FIRST(X). Both will wind up with same results, but one or the other might be easier to follow, so to speak..

Computing FIRST, FOLLOW, and nullable (1)

- Initialization
 - set FIRST and FOLLOW to be empty sets
 - set nullable to false for all non-terminals
 - set FIRST[a] to a for all terminal symbols a
- Repeatedly apply four simple observations to update these sets
 - Stop when there are no further changes
 - Another fixed-point algorithm

Computing FIRST, FOLLOW, and nullable (2)

repeat

for each production $X := Y_1 Y_2 Y_3 \dots Y_{k-2} Y_{k-1} Y_k$

if $Y_1 \dots Y_k$ are all nullable (or if $k = 0$)

set nullable[X] = true

1

for each i from 1 to k and each j from $i + 1$ to k

if $Y_1 \dots Y_{i-1}$ are all nullable (or if $i = 1$)

add FIRST[Y_i] to FIRST[X]

2

if $Y_{i+1} \dots Y_k$ are all nullable (or if $i = k$)

add FOLLOW[X] to FOLLOW[Y_i]

3

if $Y_{i+1} \dots Y_{j-1}$ are all nullable (or if $i+1=j$)

add FIRST[Y_j] to FOLLOW[Y_i]


4

Until FIRST, FOLLOW, and nullable do not change


Computing FIRST, FOLLOW, & nullable (3)

\boxed{Y} = nullable


①




②



③



④



Example (initial)

- Grammar

$Z ::= d$

$Z ::= X Y Z$

$Y ::= \epsilon$

$Y ::= c$

$X ::= Y$

$X ::= a$

	nullable	FIRST	FOLLOW
X	no		
Y	no		
Z	no		

Example (final)

- Grammar

$Z ::= d$

$Z ::= X Y Z$

$Y ::= \epsilon$

$Y ::= c$

$X ::= Y$


$X ::= a$

	nullable	FIRST	FOLLOW
X	no yes	a, c	a, c, d
Y	no yes	c	a, c, d
Z	no	a, c, d	

LR(0) Reduce Actions (review)


- In a LR(0) parser, if a state contains a reduction, it is unconditional regardless of the next input symbol
- Algorithm:
 - Initialize R to empty
 - for each state I in T
 - for each item $[A ::= \alpha .]$ in I
 - add $(I, A ::= \alpha)$ to R

SLR Construction

- This is identical to LR(0) – states, etc., except for the calculation of reduce actions
- Algorithm:
 - Initialize R to empty
 - for each state I in T
 - for each item $[A ::= \alpha .]$ in I
 - for each terminal a in $\text{FOLLOW}(A)$  new!
 - add $(I, a, A ::= \alpha)$ to R
- i.e., reduce α to A in state I only on lookahead a

SLR Parser for

0. $E' ::= E \$$
1. $E ::= T + E$
2. $E ::= T$
3. $T ::= x$



	x	+	\$	E	T
1	s5			g2	g3
2			acc		
3	r2	s4,r2	r2		
4	s5			g6	g3
5	r3	r3	r3		
6	r1	r1	r1		

Ghost yellow = reductions omitted in SLR parser because next terminal is not in FOLLOW(non-terminal)

On To LR(1)

- Many practical grammars are SLR
- LR(1) is more powerful yet
- Similar construction, but notion of an item is more complex, incorporating lookahead information
 - So lookahead information is associated with specific items rather than FOLLOW for a non-terminal regardless of specific context where that non-terminal appears in the derivation

LR(1) Items

- An LR(1) item $[A ::= \alpha . \beta, a]$ is
 - A grammar production ($A ::= \alpha\beta$)
 - A right hand side position (the dot)
 - A lookahead symbol (a)
- Idea: This item indicates that α is the top of the stack and the next input is derivable from βa .
- Full construction: see the book(s)

LR(1) Tradeoffs

- LR(1)
 - Pro: extremely precise; largest set of grammars
 - Con: potentially **very** large parse tables with many states


LALR(1)

- Variation of LR(1), but merge any two states that differ only in lookahead
 - Example: these two would be merged
 - $[A ::= x . y , a]$
 - $[A ::= x . y , b]$
 - to produce
 - $[A ::= x . y , ab]$

LALR(1) vs LR(1)

- LALR(1) tables can have many fewer states than LR(1)
 - Somewhat surprising result: will actually have same number of states as SLR parsers, even though LALR(1) is more powerful because of the more fine-grained lookahead info in the states
 - After the merge step, LALR(1) acts like SLR parser with “smarter” FOLLOW sets (can be specific to particular handles)
- LALR(1) may have reduce conflicts where LR(1) would not (but in practice this doesn't happen often)
- Most practical bottom-up parser tools are LALR(1) (e.g., yacc, bison, CUP, ...)

Language Hierarchies



Coming Attractions

Lecture

- ASTs and Visitor pattern
- LL(k) Parsing – Top-Down
- Recursive Descent Parsers
 - What you can do if you want a parser in a hurry

Sections next week

- AST construction – what do do while you parse!
- Visitor Pattern details – how to traverse ASTs for further processing (type checking, code gen, ...)