

Syntax and Parsing

COMS W4115

Prof. Stephen A. Edwards

Fall 2003

Columbia University

Department of Computer Science

Lexical Analysis (Scanning)

Lexical Analysis (Scanning)

Goal is to translate a stream of characters

```
i n t sp g c d ( i n t sp  
a , sp i n t sp b
```

into a stream of tokens

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|
| ID | ID | LPAREN | ID | ID | COMMA | ID | ID |
| int | gcd | (| int | a | , | int | b |

Each token consists of a token type and its text.

Whitespace and comments are discarded.

Lexical Analysis

Goal: simplify the job of the parser.

Scanners are usually much faster than parsers.

Discard as many irrelevant details as possible (e.g., whitespace, comments).

Parser does not care that the the identifier is
“supercalifragilisticexpialidocious.”

Parser rules are only concerned with token types.

The ANTLR Compiler Generator

Language and compiler for writing compilers

Running ANTLR on an ANTLR file produces Java source files that can be compiled and run.

ANTLR can generate

- Scanners (lexical analyzers)
- Parsers
- Tree walkers

An ANTLR File for a Simple Scanner

```
class CalcLexer extends Lexer;
```

```
LPAREN : '(' ; // Rules for punctuation
```

```
RPAREN : ')' ;
```

```
STAR : '*' ;
```

```
PLUS : '+' ;
```

```
SEMI : ';' ;
```

```
protected // Can only be used as a sub-rule
```

```
DIGIT : '0'..'9' ; // Any character between 0 and 9
```

```
INT : (DIGIT)+ ; // One or more digits
```

```
WS : (' ' | '\t' | '\n' | '\r') // Whitespace
```

```
{ setType(Token.SKIP); } ; // Action: ignore
```

ANTLR Specifications for Scanners

Rules are names starting with a capital letter.

A character in single quotes matches that character.

```
LPAREN : '(' ;
```

A string in double quotes matches the string

```
IF : "if" ;
```

A vertical bar indicates a choice:

```
OP : '+' | '-' | '*' | '/' ;
```

ANTLR Specifications

Question mark makes a clause optional.

```
PERSON : ("wo")? 'm' ('a' | 'e') 'n' ;
```

(Matches man, men, woman, and women.)

Double dots indicate a range of characters:

```
DIGIT : '0'..'9' ;
```

Asterisk and plus match “zero or more,” “one or more.”

```
ID : LETTER (LETTER | DIGIT)* ;
```

```
NUMBER : (DIGIT)+ ;
```

Kleene Closure

The asterisk operator (*) is called the Kleene Closure operator after the inventor of regular expressions, Stephen Cole Kleene, who pronounced his last name “CLAY-nee.”

His son Ken writes “As far as I am aware this pronunciation is incorrect in all known languages. I believe that this novel pronunciation was invented by my father.”


Scanner Behavior

All rules (tokens) are considered simultaneously. The longest one that matches wins:

1. Look at the next character in the file.
2. Can the next character be added to any of the tokens under construction?
3. If so, add the character to the token being constructed and go to step 1.
4. Otherwise, return the token.

How to keep track of multiple rules matching simultaneously? Build an automata.

Implementing Scanners Automatically



Regular Expressions and NFAs

We are describing tokens with *regular expressions*:

- The symbol ϵ always matches
- A symbol from an alphabet, e.g., a , matches itself
- A sequence of two regular expressions e.g., $e_1 e_2$
Matches e_1 followed by e_2
- An “OR” of two regular expressions e.g., $e_1 | e_2$
Matches e_1 or e_2
- The Kleene closure of a regular expression, e.g., $(e)^*$
Matches zero or more instances of e_1 in sequence.

Deterministic Finite Automata

A state machine with an initial state

Arcs indicate “consumed” input symbols.

States with double lines are accepting.

If the next token has an arc, follow the arc.


If the next token has no arc and the state is accepting, return the token.

If the next token has no arc and the state is not accepting, syntax error.

Deterministic Finite Automata

`ELSE: "else" ;`

`ELSEIF: "elseif" ;`




Deterministic Finite Automata

IF: "if" ;

ID: 'a'..'z' ('a'..'z' | '0'..'9')* ;

NUM: ('0'..'9')+ ;



Nondeterministic Finite Automata

DFAs with ϵ arcs.


Conceptually, ϵ arcs denote state equivalence.

ϵ arcs add the ability to make nondeterministic (schizophrenic) choices.

When an NFA reaches a state with an ϵ arc, it moves into *every* destination.

NFAs can be in multiple states at once.

Translating REs into NFAs




RE to NFAs

Building an NFA for the regular expression

$(wo|\epsilon)m(a|e)n$

produces




after simplification. Most ϵ arcs disappear.

Subset Construction

How to compute a DFA from an NFA.

Basic idea: each state of the DFA is a *marking* of the NFA



Subset Construction

An DFA can be exponentially larger than the corresponding NFA.

n states versus 2^n

Tools often try to strike a balance between the two representations.

ANTLR uses a different technique.

Free-Format Languages

Typical style arising from scanner/parser division

Program text is a series of tokens possibly separated by whitespace and comments, which are both ignored.

- keywords (`if while`)
- punctuation (`,` `(` `+`)
- identifiers (`foo bar`)
- numbers (`10 -3.14159e+32`)
- strings (`"A string"`)

Free-Format Languages

Java C C++ Algol Pascal

Some deviate a little (e.g., C and C++ have a separate preprocessor)

But not all languages are free-format.

FORTRAN 77

FORTRAN 77 is not free-format. 72-character lines:

```
100    IF(IN .EQ. 'Y' .OR. IN .EQ. 'y' .OR.  
      $    IN .EQ. 'T' .OR. IN .EQ. 't' ) THEN
```



Statement label Continuation Normal

When column 6 is not a space, line is considered part of the previous.

Fixed-length line works well with a one-line buffer.

Makes sense on punch cards.

Python

The Python scripting language groups with indentation

```
i = 0
while i < 10:
    i = i + 1
    print i      # Prints 1, 2, ..., 10
```

```
i = 0
while i < 10:
    i = i + 1
print i        # Just prints 10
```

This is succinct, but can be error-prone.

How do you wrap a conditional around instructions?

Syntax and Language Design

Does syntax matter? Yes and no

More important is a language's *semantics*—its meaning.

The syntax is aesthetic, but can be a religious issue.

But aesthetics matter to people, and can be critical.

Verbosity does matter: smaller is usually better.

Too small can be a problem: APL is a compact, cryptic language with its own character set (!)

```
E←A TEST B;L
```

```
L←0.5
```

```
E←((A×A)+B×B)*L
```

Syntax and Language Design

Some syntax is error-prone. Classic FORTRAN example:

```
DO 5 I = 1,25    ! Loop header (for i = 1 to 25)
DO 5 I = 1.25    ! Assignment to variable D05I
```

Trying too hard to reuse existing syntax in C++:

```
vector< vector<int> > foo;
vector<vector<int>> foo; // Syntax error
```

C distinguishes > and >> as different operators.

Keywords

Keywords look like identifiers in most languages.

Scanners do not know context, so keywords must take precedence over identifiers.


Too many keywords leaves fewer options for identifiers.

Languages such as C++ or Java strive for fewer keywords to avoid “polluting” available identifiers.

Parsing

Parsing

Objective: build an abstract syntax tree (AST) for the token sequence from the scanner.



Goal: discard irrelevant information to make it easier for the next stage.

Parentheses and most other forms of punctuation removed.

Grammars

Most programming languages described using a *context-free grammar*.

Compared to regular languages, context-free languages add one important thing: recursion.

Recursion allows you to count, e.g., to match pairs of nested parentheses.

Which languages do humans speak? I'd say it's regular: I do not not not not not not not not not understand this sentence.

Languages

Regular languages (t is a terminal):

$$A \rightarrow t_1 \dots t_n B$$

$$A \rightarrow t_1 \dots t_n$$

Context-free languages (P is terminal or a variable):

$$A \rightarrow P_1 \dots P_n$$

Context-sensitive languages:

$$\alpha_1 A \alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_1 B \alpha_2$$

“ $B \rightarrow A$ only in the ‘context’ of $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_2$ ”

Issues

Ambiguous grammars

Precedence of operators

Left- versus right-recursive

Top-down vs. bottom-up parsers

Parse Tree vs. Abstract Syntax Tree






Ambiguous Grammars

A grammar can easily be ambiguous. Consider parsing

$$3 - 4 * 2 + 5$$

with the grammar

$$e \rightarrow e + e \mid e - e \mid e * e \mid e / e$$



Operator Precedence and Associativity

Usually resolve ambiguity in arithmetic expressions

Like you were taught in elementary school:

“My Dear Aunt Sally”

Mnemonic for multiplication and division before addition and subtraction.


Operator Precedence

Defines how “sticky” an operator is.

1 * 2 + 3 * 4


* at higher precedence than +:

(1 * 2) + (3 * 4)



+ at higher precedence than *:

1 * (2 + 3) * 4




Associativity

Whether to evaluate left-to-right or right-to-left


Most operators are left-associative

1 - 2 - 3 - 4



$((1 - 2) - 3) - 4$

left associative



$1 - (2 - (3 - 4))$

right associative

Fixing Ambiguous Grammars

Original ANTLR grammar specification

expr

```
: expr '+' expr  
| expr '-' expr  
| expr '*' expr  
| expr '/' expr  
| NUMBER  
;
```

Ambiguous: no precedence or associativity.

Assigning Precedence Levels

Split into multiple rules, one per level

```
expr : expr '+' expr  
      | expr '-' expr  
      | term ;
```

```
term : term '*' term  
      | term '/' term  
      | atom ;
```

```
atom : NUMBER ;
```

Still ambiguous: associativity not defined

Assigning Associativity

Make one side or the other the next level of precedence

```
expr : expr '+' term  
      | expr '-' term  
      | term ;
```

```
term : term '*' atom  
      | term '/' atom  
      | atom ;
```

```
atom : NUMBER ;
```

Parsing Context-Free Grammars

There are $O(n^3)$ algorithms for parsing arbitrary CFGs, but most compilers demand $O(n)$ algorithms.

Fortunately, the LL and LR subclasses of CFGs have $O(n)$ parsing algorithms. People use these in practice.

Parsing LL(k) Grammars

LL: Left-to-right, Left-most derivation

k: number of tokens to look ahead

Parsed by top-down, predictive, recursive parsers

Basic idea: look at the next token to predict which production to use

ANTLR builds recursive LL(k) parsers

Almost a direct translation from the grammar.

A Top-Down Parser

```
stmt : 'if' expr 'then' expr
      | 'while' expr 'do' expr
      | expr ':=' expr ;
```

```
expr : NUMBER | '(' expr ')' ;
```

```
AST stmt() {
  switch (next-token) {
  case "if" : match("if"); expr(); match("then"); expr();
  case "while" : match("while"); expr(); match("do"); expr();
  case NUMBER or "(" : expr(); match(":="); expr();
  }
}
```

Writing LL(k) Grammars

Cannot have left-recursion

```
expr : expr '+' term | term ;
```

becomes

```
AST expr() {  
    switch (next-token) {  
        case NUMBER : expr(); /* Infinite Recursion */
```

Writing LL(1) Grammars

Cannot have common prefixes

```
expr : ID '(' expr ')'  
      | ID '=' expr
```

becomes

```
AST expr() {  
  switch (next-token) {  
  case ID : match(ID); match('('); expr(); match(')');  
  case ID : match(ID); match('='); expr();
```

Eliminating Common Prefixes

Consolidate common prefixes:

expr

```
: expr '+' term  
| expr '-' term  
| term  
;
```

becomes

expr

```
: expr ( '+' term | '-' term )  
| term  
;
```

Eliminating Left Recursion

Understand the recursion and add tail rules

`expr`

```
    : expr ( '+' term | '-' term )  
    | term  
    ;
```

becomes

```
expr : term exprt ;  
exprt : '+' term exprt  
       | '-' term exprt  
       | /* nothing */  
       ;
```

Using ANTLR's EBNF

ANTLR makes this easier since it supports * and -:

```
expr : expr '+' term  
      | expr '-' term  
      | term ;
```


becomes

```
expr : term ('+' term | '-' term)* ;
```

The Dangling Else Problem

Who owns the *else*?

```
if (a) if (b) c(); else d();
```



Grammars are usually ambiguous; manuals give disambiguating rules such as C's:

As usual the "else" is resolved by connecting an else with the last encountered elseless if.

The Dangling Else Problem

```
stmt : "if" expr "then" stmt iftail  
      | other-statements ;
```

```
iftail  
      : "else" stmt  
      | /* nothing */  
      ;
```

Problem comes when matching “iftail.”

Normally, an empty choice is taken if the next token is in the “follow set” of the rule. But since “else” can follow an iftail, the decision is ambiguous.

The Dangling Else Problem

ANTLR can resolve this problem by making certain rules “greedy.” If a conditional is marked as greedy, it will take that option even if the “nothing” option would also match:

```
stmt
  : "if" expr "then" stmt
    ( options {greedy = true;}
      : "else" stmt
    )?
  | other-statements
  ;
```

The Dangling Else Problem

Some languages resolve this problem by insisting on nesting everything.

E.g., Algol 68:

```
if a < b then a else b fi;
```

“fi” is “if” spelled backwards. The language also uses do–od and case–esac.

Statement separators/terminators

C uses ; as a statement terminator.

```
if (a<b) printf("a less");  
else {  
    printf("b"); printf(" less");  
}
```

Pascal uses ; as a statement separator.

```
if a < b then writeln('a less')  
else begin  
    write('a'); writeln(' less')  
end
```

Pascal later made a final ; optional.

Bottom-up Parsing

Rightmost Derivation

$$1 : e \rightarrow t + e$$

$$2 : e \rightarrow t$$

$$3 : t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld} * t$$

$$4 : t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld}$$

A rightmost derivation for $\mathbf{ld} * \mathbf{ld} + \mathbf{ld}$:

e

$t + e$

$t + t$


$t + \mathbf{ld}$

$\mathbf{ld} * t + \mathbf{ld}$

$\mathbf{ld} * \mathbf{ld} + \mathbf{ld}$

Basic idea of bottom-up parsing:
construct this rightmost derivation
backward.

Handles



This is a reverse rightmost derivation for **Id * Id + Id**.

Each highlighted section is a **handle**.

Taken in order, the handles build the tree from the leaves to the root.

Shift-reduce Parsing

| | stack | input | action |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|
| 1 : $e \rightarrow t + e$ | | | |
| 2 : $e \rightarrow t$ | | ld * ld + ld | shift |
| 3 : $t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld} * t$ | ld | * ld + ld | shift |
| | ld * | ld + ld | shift |
| 4 : $t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld}$ | ld * ld | + ld | reduce (4) |
| | ld * t | + ld | reduce (3) |
| | <i>t</i> | + ld | shift |
| | <i>t</i> + | ld | shift |
| | <i>t</i> + ld | | reduce (4) |
| | <i>t</i> + t | | reduce (2) |
| | t + e | | reduce (1) |
| | <i>e</i> | | accept |

Scan input left-to-right, looking for handles.

An oracle tells what to do



LR Parsing

1 : $e \rightarrow t + e$

2 : $e \rightarrow t$

3 : $t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld} * t$

4 : $t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld}$

| | action | | | | goto | |
|---|-----------|----|----|-----|----------|----------|
| | ld | + | * | \$ | <i>e</i> | <i>t</i> |
| 0 | s1 | | | | 7 | 2 |
| 1 | r4 | r4 | s3 | r4 | | |
| 2 | r2 | s4 | r2 | r2 | | |
| 3 | s1 | | | | | 5 |
| 4 | s1 | | | | 6 | 2 |
| 5 | r3 | r3 | r3 | r3 | | |
| 6 | r1 | r1 | r1 | r1 | | |
| 7 | | | | acc | | |

stack

0

input

ld * **ld** + **ld** \$

action

shift, goto 1

1. Look at state on top of stack
2. and the next input token
3. to find the next action
4. In this case, shift the token onto the stack and go to state 1.

LR Parsing

1 : $e \rightarrow t + e$

2 : $e \rightarrow t$

3 : $t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld} * t$

4 : $t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld}$

| | action | | | | goto | |
|---|--------|----|----|-----|------|---|
| | ld | + | * | \$ | e | t |
| 0 | s1 | | | | 7 | 2 |
| 1 | r4 | r4 | s3 | r4 | | |
| 2 | r2 | s4 | r2 | r2 | | |
| 3 | s1 | | | | | 5 |
| 4 | s1 | | | | 6 | 2 |
| 5 | r3 | r3 | r3 | r3 | | |
| 6 | r1 | r1 | r1 | r1 | | |
| 7 | | | | acc | | |

stack

input

action

0

ld * ld + ld \$

shift, goto 1

0 ld 1

* ld + ld \$

shift, goto 3

0 ld 1 *

ld + ld \$

shift, goto 1

0 ld 1 * ld 1

+ ld \$

reduce w/ 4

Action is reduce with rule 4 ($t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld}$). The right side is removed from the stack to reveal state 3. The goto table in state 3 tells us to go to state 5 when we reduce a t :

stack

input

action

0 ld 1 * t 5

+ ld \$

LR Parsing

1 : $e \rightarrow t + e$

2 : $e \rightarrow t$

3 : $t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld} * t$

4 : $t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld}$

| | action | | | | goto | |
|---|--------|----|----|-----|------|---|
| | ld | + | * | \$ | e | t |
| 0 | s1 | | | | 7 | 2 |
| 1 | r4 | r4 | s3 | r4 | | |
| 2 | r2 | s4 | r2 | r2 | | |
| 3 | s1 | | | | | 5 |
| 4 | s1 | | | | 6 | 2 |
| 5 | r3 | r3 | r3 | r3 | | |
| 6 | r1 | r1 | r1 | r1 | | |
| 7 | | | | acc | | |

stack

| | | | |
|---|----|---|----|
| 0 | | | |
| 0 | ld | | |
| 0 | ld | * | |
| 0 | ld | * | ld |
| 0 | ld | * | t |
| 0 | t | | |
| 0 | t | + | |
| 0 | t | + | ld |
| 0 | t | + | t |
| 0 | t | + | e |
| 0 | e | | |

input

ld * ld + ld \$

*** ld + ld \$**

ld + ld \$

+ ld \$

+ ld \$

+ ld \$

ld \$

\$

\$

\$

\$

action

shift, goto 1

shift, goto 3

shift, goto 1

reduce w/ 4

reduce w/ 3

shift, goto 4

shift, goto 1

reduce w/ 4

reduce w/ 2

reduce w/ 1

accept

Constructing the SLR Parse Table

The states are places we could be in a reverse-rightmost derivation. Let's represent such a place with a dot.

$$1 : e \rightarrow t + e$$

$$2 : e \rightarrow t$$

$$3 : t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld} * t$$

$$4 : t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld}$$

Say we were at the beginning ($\cdot e$). This corresponds to

$$e' \rightarrow \cdot e$$

$$e \rightarrow \cdot t + e$$


$$e \rightarrow \cdot t$$

$$t \rightarrow \cdot \mathbf{ld} * t$$

$$t \rightarrow \cdot \mathbf{ld}$$

The first is a placeholder. The second are the two possibilities when we're just before e . The last two are the two possibilities when we're just before t .

Constructing the SLR Parsing Table



The Punchline

This is a tricky, but mechanical procedure. The parser generators YACC, Bison, Cup, and others (but not ANTLR) use a modified version of this technique to generate fast bottom-up parsers.

You need to understand it to comprehend error messages:

Shift/reduce conflicts are caused by a state like

$$t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld} \cdot *t$$

$$t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld} * t \cdot$$

Reduce/reduce conflicts are caused by a state like

$$t \rightarrow \mathbf{ld} * t \cdot$$

$$e \rightarrow t + e \cdot$$