Lecture 8: Recursive-descent parsing

- Recursive-descent formalized
 - FIRST sets
 - LL(1) condition
 - Transformations to LL(1) form
- Grammars for expressions a difficult case

(Next week: LR(1) parsing, ocamlyacc)

Top-down parsing

For each non-terminal with productions:

$$A \to \vec{X} \mid \vec{Y} \mid \dots \mid \vec{Z}$$

define parseA:

```
parseA toklis = choose production based on hd toklis: if A \rightarrow \vec{X} chosen: handle \vec{X} else if A \rightarrow \vec{Y} chosen: handle \vec{Y}, else if etc.

handle X_1 X_2 \dots X_n: handle X_1; handle X_2; ...; handle X_n where handle t: if hd toklis = t then remove t and continue else error
```

handle B: parseB toklis

"choose production based on hd toklis"

- Need to formalize some things...
- Define " \Rightarrow ": $X_1 \dots X_n \Rightarrow X_1 \dots X_{i-1} \alpha X_{i+1} \dots X_n$ (for any $1 \le i \le n$) if the grammar has production $X_i \to \alpha$.
- ullet \Rightarrow^+ and \Rightarrow^* are the transitive and reflexive-transive closures of \Rightarrow . (Say \vec{X} derives α if $\vec{X} \Rightarrow^* \alpha$.)
- α is a $sentential\ form$ of G if the start symbol of G derives α . If, furthermore, α consists solely of tokens, then it is a sentence. (These notions correspond to being the "frontier" of a syntax tree; some care is needed in defining "frontier" to account for ϵ -productions.)

"choose production based on hd toklis" (cont.)

- ullet \vec{X} is *nullable* if it can derive ϵ .
- Define: FIRST(\vec{X}) = $\{t \in T | \vec{X} \Rightarrow^* t\alpha \text{ for some } \alpha\} \cup \{\bullet | \vec{X} \ nullable \}.$
- Define: FOLLOW(A) = $\{t \in T \mid \exists \text{ a sentential form } \alpha A t \beta\}$

There are well-known algorithms for calculating FIRST and FOLLOW sets, but we will consider only simple cases where they can be calculated by inspection.

"choose production based on hd toklis" (cont.)

- Define: G is *left-recursive* if $\exists A: A \Rightarrow^+ A\alpha$ for some α .
- Define: G is LL(1) if
 - 1. G is not left-recursive, and
 - 2. For all non-terminals A, if the productions of A are $A \rightarrow \alpha_1 | \ldots | \alpha_n$:
 - (a) The sets FIRST(α_1), ..., FIRST(α_n) are pairwise disjoint. ($\forall i, j.i \neq j \Rightarrow FIRST(\alpha_i) \cap FIRST(\alpha_j) = \emptyset$.)
 - (b) If A is nullable, then suppose α_i is the unique right-hand side such that $\bullet \in \mathsf{FIRST}(\alpha_i)$. Then, for all $j \neq i$, $\mathsf{FIRST}(\alpha_i) \cap \mathsf{FOLLOW}(\mathsf{A}) = \emptyset$.

Top-down parsing revisited

If G is LL(1), then for each non-terminal A with productions

$$A \to \vec{X} \mid \vec{Y} \mid \dots \mid \vec{Z}$$

construct parseA:

```
parseA toklis = let t = hd toklis in if t \in FIRST(\vec{X}) then handle \vec{X} else if t \in FIRST(\vec{Y}) then handle \vec{Y} ...else if t \in FIRST(\vec{Z}) or (\bullet \in FIRST(\vec{Z}) \text{ and } t \in FOLLOW(A)) then handle \vec{Z} (\vec{Z} the unique nullable right-hand side of A, if any) else error
```

handle X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n : handle X_1 ; handle X_2 ; ...; handle X_n

handle t: if hd toklis = t
then remove t and continue
else error

handle B: parseB toklis

Transformation to LL(1)

Left refactoring:

$$A \to \alpha \beta \mid \alpha \gamma$$

$$\Rightarrow A \to \alpha B$$

$$B \to \beta \mid \gamma$$

Left-recursion removal:

$$A \rightarrow A\alpha \mid \beta$$

$$\Rightarrow A \to \beta B$$
$$B \to \epsilon \mid \alpha B$$

Example

Consider non-LL(1) grammar 3 from the previous class:

$$A \rightarrow id \mid '('B')'$$

 $B \rightarrow A \mid A'+'B$

Grammar 3 transformed to LL(1) form:

$$f A
ightarrow id \mid '(' \ B \ ')' \ f B
ightarrow A \ f C \ f C
ightarrow '+' \ f B \mid \epsilon$$

Ambiguity

- No test for ambiguity
- Recursive descent and LR(1) parsing not applicable to ambiguous grammar (possible to "cheat" with LR parser will see how next week)

Expression grammars

- Expressions are challenging for several reasons:
 - Grammar should enforce precedence, if possible
 - Grammar should enforce associativity, if possible
 - Grammar shouldn't be ambiguous
 - Should be easy to construct abstract syntax tree
- Especially hard to write LL(1) parser for expressions. Not so hard for LR(1).

Enforcing precedence

Enforcing associativity

Some expression grammars

$$G_A : E \to id \mid E - E \mid E * E$$

$$G_B: E \to id \mid id - E \mid id * E$$

$$G_C$$
: E \rightarrow id | E - id | E * id

$$G_D$$
: $E \to T - E \mid T$
 $T \to id \mid id * T$

$$G_E$$
: $E \to E - T \mid T$
 $T \to id \mid T * id$

$$G_F \colon \quad \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{T} \quad \mathcal{E}'$$

$$\mathcal{E}' \to \epsilon \mid -\mathcal{E}$$

$$\mathcal{T} \to \operatorname{id} \mathcal{T}'$$

$$\mathcal{T}' \to \epsilon \mid *\mathcal{T}$$

• G_A : $E \rightarrow id \mid E - E \mid E * E$

$$x - y - z$$

• G_B : $E \rightarrow id \mid id - E \mid id * E$

$$x - y * z - w$$

• G_C : $\mathsf{E} \to \mathsf{id} \mid \mathsf{E} - \mathsf{id} \mid \mathsf{E} * \mathsf{id}$

$$x - y * z - w$$

•
$$G_D$$
: $\mathsf{E} \to \mathsf{T} - \mathsf{E} \mid \mathsf{T}$
 $\mathsf{T} \to \mathsf{id} \mid \mathsf{id} * \mathsf{T}$

$$x - y - z$$

•
$$G_E$$
: $\mathsf{E} \to \mathsf{E} - \mathsf{T} \mid \mathsf{T}$
 $\mathsf{T} \to \mathsf{id} \mid \mathsf{T} * \mathsf{id}$

$$x - y - z$$

•
$$G_F$$
: $\mathsf{E} \to \mathsf{T} \; \mathsf{E}'$
 $\mathsf{E}' \to \epsilon \mid \mathsf{-} \; \mathsf{E}$
 $\mathsf{T} \to \mathsf{id} \; \mathsf{T}'$
 $\mathsf{T}' \to \epsilon \mid \mathsf{*} \; \mathsf{T}$

$$x - y - z$$