

Precedence, EBNFs and Syntax Diagrams

CS152

Chris Pollett

Sep. 22, 2008.

Outline

- Disambiguating rules, Precedence, Associativity
- EBNFs and Syntax Diagrams

Recalling Ambiguity

- Recall last Wednesday we had the grammar:
 $\langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle \mid \langle \text{expr} \rangle * \langle \text{expr} \rangle \mid (\langle \text{expr} \rangle)$
 $\mid \langle \text{number} \rangle$
 $\langle \text{number} \rangle ::= \langle \text{number} \rangle \langle \text{digit} \rangle \mid \langle \text{digit} \rangle$
 $\langle \text{digit} \rangle ::= 0 \mid 1 \mid 2 \mid 3 \mid 4 \mid 5 \mid 6 \mid 7 \mid 8 \mid 9$
- Consider the expression $3 + 4 * 5$.
- It actually has two distinct parse trees using the grammar of a couple slides back:
 - One corresponds to $3 + (4 * 5)$
 - The other to $(3 + 4) * 5$
- Worse, these two expressions evaluate to different things.
- Grammars which have two distinct parse trees for the same string are called **ambiguous**.

Leftmost Derivations

- If a derivation in each step always operates on its leftmost non-terminal, then it is called a **leftmost derivation**.
- It turns out that having distinct parse trees for the same string is equivalent to having two distinct leftmost derivations for the same string.
- In the example above, one derivation begins

$\langle \text{expr} \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{expr} \rangle * \langle \text{expr} \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle * \langle \text{expr} \rangle$

the other as

$\langle \text{expr} \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{number} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle \Rightarrow$
 $\langle \text{digit} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle \Rightarrow 3 + \langle \text{expr} \rangle \Rightarrow 3 + \langle \text{expr} \rangle * \langle \text{expr} \rangle$

and the rest of the derivations are the same.

PDA_s

- There are algorithms (such as CYK) which work for parsing any CFG ambiguous or not.
- They are typically slow -- $O(n^3)$ -- and they don't address the problem of the fact that ambiguous grammars often yield strings with two "meanings".
- To do parsing people instead, prefer to use a machine model like the finite automata model we briefly discussed for regular expressions.
- For CFGs, this model is basically a finite automata together with a stack, a push down automata. (PDA).
- When trying to parse a grammar, the approach is to initially **shift** the start symbol for the grammar unto the stack.
- Then in each step we check is the top symbol of the stack a non-terminal? If it is, we pop it and replace it with a right hand side of a rule with involving that non-terminal.
- If there a terminal on the top of the stack we check if the input has that terminal. If it does we read the terminal/token from the input and pop the terminal from the stack.
- We keep going till the string is parsed.

Disambiguating Rules

- The problem with ambiguous grammars is that there may be more than one rule that could be pushed onto the stack in a given step.
- One way to solve this problem (and this can be done in YACC) is to give a **precedence** to the rules.
- I.e., we could say do rule $\langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle$ before $\langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \langle \text{expr} \rangle * \langle \text{expr} \rangle$.
- This yields the parenthesization $3 + (4 * 5)$.
- Alternatively, we could modify our grammar to remove the problem:
 $\langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle \mid \langle \text{term} \rangle$
 $\langle \text{term} \rangle ::= \langle \text{term} \rangle * \langle \text{expr} \rangle \mid (\langle \text{expr} \rangle) \mid \langle \text{number} \rangle$
- This has the same effect as giving precedence to the rules.

Associativity

- Consider $3 + 4 + 5$. This could be viewed as either $(3 + 4) + 5$ or $3 + (4 + 5)$.
- The first would say $+$ is **left associative**, the second **right associative**.
- Our current grammar, using leftmost derivations, favors a left associative parse trees for $+$.
- For $+$, it doesn't really matter; however, for $-$, notice $(3 - 4) - 5 \neq 3 - (4 - 5)$.
- We can modify our grammar to make $+$ either left or right associative, by replacing $\langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle$ with either $\langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \langle \text{term} \rangle + \langle \text{expr} \rangle$ or $\langle \text{expr} \rangle ::= \langle \text{expr} \rangle + \langle \text{term} \rangle$

EBNFs

- EBNF stands for extended BNF.
- It allows us slightly more general rules to make it easier to write down grammars.
- For example, rather than have to write
 $\langle \text{number} \rangle ::= \langle \text{number} \rangle \langle \text{digit} \rangle \mid \langle \text{digit} \rangle$
to say that a $\langle \text{number} \rangle$ a string of one or more $\langle \text{digits} \rangle$,
one can write instead
 $\langle \text{number} \rangle ::= \text{digit} \{ \text{digit} \}$
here $\{ \}$ is used to denote zero or more repetitions.
- Another abbreviation is $[]$ for optional. So one can write
 $\text{if} (\langle \text{expr} \rangle) \langle \text{statement} \rangle [\text{else} \langle \text{statement} \rangle]$
to indicate the else clause is optional.

Syntax Diagrams

- Sometimes a diagramming notation called **syntax diagrams** is used to indicate grammar rules. For instance, Oracle documentation often uses this.
- In syntax diagrams a circle is used for a terminal and a box for a non-terminal.
- The left hand side of the rule is indicated by a word above an arc coming into the diagram. Arcs are used to indicate connections between parts of the rule.
- So $\langle \text{noun-phrase} \rangle ::= \langle \text{article} \rangle \langle \text{noun} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{article} \rangle ::= a \mid \text{the} \mid \text{might be}$ draws as:

Example Diagram

