

Where Syntax Meets Semantics


Three ‘Equivalent’ Grammars

G1: $\langle \textit{subexp} \rangle ::= \mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{c} \mid \langle \textit{subexp} \rangle - \langle \textit{subexp} \rangle$


G2: $\langle \textit{subexp} \rangle ::= \langle \textit{var} \rangle - \langle \textit{subexp} \rangle \mid \langle \textit{var} \rangle$
 $\langle \textit{var} \rangle ::= \mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{c}$

G3: $\langle \textit{subexp} \rangle ::= \langle \textit{subexp} \rangle - \langle \textit{var} \rangle \mid \langle \textit{var} \rangle$
 $\langle \textit{var} \rangle ::= \mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{c}$

These grammars all define the same language: the language of strings that contain one or more **as**, **bs** or **cs** separated by minus signs. But...



G2 parse tree:



G3 parse tree:

Why Parse Trees Matter

- We want the structure of the parse tree to correspond to the semantics of the string it generates
- This makes grammar design much harder: we're interested in the structure of each parse tree, not just in the generated string
- Parse trees are where syntax meets semantics

Outline

- Operators
- Precedence
- Associativity
- Other ambiguities: dangling else
- Cluttered grammars
- Parse trees and EBNF
- Abstract syntax trees

Operators

- Special syntax for frequently-used simple operations like addition, subtraction, multiplication and division
- The word *operator* refers both to the token used to specify the operation (like + and *) and to the operation itself
- Usually predefined, but not always
- Usually a single token, but not always

Operator Terminology

- *Operands* are the inputs to an operator, like **1** and **2** in the expression **1+2**
- *Unary* operators take one operand: **-1**
- *Binary* operators take two: **1+2**
- *Ternary* operators take three: **a?b:c**

More Operator Terminology

- In most programming languages, binary operators use an *infix* notation: **a + b**
- Sometimes you see *prefix* notation: **+ a b**
- Sometimes *postfix* notation: **a b +**
- Unary operators, similarly:
 - (Can't be infix, of course)
 - Can be prefix, as in **-1**
 - Can be postfix, as in **a++**

Outline


- Operators
- Precedence
- Associativity
- Other ambiguities: dangling else
- Cluttered grammars
- Parse trees and EBNF
- Abstract syntax trees

Working Grammar

G4: $\langle exp \rangle ::= \langle exp \rangle + \langle exp \rangle$
| $\langle exp \rangle * \langle exp \rangle$
| $(\langle exp \rangle)$
| **a** | **b** | **c**

This generates a language of arithmetic expressions using parentheses, the operators **+** and *****, and the variables **a**, **b** and **c**

Issue #1: Precedence



Our grammar generates this tree for **a+b*c**. In this tree, the addition is performed before the multiplication, which is not the usual convention for operator *precedence*.

Operator Precedence

- Applies when the order of evaluation is not completely decided by parentheses
- Each operator has a *precedence level*, and those with higher precedence are performed before those with lower precedence, as if parenthesized
- Most languages put ***** at a higher precedence level than **+**, so that

$$\mathbf{a+b*c = a+(b*c)}$$

Precedence Examples

- C (15 levels of precedence—too many?)

a = b < c ? * p + b * c : 1 << d ()

- Pascal (5 levels—not enough?)

a <= 0 or 100 <= a Error!

- Smalltalk (1 level for all binary operators)

a + b * c


Precedence In The Grammar

G4: $\langle exp \rangle ::= \langle exp \rangle + \langle exp \rangle$
| $\langle exp \rangle * \langle exp \rangle$
| $(\langle exp \rangle)$
| **a** | **b** | **c**

To fix the precedence problem, we modify the grammar so that it is forced to put ***** below **+** in the parse tree.

G5: $\langle exp \rangle ::= \langle exp \rangle + \langle exp \rangle$ | $\langle mulexp \rangle$
 $\langle mulexp \rangle ::= \langle mulexp \rangle * \langle mulexp \rangle$
| $(\langle exp \rangle)$
| **a** | **b** | **c**

Correct Precedence




Our new grammar generates this tree for **a+b*c**. It generates the same language as before, but no longer generates parse trees with incorrect precedence.

Outline

- Operators
- Precedence
- Associativity
- Other ambiguities: dangling else
- Cluttered grammars
- Parse trees and EBNF
- Abstract syntax trees

Issue #2: Associativity



Our grammar G5 generates both these trees for $a+b+c$. The first one is not the usual convention for operator *associativity*.

Operator Associativity

- Applies when the order of evaluation is not decided by parentheses or by precedence
- *Left-associative* operators group left to right: $a+b+c+d = ((a+b)+c)+d$
- *Right-associative* operators group right to left: $a+b+c+d = a+(b+(c+d))$
- Most operators in most languages are left-associative, but there are exceptions

Associativity Examples

■ C

$a < b < c$ — most operators are left-associative
 $a = b = 0$ — right-associative (assignment)

■ ML

$3 - 2 - 1$ — most operators are left-associative
 $1 :: 2 :: \text{nil}$ — right-associative (list builder)

■ Fortran

$a / b * c$ — most operators are left-associative
 $a ** b ** c$ — right-associative (exponentiation)


Associativity In The Grammar

G5: $\langle exp \rangle ::= \langle exp \rangle + \langle exp \rangle \mid \langle mulexp \rangle$
 $\langle mulexp \rangle ::= \langle mulexp \rangle * \langle mulexp \rangle$
 $\mid (\langle exp \rangle)$
 $\mid \mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{c}$

To fix the associativity problem, we modify the grammar to make trees of **+**s grow down to the left (and likewise for *****s)

G6: $\langle exp \rangle ::= \langle exp \rangle + \langle mulexp \rangle \mid \langle mulexp \rangle$
 $\langle mulexp \rangle ::= \langle mulexp \rangle * \langle rootexp \rangle \mid \langle rootexp \rangle$
 $\langle rootexp \rangle ::= (\langle exp \rangle)$
 $\mid \mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{c}$

Correct Associativity



Our new grammar generates this tree for **a+b+c**. It generates the same language as before, but no longer generates trees with incorrect associativity.

Practice

Starting with this grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} G_6: \quad & \langle exp \rangle ::= \langle exp \rangle + \langle mulexp \rangle \mid \langle mulexp \rangle \\ & \langle mulexp \rangle ::= \langle mulexp \rangle * \langle rootexp \rangle \mid \langle rootexp \rangle \\ & \langle rootexp \rangle ::= (\langle exp \rangle) \\ & \quad \mid \mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{c} \end{aligned}$$

- 1.) Add a left-associative **&** operator, at lower precedence than any of the others
- 2.) Then add a right-associative ****** operator, at higher precedence than any of the others

Outline

- Operators
- Precedence
- Associativity
- Other ambiguities: dangling else
- Cluttered grammars
- Parse trees and EBNF
- Abstract syntax trees

Issue #3: Ambiguity

- G4 was *ambiguous*: it generated more than one parse tree for the same string
- Fixing the associativity and precedence problems eliminated all the ambiguity
- This is usually a good thing: the parse tree corresponds to the meaning of the program, and we don't want ambiguity about that
- Not all ambiguity stems from confusion about precedence and associativity...



Dangling Else In Grammars

$$\begin{aligned} \langle stmt \rangle & ::= \langle if-stmt \rangle \mid s1 \mid s2 \\ \langle if-stmt \rangle & ::= \mathbf{if} \langle expr \rangle \mathbf{then} \langle stmt \rangle \mathbf{else} \langle stmt \rangle \\ & \quad \mid \mathbf{if} \langle expr \rangle \mathbf{then} \langle stmt \rangle \\ \langle expr \rangle & ::= e1 \mid e2 \end{aligned}$$

This grammar has a classic “dangling-else ambiguity.” The statement we want derive is

if e1 then if e2 then s1 else s2

and the next slide shows two different parse trees for it...



Most languages that have this problem choose this parse tree: **else** goes with nearest unmatched **then**

Eliminating The Ambiguity

$\langle stmt \rangle ::= \langle if-stmt \rangle \mid s1 \mid s2$
 $\langle if-stmt \rangle ::= \mathbf{if} \langle expr \rangle \mathbf{then} \langle stmt \rangle \mathbf{else} \langle stmt \rangle$
 $\quad \mid \mathbf{if} \langle expr \rangle \mathbf{then} \langle stmt \rangle$
 $\langle expr \rangle ::= e1 \mid e2$

We want to insist that **if** this expands into an **if**, that **if** must already have its own **else**. First, we make a new non-terminal $\langle full-stmt \rangle$ that generates everything $\langle stmt \rangle$ generates, except that it can not generate **if** statements with no **else**:

$\langle full-stmt \rangle ::= \langle full-if \rangle \mid s1 \mid s2$
 $\langle full-if \rangle ::= \mathbf{if} \langle expr \rangle \mathbf{then} \langle full-stmt \rangle \mathbf{else} \langle full-stmt \rangle$


Eliminating The Ambiguity

$\langle stmt \rangle ::= \langle if-stmt \rangle \mid s1 \mid s2$
 $\langle if-stmt \rangle ::= \mathbf{if} \langle expr \rangle \mathbf{then} \langle full-stmt \rangle \mathbf{else} \langle stmt \rangle$
 $\quad \mid \mathbf{if} \langle expr \rangle \mathbf{then} \langle stmt \rangle$
 $\langle expr \rangle ::= e1 \mid e2$

Then we use the new non-terminal here.

The effect is that the new grammar can match an **else** part with an **if** part only if all the nearer **if** parts are already matched.

Correct Parse Tree



Dangling Else

- We fixed the grammar, but...
- The grammar trouble reflects a problem with the language, which we did not change
- A chain of if-then-else constructs can be very hard for people to read
- Especially true if some but not all of the else parts are present

Practice

```
int a=0;  
if (0==0)  
    if (0==1) a=1;  
else a=2;
```

What is the value of **a** after
this fragment executes?

Clearer Styles

```
int a=0;
if (0==0)
    if (0==1) a=1;
    else a=2;
```

Better: correct indentation

```
int a=0;
if (0==0) {
    if (0==1) a=1;
    else a=2;
}
```

Even better: use of a block
reinforces the structure

Languages That Don't Dangle

- Some languages define **if-then-else** in a way that forces the programmer to be more clear
- Algol does not allow the **then** part to be another **if** statement – though it can be a block containing an **if** statement
- Ada requires each **if** statement to be terminated with an **end if**

Outline

- Operators
- Precedence
- Associativity
- Other ambiguities: dangling else
- Cluttered grammars
- Parse trees and EBNF
- Abstract syntax trees

Clutter

- The new if-then-else grammar is harder for people to read than the old one
- It has a lot of clutter: more productions and more non-terminals
- Same with G4, G5 and G6: we eliminated the ambiguity but made the grammar harder for people to read
- This is not always the right trade-off

Reminder: Multiple Audiences

- In Chapter 2 we saw that grammars have multiple audiences:
 - Novices want to find out what legal programs look like
 - Experts—advanced users and language system implementers—want an exact, detailed definition
 - Tools—parser and scanner generators—want an exact, detailed definition in a particular, machine-readable form
- Tools often need ambiguity eliminated, while people often prefer a more readable grammar

Options

- Rewrite grammar to eliminate ambiguity
- Leave ambiguity but explain in accompanying text how things like associativity, precedence, and the dangling else should be parsed
- Do both in separate grammars

Outline

- Operators
- Precedence
- Associativity
- Other ambiguities: dangling else
- Cluttered grammars
- Parse trees and EBNF
- Abstract syntax trees

EBNF and Parse Trees

- You know that $\{x\}$ means "zero or more repetitions of x " in EBNF
- So $\langle exp \rangle ::= \langle mulexp \rangle \{ + \langle mulexp \rangle \}$ should mean a $\langle mulexp \rangle$ followed by zero or more repetitions of " $+ \langle mulexp \rangle$ "
- But what then is the associativity of that $+$ operator? What kind of parse tree would be generated for $a+a+a$?

Two Camps

- Some people use EBNF loosely:
 - Use `{ }` anywhere it helps
 - Add a paragraph of text dealing with ambiguities, associativity of operators, etc.
- Other people use EBNF strictly:
 - Use `<exp> ::= <mulexp> { + <mulexp> }` only for left-associative operators
 - Use recursive rules for right-associative operators: `<expa> ::= <expb> [= <expa>]`

About Syntax Diagrams

- Similar problem: what parse tree is generated?
- As in loose EBNF applications, add a paragraph of text dealing with ambiguities, associativity, precedence, and so on

Outline


- Operators
- Precedence
- Associativity
- Other ambiguities: dangling else
- Cluttered grammars
- Parse trees and EBNF
- Abstract syntax trees

Full-Size Grammars

- In any realistically large language, there are many non-terminals
- Especially true when in the cluttered but unambiguous form needed by parsing tools
- Extra non-terminals guide construction of unique parse tree
- Once parse tree is found, such non-terminals are no longer of interest

Abstract Syntax Tree

- Language systems usually store an abbreviated version of the parse tree called the *abstract syntax tree*
- Details are implementation-dependent
- Usually, there is a node for every operation, with a subtree for every operand



Parsing, Revisited

- When a language system parses a program, it goes through all the steps necessary to find the parse tree
- But it usually does not construct an explicit representation of the parse tree in memory
- Most systems construct an AST instead
- We will see ASTs again in Chapter 23

Conclusion

- Grammars define syntax, *and more*
- They define not just a set of legal programs, but a parse tree for each program
- The structure of a parse tree corresponds to the order in which different parts of the program are to be executed
- Thus, grammars contribute (a little) to the definition of semantics