Building a Parser I

CS164
3:30-5:00 TT
10 Evans

Recall: The Structure of a Compiler



Recall: Syntactic Analysis

- **Input:** sequence of tokens from scanner
- **Output:** abstract syntax tree
- Actually,
  - parser first builds a parse tree
  - AST is then built by translating the parse tree
  - parse tree rarely built explicitly; only determined by, say, how parser pushes stuff to stack
  - our lectures first focus on constructing the parse tree; later we'll show the translation to AST.

Example

- Decaf

  4*(2+3)

- Parser input

  NUM(4) TIMES LPAR NUM(2) PLUS NUM(3) RPAR

- Parser output (AST):



Parse tree for the example



leaves are tokens

Another example

- Decaf

```
if (x == y) { a=1; }
```

- Parser input

IF LPAR ID EQ ID RPAR LBR ID AS INT SEMI RBR

- Parser output (AST):



Parse tree for the example



leaves are tokens

Parse tree vs. abstract syntax tree

- Parse tree
  - contains all tokens, including those that parser needs "only" to discover
    - intended nesting: parentheses, curly braces
    - statement termination: semicolons
  - technically, parse tree shows concrete syntax
- Abstract syntax tree (AST)
  - abstracts away artifacts of parsing, by flattening tree hierarchies, dropping tokens, etc.
  - technically, AST shows abstract syntax

Comparison with Lexical Analysis

Phase	*Input*	*Output*
Lexer	Sequence of characters	Sequence of tokens
Parser	Sequence of tokens	AST, built from parse tree

Summary

- Parser performs two tasks:
  - syntax checking
    - a program with a syntax error may produce an AST that's different than intended by the programmer
  - parse tree construction
    - usually implicit
    - used to build the AST

First example: balanced parens

- Our problem: check the syntax
  - are parentheses in input string balanced?
- The simple language
  - parenthesized number literals
  - Ex.: 3, (4), ((1)), (((2))), etc

- Before we look at the parser
  - why aren't finite automata sufficient for this task?

Why can't DFA/NFA's find syntax errors?

- When checking balanced parentheses, FA's can either
  - accept all correct (i.e., balanced) programs but also some incorrect ones, or
  - reject all incorrect programs but also reject some correct ones.
- Problem: finite state
  - can't count parens seen so far





Parser code preliminaries

- Let TOKEN be an enumeration type of tokens:
  - INT, OPEN, CLOSE, PLUS, TIMES, NUM, LPAR, RPAR
- Let the global in[] be the input string of tokens
- Let the global next be an index in the token string

Parsers use stack to implement infinite state

Balanced parentheses parser:

```
void Parse() {
   nextToken = in[next++];
   if (nextToken == NUM) return;

   if (nextToken != LPAR)  print("syntax error");
   Parse();
   if (in[next++] != RPAR) print("syntax error");
}
```

Where's the parse tree constructed?

- In this parser, the parse is given by the call tree:
- For the input string (((1))) :



Second example: subtraction expressions

The language of this example:

1, 1-2, 1-2-3, (1-2)-3, (2-(3-4)), etc

```
void Parse() {
    if (in[++next] == NUM) {
        if (in[++next] == MINUS)  { Parse(); }
    } else if (in[next] == LPAR) {
        Parse();
        if (in[++next] != RPAR) print("syntax error");
    } else print("syntax error");
}
```

Subtraction expressions continued

- Observations:
  - a more complex language
    - hence, harder to see how the parser works (and if it works correctly at all)
  - the parse tree is actually not really what we want
    - consider input 3-2-1
    - what's undesirable about this parse tree's structure?