# LL(1) predictive parsing

## Informatics 2A: Lecture 10

Alex Simpson

School of Informatics
University of Edinburgh
als@staffmail.ed.ac.uk

9 October, 2012

# LL(1) grammars: the intuition

Think about a (one-state) NPDA derived from a CFG $\mathcal{G}$.

Intuition: at each step, our NPDA can 'see' two things:

- the current input symbol
- the topmost stack symbol

Roughly speaking, we say $\mathcal{G}$ is an LL(1) grammar if, just from this information, it's possible to determine which transition/production to apply next. (Precise definition later!) If this is so, parsing can proceed deterministically and efficiently.

Here LL(1) means 'read input from Left, build Leftmost derivation, look just one symbol ahead'.

Subtle point: we can use the input symbol to help us choose a transition, even if this transition doesn't consume that input symbol. . . hence 'look ahead'.

# Parse tables

Saying the current input symbol and stack symbol uniquely determine the production means we can draw up a two-dimensional parse table telling us which production to apply in any situation.

Consider e.g. the following grammar for well-bracketed sequences:

$$S \rightarrow \epsilon \mid TS \qquad T \rightarrow (S)$$

This has the following parse table:

| | ( | ) | \$ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $S$ | $S \rightarrow TS$ | $S \rightarrow \epsilon$ | $S \rightarrow \epsilon$ |
| $T$ | $T \rightarrow (S)$ | | |

- Columns are labelled by terminals, which are the input symbols. We include an extra column for an 'end-of-input' marker \$.
- Rows are labelled by nonterminals. If the current stack symbol is a terminal, just match it against current input symbol.
- Blank entries correspond to situations that can never arise in processing a legal input string.

# Predictive parsing with parse tables

Given such a parse table, parsing can be done very efficiently using a stack. The stack (reading downwards) records the predicted sentential form for the remaining part of the input.

- Begin with just start symbol $S$ on the stack.
- If current input symbol is $a$ (maybe \$), and current stack symbol is a non-terminal $X$, look up rule for $a, X$ in table. [Error if no rule.] If rule is $X \to \beta$, pop $X$ and replace with $\beta$ (pushed right-end-first!)
- If current input symbol is $a$ and stack symbol is $a$, just pop $a$ from stack and advance input read position. [Error if stack symbol is any other terminal.]
- Accept if stack empties with \$ as input symbol. [Error if stack empties sooner.]

# Example of predictive parsing

| | ( | ) | $ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $S$ | $S \rightarrow TS$ | $S \rightarrow \epsilon$ | $S \rightarrow \epsilon$ |
| $T$ | $T \rightarrow (S)$ | | |

Let's use this table to parse the input string (()).

| Operation | Remaining input | Stack state |
|---|---|---|
| | (())$ | $S$ |
| Lookup (, $S$ | (())$ | $TS$ |
| Lookup (, $T$ | (())$ | $(S)S$ |
| Match ( | ())$ | $S)S$ |
| Lookup (, $S$ | ())$ | $TS)S$ |
| Lookup (, $T$ | ())$ | $(S)S)S$ |
| Match ( | ))$ | $S)S)S$ |
| Lookup ), $S$ | ))$ | $)S)S$ |
| Match ) | )$ | $S)S$ |
| Lookup ), $S$ | )$ | $)S$ |
| Match ) | $ | $S$ |
| Lookup $, $S$ | $ | empty stack |

(Also easy to build a syntax tree as we go along!)

# Clicker questions

| | ( | ) | $ |
|---|---|---|---|
| $S$ | $S \rightarrow TS$ | $S \rightarrow \epsilon$ | $S \rightarrow \epsilon$ |
| $T$ | $T \rightarrow (S)$ | | |

For each of the following two input strings:

)　　　　　(

what will go wrong when we try to apply the predictive parsing algorithm?

1. Blank entry in table encountered
2. Input symbol (or end marker) doesn't match expected symbol
3. Stack empties before end of string reached

# Further remarks

Slogan: the parse table entry for $a, X$ tells us which rule to apply if we're expecting an $X$ and see an $a$.

- Often, the $a$ will be simply the first symbol of the $X$-subphrase in question.
- But not always: maybe the $X$-subphrase in question is $\epsilon$, and the $a$ belongs to whatever follows the $X$.

  E.g. in the lookups for $), S$ on the previous slide, the $S$ in question turns out to be empty.

Once we've got a parse table for a given grammar $\mathcal{G}$, we can parse strings of length $n$ in $O(n)$ time (and $O(n)$ space).

Our algorithm is an example of a top-down predictive parser: it works by 'predicting' the form of the remainder of the input, and builds syntax trees a top-down way (i.e. starting from the root). There are other parsers (e.g. LR(1)) that work 'bottom up'.

# LL(1) grammars: formal definition

Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is a CFG containing no 'useless' nonterminals, i.e.

- every nonterminal appears in some sentential form derived from the start symbol;
- every nonterminal can be expanded to some (possibly empty) string of terminals.

We say $\mathcal{G}$ is LL(1) if for each terminal $a$ and nonterminal $X$, there is some production $X \to \alpha$ with the following property:

> *If $b_1 \ldots b_n X \gamma$ is a sentential form appearing in a leftmost derivation of some string $b_1 \ldots b_n a c_1 \ldots c_m$ $(n, m \geq 0)$, the next sentential form appearing in the derivation is necessarily $b_1 \ldots b_n \alpha \gamma$.*

(Note that if $a, X$ corresponds to a 'blank entry' in the table, *any* production $X \to \alpha$ will satisfy this property, because a sentential form $b_1 \ldots b_n X \gamma$ can't arise.)

# Non-LL(1) grammars

Roughly speaking, a grammar is by definition LL(1) if and only if there's a parse table for it. Not all CFGs have this property!

Consider e.g. a different grammar for the same language of well-bracketed sequences:

$$S \rightarrow \epsilon \mid (S) \mid SS$$

Suppose we'd set up our initial stack with S, and we see the input symbol (. What rule should we apply?

- If the input string is (()), should apply $S \rightarrow (S)$.
- If the input string is ()(), should apply $S \rightarrow SS$. We can't tell without looking further ahead.

Put another way: if we tried to build a parse table for this grammar, the two rules $S \rightarrow (S)$ and $S \rightarrow SS$ would be competing for the slot $(, S$. So this grammar is not LL(1).

# Remaining issues

Easy to see from the definition that any LL(1) grammar will be unambiguous: never have two syntax trees for the same string.

- For computer languages, this is fine: normally want to avoid ambiguity anyway.
- For natural languages, ambiguity is a fact of life! So LL(1) grammars are normally inappropriate.

Two outstanding questions. . .

- How can we tell if a grammar is LL(1) — and if it is, how can we construct a parse table? (See Lecture 11.)
- If a grammar isn't LL(1), is there any hope of replacing it by an equivalent one that is? (See Lecture 12.)

# Reading and prospectus

Relevant reading:

- Some lecture notes from a previous year (covering the same material but with different examples) are available via the course website.
- See also Aho, Sethi and Ullman, *Compilers: Principles, Techniques, Tools*, Section 4.4.