Comp 411 Principles of Programming Languages Lecture 2 Syntax

Corky Cartwright August 24, 2011



Syntax: The Boring Part of Programming Languages

- Programs are represented by sequences of symbols.
- These symbols are represented as sequences of characters that can be typed on a keyboard (ASCII).
- What about Unicode?
- To analyze or execute the programs written in a language, we must translate the ASCII representation for a program to a higher-level tree representation. This process, called *parsing*, conveniently breaks into two parts:
 - lexical analysis, and
 - context-free parsing (often simply called parsing).



Lexical Analysis

- Consider this sequence of characters: begin middle end
- What are the smallest meaningful pieces of syntax in this phrase?
- The process of converting a character stream into a corresponding sequence of meaningful symbols (called *tokens* or *lexemes*) is called *tokenizing*, *lexing* or *lexical* analysis. A program that performs this process is called a *tokenizer*, *lexer*, or *scanner*.

```
    In Scheme, we tokenize (set! x (+ x 1)) as
    ( set! x (+ x 1 ) )
```

• Similarly, in Java, we tokenize

```
System.out.println("Hello World!"); as
```

System . out . println ("Hello World!") ;

Lexical Analysis, cont.

- Tokenizing is straightforward for most languages because it can be performed by a finite automaton [regular grammar] (Fortran is an exception!).
 - The rules governing this process are (a very boring) part of the language definition.
- Parsing a stream of tokens into structural description of a program (typically a tree) is harder.



Parsing

- Consider the Java statement: x = x + 1; where x is an int variable.
- The grammar for Java stipulates (among other things):
 - The assignment operator = may be preceded by an identifier and must be followed by an expression.
 - An expression may be two expressions separated by a binary operator, such as +.
 - An assignment expression can serve as a statement if it is followed by the terminator symbol;.

Given all of the rules of this grammar, we can deduce that the sequence of characters (tokens)

$$x = x + 1;$$

is a legal program statement.



Parsing Token Streams into Trees

• Consider the following ways to express an assignment operation:

```
x = x + 1

x := x + 1

(set! x (+ x 1))
```

- Which of these do you prefer?
- It should not matter very much.
- To eliminate the irrelevant syntactic details, we can create a data representation that formulates program syntax as trees. For instance, the abstract syntax for the assignment code given above could be

```
(make-assignment <Rep of x> <Rep of x+ 1>)
```

• or
new Assignment(<Rep of x> , <Rep of x + 1>)



A Simple Example

```
Exp ::= Num | Var | (Exp Exp) | (lambda Var Exp)
```

Num is the set of numeric constants (given in the lexer specification)

Var is the set of variable names (given in the lexer specification)

• To represent this syntax as trees (abstract syntax) in Scheme

app represents a function application
proc represents a function definition

In Java, we represent the same data definition using the composite pattern. In Scala, there is a special form of class (called a variant) for representing functional data.

Top Down (Predictive) Parsing

Idea: design the grammar so that we can always tell what rule to use next starting from the root of the parse tree by looking ahead some small number [k] of tokens (formalized as LL(k) parsing).

Can easily be implemented by hand by writing one recursive procedure for each syntactic category (non-terminal symbol). The code in each procedure matches the token pattern of the right hand side of the rule for that procedure against the token stream. This approach to writing a parser is called *recursive descent*.

Conceptual aid: syntax diagrams to express context free grammars.

Recursive descent and syntax diagrams are discussed in next lecture.

