Programming languages are used to specify computations – that is, computations are the meaning/semantics of programs.



• Chap 3 in MPL

Consider the simple language of expressions:

G: <Exp>* ::= <Exp> + <Exp> | <Exp> * <Exp> | a | b | c

When we write the sentence a + b we can build the parse tree:



We can say that this parse tree *represents* the computation a + b.

If we let a and b be variables, then the parse tree gives us a procedure to compute a + b by starting at the leaves of the tree: (1) lookup the values of the variables (2) pass the values up along the parse tree branches (3) use the values to compute the value of the + operator.

Now consider the sentence a + b * c, for this sentence we can construct two parse trees:



Even though both parse trees derive the same terminal string, the computations they represent are very different:

- (1) left tree first compute the product, then the addition
- (2) right tree first compute the addition, then the product

Since we had written the original sentence without parentheses the left parse tree represents the intended computation according to algebraic conventions.

However, from a machine point of view, there is no way of knowing which parse tree to pick...

...we need additional information: operator precedence

Operator precedence means that some operators bind tighter than others, e.g. * binds tighter than +.

We can build operator precedence right into our grammar ("precedence climbing"):

```
G': <AddExp>*::= <AddExp> + <AddExp>
| <MulExp>
<MulExp> ::= <MulExp> * <MulExp>
| a | b | c
```

Let's try our problematic sentence a + b * c, only one parse tree is possible:



This is the only parse tree we can build, therefore, the grammar G' is not ambiguous.

However, our new grammar still has a problem, consider the sentence a+b+c; here we have two possible parse trees:



- Again, our grammar is ambiguous because the computation specified by the sentence a+b+c can be represented by two different parse trees.
- We need more information!
- There is one more algebraic property we have not yet explored <u>associativity</u>
- Most algebraic operators, including the + operator, are leftassociative.
- We can rewrite our grammar to take advantage of this additional information:

```
G": <E>* ::= <E> + <T> | <T>
<T> ::= <T> * <P> | <P>
<P> ::= a | b | c
```

Let's try our sentence a+b+c again with grammar G'':



There is no other way to derive this string from the grammar and thus the grammar is not ambiguous.

Take Away

- Grammars can be ambiguous in the sense that a derived string can have multiple distinct parse trees.
- By taking additional information such as associativity and precedence about the operators of a language into account we can construct grammars that are not ambiguous.

Given the following grammar,

```
G": <E>* ::= <E> + <T> | <T>
<T> ::= <T> * <P> | <P>
<P> ::= a | b | c
```

Add productions to the grammar that define the right-associative operator = at a lower precedence than any of the other operators.

This new operator should allow you to write expressions such as

a = b a = b = c a = b = b + c

a) Show that the following grammar is ambiguous.

```
G: <S> ::= <S> <S>
| ( <S> )
| ()
```

b) Rewrite the above grammar so that it is no longer ambiguous.

Class Exercise

- Let L(G) be the set of all strings that start with an a followed by zero or more b's and end with the character c. Design grammar G.
- Given the following grammar Q:
 Q: <A>* ::= <A> @ <A>
 - What are some of the strings in L(Q)?

 \star

Show that Q is ambiguous.

Assignment

