#### Syntax Directed Translation



## Role of SDT

- To associate actions with productions
- To associate attributes with non-terminals
- To create implicit or explicit syntax tree To
- perform semantic analysis

• ... essentially, to add life to the skeleton.

#### Example



# Syntax Directed Definition

- An SDD is a CFG with attributes and rules.
  - Attributes are associated with grammar symbols.
  - Rules are associated with productions.
- An SDD specifies the semantics of productions.
  - It does not enforce a specific way of achieving the semantics.

# Syntax Directed Translation

- An SDT is done by attaching rules or program fragments to productions.
- The order induced by the syntax analysis produces a translation of the input program.

## Attributes

- Inherited
  - In terms of the attributes of the node, its parent and siblings.
  - e.g., int x, y, z; or
     Ishu's nested scoping
- Synthesized
  - In terms of the attributes of the node and its children.
  - e.g., a + b \* c or most of the constructs from your assignments



#### **SDD** for Calculator



# Order of Evaluation

- If there are only synthesized attributes in the SDD, there exists an evaluation order.
- Any bottom-up order would do; for instance, post-order.
- Helpful for LR parsing.
- How about when the attributes are both synthesized as well as inherited?
- How about when the attributes are only inherited?



### Order of Evaluation

Production	Semantic Rule
$A \rightarrow B$	A.s = B.i; B.i = A.s + 1;

 This SDD uses a combination of synthesized and inherited attributes.

A.s

B.i

В

- A.s (head) is defined in terms of B.i (body nonterminal). Hence, it is synthesized.
- B.i (body non-terminal) is defined in terms of A.s (head). Hence, it is inherited.
- There exists a *circular dependency* between their evaluations.
- In practice, subclasses of SDDs required for our purpose do have an order.



#### Classwork

- Write semantic rules for the following grammar.
  - It computes terms like 3 \* 5 and 3 \* 5 \* 7.
  - Is \* left or right-associative? Can you make it left?
- Now write the annotated parse tree for 3 \* 5.

Sr. No.	Production	Semantic Rules
1	$T \rightarrow F T'$	T'.inh = F.val T.val = T'.syn
2	$T' \rightarrow * F T'_{1}$	T'inh = T'.inh * F.val T'.syn = T'syn
3	$T' \to \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$	T'.syn = T'.inh
4	$F \rightarrow digit$	F.val = <i>digit</i> .lexval

#### Classwork



Sr. No.	Production	Semantic Rules
1	$T \to F  T'$	T'.inh = F.val T.val = T'.syn
2	$T' \rightarrow * F T'_{1}$	$T'_{1}.inh = T'.inh * F.val$ $T'.syn = T'_{1}.syn$
3	$T' \to \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$	T'.syn = T'.inh
4	F  ightarrow digit	F.val = <i>digit</i> .lexval

#### Classwork



#### What is the order in which rules are evaluated?

Sr. No.	Production	Semantic Rules
1	$T \to F T'$	T'.inh = F.val T.val = T'.syn
2	$T' \rightarrow * F T'_{1}$	T'inh = T'.inh * F.val T'.syn = T'syn
3	$T' \to \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$	T'.syn = T'.inh
4	$F \to digit$	F.val = <i>digit</i> .lexval

#### **Dependency Graph**



- A dependency graph depicts the flow of information amongst attributes.
- An edge  $attr1 \rightarrow attr2$  means that the value of attr1 is needed to compute attr2.
- Thus, allowable evaluation orders are those sequences of rules N1, N2, ..., Nk such that if Ni → Nj, then i < j.</li>
  - What are such allowable orders?
  - Topological sort
  - What about cycles?

# Order of Evaluation

- If there are only synthesized attributes in the SDD, there exists an evaluation order.
- Any bottom-up order would do; for instance, post-order.
- Helpful for LR parsing.
- How about when the attributes are both synthesized as well as inherited?
- How about when the attributes are only inherited?



S-attributed

#### **SDD** for Calculator



### S-attributed SDD

- Every attribute is synthesized.
- A topological evaluation order is well-defined.
- Any bottom-up order of the parse tree nodes.
- In practice, preorder is used.

```
preorder(N) {
    for (each child C of N, from the left) preorder(C)
    evaluate attributes of N
}
```

# Issues with S-attributed SDD

- It is too strict!
- There exist reasonable non-cyclic orders that it disallows.
  - If a non-terminal uses attributes of its parent only (no sibling attributes)
  - If a non-terminal uses attributes of its left-siblings only (and not of right siblings).
- The rules may use information "from above" and "from left".

**L**-attributed

# L-attributed SDD

- Each attribute must be either
  - synthesized, or
  - inherited, but with restriction. For production  $A \rightarrow X1$ X2 ... Xn with inherited attributed Xi.a computed by an action; then the rule may use only
    - inherited attributes of A.
    - either inherited or synthesized attributes of X1, X2, ..., Xi-1.
    - inherited or synthesized attributes of Xi with no cyclic dependence.
- L is for left-to-right.

Have you seen any such SDD?

#### Example of L-attributed SDD

Sr. No.	Production	Semantic Rules
1	$T \rightarrow F T'$	T'.inh = F.val T.val = T'.syn
2	$T' \rightarrow * F T'_{1}$	T'.inh = T'.inh * F.val T'.syn = T' <sub>1</sub> .syn
3	$T' \to \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$	T'.syn = T'.inh
4	$F \to digit$	F.val = <i>digit</i> .lexval



## Example of non-L-attributed SDD

Production	Semantic rule
$A \rightarrow BC$	A.s = B.b; B.i = C.c + A.s

- First rule uses synthesized attributes.
- Second rule has inherited attributes.
- However, B's attribute is dependent on C's attribute, which is on the right.
- Hence, it is not L-attributed SDD.

$$S \rightarrow L \cdot L \mid L$$
$$L \rightarrow L \mid B \mid B$$
$$B \rightarrow 0 \mid 1$$

#### **Classwork:**

- What does this grammar generate?
- Design L-attributed SDD to compute S.val, the decimal value of an input string.
- For instance, 101.101 should output 5.625.
- Idea: Use an inherited attribute L.side that tells which side (left or right) of the decimal point a bit is on.

# **SDT** Applications

- Creating an explicit syntax tree.
  - -e.g., a -4 + c
    - $p1 = new Leaf(id_a);$
    - $p2 = new Leaf(num_4);$
    - p3 = new Op(p1, '-', p2);
    - $p4 = new Leaf(id_c);$
    - p5 = new Op(p3, '+', p4);



Production	Semantic Rules
$E \rightarrow E + T$	\$\$.node = new Op(\$1.node, '+', \$3.node)
$E \rightarrow E - T$	\$\$.node = new Op(\$1.node, '-', \$3.node)
$E \rightarrow T$	\$\$.node = \$1.node
$T \rightarrow (E)$	\$\$.node = \$2.node
$T \rightarrow id$	\$\$.node = new Leaf(\$1)
$T \rightarrow num$	\$\$.node = new Leaf(\$1)

# **SDT** Applications

- Creating an explicit syntax tree.
  - -e.g., a 4 + c
- Classwork:



-Generate syntax tree using the following grammar.

Production	Semantic Rules
$E \rightarrow T E'$	\$\$.node = \$2.syn \$2.inh = \$1.node
$E' \rightarrow + T E'_1$	\$3.inh = new Op(\$\$.inh, '+', \$2.node) \$\$.syn = \$3.syn
$E' \rightarrow - T E'_1$	\$3.inh = new Op(\$\$.inh, '-', \$2.node) \$\$.syn = \$3.syn
$E' \rightarrow \epsilon$	\$\$.syn = \$\$.inh
$T \rightarrow (E)$	\$\$.node = \$2.node
$T \rightarrow id$	\$\$.node = new Leaf(\$1)
$T \rightarrow num$	\$\$.node = new Leaf(\$1)

# **SDT** Applications

- Finding type expressions
  - int a[2][3] is array of 2 arrays of 3 integers.
  - in functional style: array(2, array(3, int))



**Classwork:** Write productions and semantic rules for creating type expressions from array declarations.

#### SDD for Calculator

Sr. No.	Production	Semantic Rules
1	$E' \rightarrow E$ \$	E'.val = E.val
2	$E \rightarrow E_1 + T$	$E.val = E_1.val + T.val$
3	$E \rightarrow T$	
4	$T \rightarrow T_1 * F$	
5	$T\toF$	
6	$F \to (E)$	
7	$F \rightarrow digit$	F.val = <i>digit</i> .lexval

#### **SDT** for Calculator

Sr. No.	Production	Semantic Rules
1	$E' \rightarrow E$ \$	print(E.val)
2	$E \rightarrow E_1 + T$	$E.val = E_1.val + T.val$
3	$E \rightarrow T$	
4	$T \rightarrow T_1 * F$	
5	$T\toF$	
6	$F \to (E)$	
7	$F \to digit$	F.val = <i>digit</i> .lexval

## **SDT** for Calculator



- SDTs with all the actions at the right ends of the production bodies are called *postfix SDTs*.
- Only synthesized attributes are useful here.
- Can be implemented during LR parsing by executing actions when reductions occur.
- The attribute values can be put on a stack and can be retrieved.

# **Parsing Stack**

#### $\mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{X} \, \mathsf{Y} \, \mathsf{Z}$

	Х	Y	Ζ	State / grammar symbol		
	X.x	Y.y	Z.z	Synthesized attribute		
			sta	ack top	Compare with \$1, \$2, in Yaco	
Production		Actio	ons			
$E' \rightarrow E$ \$		{ prir	{ print(stack[top - 1].val);top; }			
$E \rightarrow E_1 + T$		{ sta	{ stack[top - 2].val += stack[top].val; top -= 2; }			
$E \rightarrow T$		{ sta	<pre>{ stack[top].val = stack[top].val; }</pre>			
$T \rightarrow T_1 * F$		{ stack[top - 2].val *= stack[top].val; top -= 2; }				
$T \rightarrow F$		{ sta	ck[top]	.val = stac	k[top].val; }	
$F \to (E)$		{ sta	{ stack[top - 2].val = stack[top - 1].val; top -= 2; }			
$F \rightarrow digit$		{ sta	ck[top]	.val = stac	k[top].val; }	28

## **Actions within Productions**

- Actions may be placed at any position within production body. Considered as empty non-terminals called *markers*.
- For production  $B \rightarrow X$  {action} Y, action is performed
  - as soon as X appears on top of the parsing stack in bottom-up parsing.
  - just before expanding Y in top-down parsing if Y is a nonterminal.
  - just before we check for Y on the input in top-down parsing if Y is a terminal.
- SDTs that can be implemented during parsing are
  - Postfix SDTs (S-attributed definitions)
  - SDTs implementing L-attributed definitions

**Classwork:** Write SDT for infix-to-prefix translation.

#### Infix-to-Prefix

- What is the issue with this SDT?
- The SDT has shift-reduce conflicts.
- Recall that each marker is an empty non-terminal. Thus, the parser doesn't know whether to shift or shift or reduce on seeing a digit.

```
\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{E}' \to \mathsf{E} \ \$ \\ \mathsf{E} \to \{ \ \mathsf{print} \ '+'; \ \rbrace \ \mathsf{E1} + \mathsf{T} \\ \mathsf{E} \to \mathsf{T} \\ \mathsf{T} \to \mathsf{T} \\ \mathsf{T} \to \{ \ \mathsf{print} \ '*'; \ \rbrace \ \mathsf{T1} \ * \mathsf{F} \\ \mathsf{T} \to \mathsf{F} \\ \mathsf{F} \to \mathsf{(E)} \\ \mathsf{F} \to \mathsf{digit} \ \{ \ \mathsf{print} \ \mathsf{digit.lexval;} \ \} \end{array}
```

# **Code Generation for**

- We want to generate code for while-construct  $-S \rightarrow$  while ( C ) S<sub>1</sub>
- We assume that code for  $S_1$  and C are available.
- We also (for now) generate a single code string.
- Classwork: What all do we require to generate this code?
  - -This would give us an idea of what attributes we need and their types.



# Code Generation for while

- Assume we have the following mechanism.
  - newLabel() returns a new label name.

You may have used a similar one for temporaries.

- Each statement has an attribute next, that points to the next statement to be executed.
- Each conditional has two branches true and false.
- Each non-terminal has an attribute code.



#### SDT

$$\begin{split} S &\rightarrow & \text{while } \left( \begin{array}{c} \{ \text{L1} = \text{newLabel()}; \text{L2} = \text{newLabel()}; \text{C. false} = \text{S.next; C.true} = \text{L2; } \} \\ C \right) & \{ \text{S}_1.\text{next} = \text{L2; } \} \\ S_1 & \{ \text{S.code} = \text{``label''} + \text{L1} + \text{C.code} + \text{``label''} + \text{L2} + \text{S}_1.\text{code; } \} \end{split}$$

#### What is the type of this SDD?



$$\begin{split} S & \rightarrow & \text{while } ( & \{ \text{L1} = \text{newLabel()}; \text{L2} = \text{newLabel()}; \text{C. false} = \text{S.next; C.true} = \text{L2}; \\ & \text{print("label", L1); } \} & \\ & C \text{ } ) & \{ \text{S}_1.\text{next} = \text{L2}; \text{print("label", L2); } \} & & \text{On-the-fly} \\ & \text{S}_1 & & \text{generation} \end{split}$$

#### What is the type of this SDD?

#### Homework

• Exercises 5.5.5 from ALSU book.