### Introduction

LALR Parsing Constructing Canonical LR(1) Parsing Tables

### LALR Parsing

- Canonical sets of LR(1) items
- Number of states much larger than in the SLR construction
- LR(1) = Order of thousands for a standard prog. Lang.
- SLR(1) = order of hundreds for a standard prog. Lang.
- LALR(1) (lookahead-LR)
- A tradeoff:
  - Collapse states of the LR(1) table that have the same core (the "LR(0)" part of each state)
  - LALR never introduces a Shift/Reduce Conflict if LR(1) doesn't.
  - It might introduce a Reduce/Reduce Conflict (that did not exist in the LR(1))...
  - Still much better than SLR(1) (larger set of languages)
  - ... but smaller than LR(1)
- What Yacc and most compilers employ.

#### Conflict Example

 $I_0: S \rightarrow .S$  $I_1: S' \to S.$   $I_6: S \to L=.R$  $S \rightarrow L=R$  $I_9: S \rightarrow L=R.$  $S \rightarrow R$  $S \rightarrow .L = R$  $R \rightarrow .L$  $S \rightarrow R$  $L \rightarrow R$  $L \rightarrow {}^{*}R$  $I_2:S \rightarrow L.=R$  $L \rightarrow .*R$  $L \rightarrow id$  $\mathsf{R} \to \mathsf{L}$ .  $L \rightarrow .id$  $L \rightarrow .id$  $R \rightarrow L$  $I_3: S \rightarrow R.$  $R \rightarrow .L$ 

$\checkmark$	$I_4: L \to *. R \qquad I_7: L \to * R.$		
Problem	$R \rightarrow .L$		
$FOLLOW(R) = \{=, \$\}$	$L \rightarrow .^*R$	I <sub>8</sub> :	$R \rightarrow L.$
= shift 6	$L \rightarrow .id$		
reduce by $R \rightarrow L$			
shift/reduce conflict	$I_5: L \rightarrow id.$		

## Conflict Example2



ProblemFQLLOW(A)={a,b}FOLLOW(B)={a,b}areduce by  $A \rightarrow \varepsilon$ reduce by  $B \rightarrow \varepsilon$ reduce value by  $B \rightarrow \varepsilon$ reduce/reduce conflict



b reduce by  $A \rightarrow \epsilon$ reduce by  $B \rightarrow \epsilon$ reduce/reduce conflict

# Constructing Canonical LR(1) Parsing Tables

- In SLR method, the state i makes a reduction by  $A \rightarrow \alpha$  when the current token is a:
  - if the  $A \rightarrow \alpha$ . in the I<sub>i</sub> and a is FOLLOW(A)
- In some situations,  $\beta A$  cannot be followed by the terminal a in a right-sentential form when  $\beta \alpha$  and the state i are on the top stack. This means that making reduction in this case is not correct.



## LR(1) Item

- To avoid some of invalid reductions, the states need to carry more information.
- Extra information is put into a state by including a terminal symbol as a second component in an item.
- A LR(1) item is: A  $\rightarrow \alpha \cdot \beta_{,a}$

the LR(1) item

where a is the look-head of

(a is a terminal or end-

marker.)

## LR(1) Item (cont.)

- When  $\beta$  (in the LR(1) item A  $\rightarrow \alpha$ . $\beta$ ,a) is not empty, the look-head does not have any affect.
- When  $\beta$  is empty (A  $\rightarrow \alpha$ , a), we do the reduction by A $\rightarrow \alpha$  only if the next input symbol is **a** (not for any terminal in FOLLOW(A)).
- A state will contain  $A \rightarrow \alpha \cdot a_1$  where  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \subseteq FOLLOW(A)$

 $A \rightarrow \alpha$ ., $a_n$ 

#### Canonical Collection of Sets of LR(1) Items

 The construction of the canonical collection of the sets of LR(1) items are similar to the construction of the canonical collection of the sets of LR(0) items, except that *closure* and *goto* operations work a little bit different.

#### closure(I) is: (where I is a set of LR(1) items)

- every LR(1) item in I is in closure(I)
- if  $A \rightarrow \alpha \cdot B\beta$ , a in closure(I) and  $B \rightarrow \gamma$  is a production rule of G; then  $B \rightarrow \cdot \gamma$ , b will be in the closure(I) for each terminal b in FIRST( $\beta$ a).

#### goto operation

 If I is a set of LR(1) items and X is a grammar symbol (terminal or non-terminal), then goto(I,X) is defined as follows:

• If  $A \rightarrow \alpha.X\beta$ ,a in I then every item in **closure({A \rightarrow \alpha X.\beta,a})** will be in goto(I,X).