

Parsing

Homework 5 (CYK, Shift Reduce), due 02 June 2020 (Tuesday)

Laura Kallmeyer

SS 2020, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf

Question 1 (CYK with dotted productions)

Consider the CFG with non-terminals S, T, C , terminals a, b, c , start symbol S and productions $S \rightarrow aT \mid abC$, $T \rightarrow bC$, $C \rightarrow c$.

Give the chart (the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ -table) that results from CYK parsing with dotted productions for the input $w = abc$ using

1. the deduction rules from slide 30 (CYK slides)
2. the deduction rules from slide 31 (left-corner prediction, CYK slides)

Keep in mind that these items use start and end indices for spans, not start index and length (in this respect, the ex. on slide 32 is actually wrong).

Solution:

	3	$S \rightarrow abC\bullet, S \rightarrow aT\bullet$	$T \rightarrow bC\bullet$	$C \rightarrow c\bullet$	$S \rightarrow \bullet aT, S \rightarrow \bullet abC$ $T \rightarrow \bullet bC, C \rightarrow \bullet c$
	2	$S \rightarrow ab\bullet C$	$T \rightarrow b\bullet C$	$S \rightarrow \bullet aT, S \rightarrow \bullet abC$ $T \rightarrow \bullet bC, C \rightarrow \bullet c$	
1.	1	$S \rightarrow a\bullet T, S \rightarrow a\bullet bC$	$S \rightarrow \bullet aT, S \rightarrow \bullet abC$ $T \rightarrow \bullet bC, C \rightarrow \bullet c$		
	0	$S \rightarrow \bullet aT, S \rightarrow \bullet abC$ $T \rightarrow \bullet bC, C \rightarrow \bullet c$			
		0	1	2	3

	3	$S \rightarrow abC\bullet, S \rightarrow aT\bullet, S$	$T \rightarrow bC\bullet, T$	$c, C \rightarrow c\bullet, C$	
	2	$S \rightarrow ab\bullet C$	$b, T \rightarrow b\bullet C$		
2.	1	$a, S \rightarrow a\bullet T, S \rightarrow a\bullet bC$			
	0				
		0	1	2	3

Question 2 (Shift reduce parsing)

Consider the same CFG and the same input ($w = abc$) as in the preceding exercise.

1. Perform a shift-reduce parsing for this input. List the different parser configurations in a table as follows:

stack	remaining input	production (in case of reduce)
ε	abc	–
a	bc	–

All possibilities must be listed.

2. Explain why shift reduce parsing for this grammar is not deterministic. More concretely, at which point do we encounter a reduce-reduce conflict?

Solution:

	stack	remaining input	production (in case of reduce)
	ε	abc	–
	a	bc	–
1.	ab	c	–
	abc	ε	–
	abC	ε	$C \rightarrow c$
	aT	ε	$T \rightarrow bC$
	S	ε	$S \rightarrow aT, S \rightarrow abC$

2. The configuration $abC \ \varepsilon$ allows for two different reduce options, either with $T \rightarrow bC$ or with $S \rightarrow abC$.