

# LL(k)\*

CWoo<sup>†</sup>

2013-03-22 3:02:29

Given a word  $u$  and a context-free grammar  $G$ , how do we determine if  $u \in L(G)$ ?

There are in general two ways to proceed. Start from  $u$ , and proceed backward to find  $v$  such that  $v \Rightarrow u$ . Keep going until a derivation  $\sigma \Rightarrow^* u$  is found. This procedure is known as the bottom-up parsing of  $u$ . The other method the top-down approach: begin with the starting symbol  $\sigma$ , and work its way down to  $u$ , so  $\sigma \Rightarrow^* u$ .

As with the bottom-up approach, finding a derivation of  $u$  from the top-down may be time consuming, if one is lucky enough to find a derivation at all.

There is a class of grammars, known as the  $LL(k)$  grammars, which make the top-down parsing of a word natural and direct. The first  $L$  in  $LL(k)$  means scanning the symbols of  $u$  from left to right, the second  $L$  stands for finding a leftmost derivation ( $\Rightarrow_L$ ) for  $u$ , and  $k$  means having the allowance to look at up to  $k$  symbols ahead while scanning.

**Definition.** Let  $G = (\Sigma, N, P, \sigma)$  be a context-free grammar such that  $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma$  is not a production of  $G$ , and  $k \geq 0$  an integer. Suppose  $u \in L(G)$  with a  $X \rightarrow U_1$  a production in a leftmost derivation of  $u$ :

$$\sigma \Rightarrow_L^* UXU_2 \Rightarrow_L UU_1U_2 \Rightarrow_L^* u.$$

Let  $n = |U| + k$  and  $v$  be the prefix of  $u$  of length  $n$  (if  $|u| < n$ , then set  $v = u$ ).

Then  $G$  is said to be  $LL(k)$  if for any  $w \in L(G)$ , with  $v$  as a prefix, such that there is a production  $X \rightarrow W_1$  in a leftmost derivation of  $w$ :

$$\sigma \Rightarrow_L^* UXW_2 \Rightarrow_L UW_1W_2 \Rightarrow_L^* w,$$

implies that  $W_1 = U_1$ .

In a leftmost derivation  $D_u$  of a word  $u$ , call a prefix  $v$  of  $u$  is a *leftmost descendant* of a production  $P \rightarrow U$  if  $\sigma \Rightarrow^* vPU' \Rightarrow vUU' \Rightarrow^* u$  is  $D_u$ . Then the definition above can be restated in words as follows:

---

\* $\langle LLk \rangle$  created:  $\langle 2013-03-2 \rangle$  by:  $\langle CWoo \rangle$  version:  $\langle 41885 \rangle$  Privacy setting:  $\langle 1 \rangle$   
 $\langle Definition \rangle$   $\langle 68Q05 \rangle$   $\langle 68Q42 \rangle$   $\langle 03D10 \rangle$

<sup>†</sup>This text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution/Share-Alike License 3.0. You can reuse this document or portions thereof only if you do so under terms that are compatible with the CC-BY-SA license.

Given a leftmost derivation  $D_u$  of a word  $u$ , a production used in  $D_u$  is uniquely determined up to  $k$  symbols beyond the prefix of  $u$  which is a leftmost descendant of the production. In other words, if  $D_u$  and  $D_w$  are leftmost derivations of  $u$  and  $w$  which agree on  $k$  symbols beyond the common prefix  $v$ , where  $v$  is both a leftmost descendant of  $X \rightarrow U$  used in  $D_u$ , and a leftmost descendant of  $X \rightarrow W$  used in  $D_w$ , then  $X \rightarrow U$  and  $X \rightarrow W$  are the same production, i.e.  $U = W$ .

Every  $LL(k)$  is unambiguous. Furthermore, every  $LL(k)$  grammar is  $LR(k)$ .

Given a context-free grammar  $G$  and  $k \geq 0$ , there is an algorithm deciding whether  $G$  is  $LL(k)$ .

### Examples

- The grammar  $G$  over  $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$ , with productions  $\sigma \rightarrow a^2\sigma b^2$ ,  $\sigma \rightarrow a$  and  $\sigma \rightarrow \lambda$  is  $LL(2)$  but not  $LL(1)$ . It is not hard to see that  $L(G)$  is the set  $\{a^m b^n \mid n \text{ is even, and } n \leq m \leq n + 1\}$ . On the other hand, the grammar  $G'$  over  $\Sigma$ , with productions

$$\sigma \rightarrow aX, \quad \sigma \rightarrow \lambda, \quad X \rightarrow aYb, \quad X \rightarrow \lambda, \quad Y \rightarrow aXb, \quad Y \rightarrow b$$

also generates  $L(G)$ , but is  $LL(1)$  instead.

- The grammar  $G$  over  $\{a, b, c\}$ , with productions

$$\sigma \rightarrow X, \quad \sigma \rightarrow Y, \quad X \rightarrow aXb, \quad X \rightarrow ab, \quad Y \rightarrow aYc, \quad Y \rightarrow ac$$

is not  $LL(k)$  for any  $k \geq 0$ .

**Definition** A language is said to be  $LL(k)$  if it is generated by an  $LL(k)$  grammar. The family of  $LL(k)$  languages is denoted by  $\mathcal{LL}(k)$ .

It is easy to see that an  $LL(0)$  contains no more than one word. Furthermore, it can be shown that

$$\mathcal{LL}(0) \subset \mathcal{LL}(1) \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{LL}(k) \subset \dots,$$

and the inclusion is strict. If  $\mathcal{LL}(k)'$  denotes the family of  $\lambda$ -free  $LL(k)$  languages, then

$$\mathcal{LL}(0)' = \mathcal{LL}(1)' = \dots = \mathcal{LL}(k)' = \dots.$$

Given two  $LL(k)$  grammars  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , there is an algorithm that decides if  $L(G_1) = L(G_2)$ .

## References

- [1] A. Salomaa, *Formal Languages*, Academic Press, New York (1973).