

# Constrained Decoding for Code Language Models via Efficient Left and Right Quotienting of Context-Sensitive Grammars

DANIEL MELCER\*, Northeastern University, USA  
 NATHAN FULTON, AWS AI Labs, USA  
 SANJAY KRISHNA GOUDA, AWS AI Labs, USA  
 HAIFENG QIAN, AWS AI Labs, USA

Large Language Models are powerful tools for program synthesis and advanced auto-completion, but come with no guarantee that their output code is syntactically correct. This paper contributes an incremental parser that allows early rejection of syntactically incorrect code, as well as efficient detection of complete programs for fill-in-the-middle (FitM) tasks. We develop Earley-style parsers that operate over left and right quotients of arbitrary context-free grammars, and we extend our incremental parsing and quotient operations to several context-sensitive features present in the grammars of many common programming languages. The result of these contributions is an efficient, general, and well-grounded method for left and right quotient parsing.

To validate our theoretical contributions—and the practical effectiveness of certain design decisions—we evaluate our method on the particularly difficult case of FitM completion for Python 3. Our results demonstrate that constrained generation can significantly reduce the incidence of syntax errors in recommended code.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Motivating Example: AI-Assisted Coding

In recent years, several AI-assisted code generation tools have been released, such as Amazon CodeWhisperer [Amazon Web Services 2023] and GitHub Copilot [Github 2023]. These models take advantage of powerful Large Language Models (LLMs), such as the series of GPT models developed by OpenAI [Brown et al. 2020; Radford et al. 2018, 2019]. While projects such as Starcoder [Li et al. 2023] and OpenAI Codex [Chen et al. 2021] have trained and fine-tuned these models on large code datasets such as The Stack [Kocetkov et al. 2022], these models ignore the inherent syntactic structure of code. Despite this, language models often perform well in code generation tasks [Chen et al. 2021; Li et al. 2023].

These AI-assisted code generation systems are typically presented as an IDE plugin. While the user is editing a code file, they may activate the code completion tool or it may automatically activate after every action, depending on the configuration. When activated, the current cursor position, termed the *insertion point*, splits the existing code into a *left context* and *right context*.

The left and right contexts are *tokenized* to obtain a sequence of LLM tokens. A LLM token often corresponds to a sequence of one or more text characters; i.e. the right parentheses character, or the keyword “def”. Some characters, especially those in East Asian alphabets, are represented by a sequence of several LLM tokens, each of which are meaningless on their own.<sup>1</sup>

LLMs are auto-regressive predictors. Given  $n$  LLM tokens  $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ , the model calculates the probabilities of a token that follows  $p(s_{n+1}|s_1, \dots, s_n)$ . There are a variety of methods to choose

\*Work conducted during an internship at Amazon

<sup>1</sup>Note well: Throughout this paper, we use “token” to mean an LLM token, “symbol” to mean the atomic unit of a lexer’s output, and “lexeme” to mean a category of symbol. For example: foo and 23 are symbols, the category of all identifiers or all integers are lexemes, and EOS is a token. We use “element” to refer to the terminals and nonterminals of a CFG.

```

class Counter():
    def __init__():
        self.count = 0

    def inc(self):
        self.count += 1

```

```

class Counter():
    def __init__():
        self.count = 0

    def inc(self):
        self.count += 1
<7 lines omitted>
c = Counter()
c.inc()
<42 lines omitted>
c 1

```

Fig. 1. Comparing LLM-generated code completions with a single space before the “1”, and with two spaces.

a single token  $s_{n+1}$ ; e.g., greedy selection, sampling, beam search, etc. Regardless of the chosen method, the selected token is appended to the sequence and then probabilities of the next token are calculated  $p(s_{n+2}|s_1, \dots, s_{n+1})$ . This process is repeated until a special token, referred to as end of sequence (EOS), is generated. If this token is never selected, generation may stop after a maximum token limit, inference timeout, or other capacity limit is reached.

This paradigm describes how left-to-right code generation works: the left context is encoded into a sequence of LLM tokens, and the next predicted token is appended immediately after the left context. For code completion which involves the right context, known as the *fill-in-the-middle* (FitM) task, it is still possible to use this auto-regressive framework. The typical trick is to translate a task with left and right context into a left-to-right completion task by adding special “control” tokens [Bavarian et al. 2022].

Typically, FitM models add three special tokens to the language model’s vocabulary: FIM-prefix, FIM-suffix, and FIM-middle. During training, a large number of files from the dataset are randomly cut into three sections: “prefix”, “middle”, and “suffix”. The sections are arranged into a sequence of the following form:

$$\text{FIM-prefix} \circ \text{Enc}(\text{prefix}) \circ \text{FIM-suffix} \circ \text{Enc}(\text{suffix}) \circ \text{FIM-middle} \circ \text{Enc}(\text{middle}) \circ \text{EOS}$$

where  $\circ$  represents string concatenation and the “Enc” function represents the encoding of text into a series of tokens. The LLM is trained on sequences such as this; if the above sequence, up to and including FIM-middle, is later given to a trained model, then the highest-probability sequence of outputs is  $\text{Enc}(\text{middle}) \circ \text{EOS}$ .

Language generation models are not perfect. LLMs often generate EOS too early or too late, are brittle with respect to minor details such as the number of spaces (see Figure 1), or generate incorrect syntax altogether (see Figure 2, Top). These issues arise because, although a programming language has a formal grammar and specification, LLMs treat code as unstructured text. An obvious solution is to use the programming language’s formal grammar during generation, so that the model is more likely to produce code that is syntactically valid.

However, there are several challenges that complicate the use of a programming language’s specification during code generation. It is difficult to build a syntax tree of the partial program at the time of model invocation. The left and right contexts may not be valid programs—it might not even be possible to lex these, as the user may be in the process of editing the code. Even when the

```

exec_mode = ExecutionMode()
exec_ctx = ExecutionContext(context=exec_mode.local_mode)
run = Executor(exec_context=exec_ctx, configs=param_sweep)

result = run.execute(
    "SELECT * FROM test_table WHERE a = 1 AND b = 3", tablefmt='psql')

exec_mode = ExecutionMode()
exec_ctx = ExecutionContext(context=exec_mode.local_mode)
run = Executor(exec_context=exec_ctx, configs=param_sweep)

result = run.execute(
    "SELECT * FROM test_table WHERE a = 1 AND b = 3"
)
print(result.to_string(index=False, tablefmt='psql'))

```

Fig. 2. Constrained and unconstrained generation produce different results for the same code. Data index 1470 in the-stack-smol-x1 [Kocetkov et al. 2022]. Author: BlockScience 2018-20. MIT Licensed. (Top) Unconstrained generation produces EOS at a syntactically impossible position, leaving the parentheses unbalanced. (Bottom) Constrained generation only allows EOS to be generated with a parentheses nesting level of 2.

combination of the left and right context is possible to lex and parse, computing and representing the set of tokens that would result in a valid parse is difficult, as LLM tokens do not cleanly map to language symbols. Doing so efficiently is even more so. All of these issues arise before code is even inserted—generated code may modify the AST in a complex way every single time an LLM token is chosen. Efficient streaming parsing in this setting is non-trivial.

This paper presents a method that uses the grammar of a programming language to constrain code generation so that, at any point during generation, the combination of existing and generated code is always a valid prefix of a complete program. This method can be used with real-world programming languages that exhibit several common context-sensitive behaviors. We also show that it is possible to efficiently determine when the generated code forms a complete program, detecting appropriate locations for EOS tokens without re-parsing the entire file after each generated token. We realize these contributions by efficiently computing the right quotient of a programming language grammar, including context-sensitive grammars. By applying the incremental parsing and endpoint detection methods to this quotient language, we significantly increase the probability that the code generation model produces syntactically valid output, even for FlTm tasks.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 recalls the relevant theory of regular and context-free languages. Section 3 describes the main challenges in the constrained code generation setting that our paper addresses. Section 4 recalls Earley’s parsing algorithm and then extends his algorithm to solve the challenges enumerated in Section 3. Section 5 extends our parser to programming languages that use a leftmost-longest lexer. Section 6 describes issues that arise in languages with whitespace sensitivity, and details an approximate method to perform constrained generation in such cases. Section 7 further extends our method to several additional features specific to Python 3, such as the interaction between parenthetical nesting and whitespace sensitivity. Section 8 reports on experiments that evaluate the effectiveness of our method in a Python code

completion task. Section 9 compares our method to existing work on program generation. Section 10 discusses future work and Section 11 concludes.

## 2 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Automata and Regular Languages

A Nondeterministic Finite Automaton (NFA) is a tuple  $(Q, \Sigma, s_0, \delta, F)$ , where  $Q$  is a set of states,  $\Sigma$  is an alphabet,  $s_0 \in Q$  is an initial state,  $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow 2^Q$  is a transition function, and  $F \subseteq Q$  is a set of final states. A string  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \Sigma^n$  is *accepted* by a NFA if  $\exists (q_0, \dots, q_n) \in Q^{n+1}, q_0 = s_0 \wedge \forall i \in [1..n], q_i \in \delta(q_{i-1}, \alpha_i) \wedge q_n \in F$ . We use the shorthand  $\delta^*(q, \alpha)$  to represent  $\delta(\delta(\dots \delta(q, \alpha_1) \dots), \alpha_n)$ . Language  $\mathcal{R}$  is *Regular* iff there exists a NFA  $\phi$  that accepts exactly the strings which are members of that language;  $\mathcal{R}$  is said to *correspond* to  $\phi$ .

### 2.2 Context-Free Grammars and Languages

A context-free grammar (CFG) is a tuple  $(V, \Sigma, R, S)$  where  $V$  is the set of nonterminal elements,  $\Sigma$  is an alphabet of terminal elements,  $R$  is a set of production rules, each of type  $V \times (V \cup \Sigma)^*$  representing a nonterminal element and a possible expansion, and  $S$  is a top-level rule.

A CFG represents all strings which can be obtained by starting with  $S$  and recursively expanding all nonterminal elements with some rule in  $R$  until only terminal elements remain. A language is context-free if there exists a CFG that represents all strings in that language; we use  $L(G)$  to represent the language described by CFG  $G$ .

A production rule  $(E, \alpha)$  of a CFG is *inhabited* iff there exists a way to recursively expand all nonterminal elements in  $\alpha$  using rules in  $R$ . In several instances throughout this paper, we assume that every production rule of a grammar is inhabited. It is usually a mistake to write a grammar with uninhabited production rules, and this condition is easy to detect and remedy.

## 3 PROBLEM STATEMENT

In order to generate code that is syntactically valid, there are two problems which must be solved: Incremental Parsability and Right-Quotienting.

### 3.1 Incremental Parsing

Whenever the LLM proposes a token, the program must decide whether this token is acceptable. An EOS token is acceptable if the text that has been generated so far is a complete program. Any other token is acceptable if the resulting program is completable; i.e. there is some additional text which can be generated such that the full program would be complete.

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a formal grammar over alphabet  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ . An incremental recognizer is a function  $p : \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  that determines for a given string  $\alpha$  whether  $\exists \gamma \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}^*, \alpha \circ \gamma \in \mathcal{L}$ .

However, this simple definition leaves out several desired efficiency properties. First, given the computation of  $p(\alpha)$ , it should be efficient to compute whether  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ . Second, if we have previously computed  $p(\alpha)$ , it should be “cheap” to compute  $p(\alpha \circ c)$  for any  $c \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ . Third, this incremental recognizer must be able to be re-used several times cheaply: the computation efficiency of  $p(\alpha \circ c)$  should not degrade if the algorithm had already computed  $p(\alpha \circ d)$  for  $c \neq d$ ; any artifacts from computing  $p(\alpha)$  should not be destroyed.

Early rejection of strings for which the incremental recognizer fails is important for any sampling method; if the LLM starts to generate code that can never be valid, significant computation is wasted by continuing an invalid prefix. The re-usability property is especially important in the context of a beam search; a given beam may be copied many times with slightly different suffixes.

One way to express these properties is in terms of an accumulated state of type  $\mathcal{S}$ , and a correspondence relation  $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{S} \times \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ . We define four operations, along with desired properties:

**Empty Strings** The state  $s_0$  such that  $\mathcal{P}(s_0, \epsilon)$  should be computable in  $\tilde{O}(1)$  time.

**Accumulation** Given state  $s_t$  and string  $l$  such that  $\mathcal{P}(s_t, l)$ , for any character  $c \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ , a computation of state  $s_{t+1}$  where  $\mathcal{P}(s_{t+1}, l \circ c)$  should be computable in  $\tilde{O}(1)$  time. However,  $s_t$  must still be usable after this operation.

**Incremental Parsability** Given state  $s_t$  and string  $l$  such that  $\mathcal{P}(s_t, l)$ , whether  $\exists \gamma \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}^*, \alpha \circ \gamma \in \mathcal{L}$  should be computable in  $\tilde{O}(1)$  time.

**Language Membership** Given state  $s_t$  and string  $l$  such that  $\mathcal{P}(s_t, l)$ , whether  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$  should be computable in  $\tilde{O}(1)$  time.

### 3.2 Right Quotient

The user may not always place their cursor at the end of the file—rather, the insertion point may be in the middle of a function, the middle of a line, or even in the middle of a symbol.

The right quotient operation is a binary operator over two languages. For languages  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_R$  over  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ , the right quotient  $\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{L}_R = \{l \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}^* \mid \exists r \in \mathcal{L}_R, l \circ r \in \mathcal{L}\}$  [Linz 2012]. Note that if  $\mathcal{L}_R$  only contains a single string  $\beta$  (denoted as  $L(\beta)$ ), the right quotient  $\mathcal{L}/L(\beta) = \{l \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}^* \mid l \circ \beta \in \mathcal{L}\}$ .

The combination of incremental parsing and quotient language construction captures the desired functionality. Given a left context  $\alpha$  and a right context  $\beta$ , when an EOS token is proposed, we can use language membership operations to check if  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}/L(\beta)$ . If another character  $c$  is proposed, we can use the accumulation and incremental parsability operations to check if  $\exists \gamma, \alpha \circ c \circ \gamma \in \mathcal{L}/L(\beta)$ .

All performance properties described in 3.1 must be maintained for the quotient language.

### 3.3 Why Not Just Run The Parser?

There is a simple way to “incrementally” test for quotient language membership: for every character created during constrained generation, concatenate the left context, the generated code up to that character, and the right context; then, just invoke the language’s parser using this string.

However, this approach has two main drawbacks. First, it cannot test for incremental parsability. There is no functionality in most parsers to test whether, for left and right contexts  $\alpha, \beta$  there exists some string  $\gamma$  such that  $\alpha \circ \gamma \circ \beta$  is a valid program—the utility of the parser with unconstrained generation is limited to checking the validity of a EOS token. Therefore, this approach, which we refer to as *checked unconstrained generation*, can never be used for early rejection, and so it sometimes generates code for which there can never be a valid completion.

Second, checked unconstrained generation requires re-parsing the entire string after every token. This results in unfavorable asymptotic complexity.

## 4 EARLEY PARSING

In this section, we provide a short overview of the classic Earley algorithm for parsing context-free languages, and we show that minor variations of this algorithm solve many of the subproblems presented in Section 3, for context-free languages.

### 4.1 Earley Parsers

Earley’s algorithm is a well-known method for recognizing and parsing context-free grammars [Earley 1970]. This section describes the basic components of the Earley algorithm. We assume that a CFG  $G = (V, \Sigma, R, S)$  is given.

The state of the Earley algorithm is a sequence of *charts*. Each chart contains a set of Earley *items* (sometimes called *states* in other literature). The items in the chart at index  $i$  represent the set of partial parses after observing  $i$  symbols of input. Each item is of the form  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet \beta (i)]$ , where:

- $E \in V$  is a nonterminal,
- $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are strings of *elements* (terminals and nonterminals), and
- $i$  is a numerical *span start* index.

If chart index  $j$  contains Earley item  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet \beta (i)]$ , then: it is possible for a nonterminal of type  $E$  to appear at symbol index  $i$ ; between symbol indices  $i$  and  $j$ , all elements in  $\alpha$  have appeared; and, in order to complete the parse of the nonterminal  $E$ , the elements in  $\beta$  must appear next.

The chart at index 0 is initialized with  $[S \rightarrow \bullet \alpha (0)]$  for all productions  $(S, \alpha) \in R$ . Upon being added to a chart, each item is placed in a queue for the *predictor*, *completer*, or *scanner* to process.

When processing an item  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet A\beta (s)]$  where  $A$  is a nonterminal element, the algorithm runs the predictor on  $A$ . If  $i$  symbols have been observed by the parser so far, the predictor adds items  $[A \rightarrow \bullet \gamma (i)]$  to chart  $i$  for every BNF production  $(A, \gamma) \in R$ . As each chart is a set of items, duplicate items are not added if  $A$  is predicted twice.

Items which have the form  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet (s)]$  are called *complete*; their presence in chart  $i$  indicates that a complete instance of nonterminal  $E$  has appeared between symbol indices  $s$  and  $i$ . The completer searches the chart at index  $s$  for items of the form  $[X \rightarrow \gamma \bullet E\delta (n)]$ ; for each of these, an item of the form  $[X \rightarrow \gamma E \bullet \delta (n)]$  is added to chart  $i$ .

The only other possible items are of the form  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet a\beta (s)]$  where  $a$  is a terminal element. If the  $i + 1$ th symbol in the input equals  $a$ , the *scanner* adds item  $[E \rightarrow \alpha a \bullet \beta (s)]$  to chart  $i + 1$ . Element  $a$  is termed a *scannable terminal* for chart  $i$ .

A string of symbols (ending in symbol of index  $i$ ) is *recognized* by an Earley parser iff chart  $i$  contains any complete items, where the item's grammar element is  $S$ .

## 4.2 Earley Parsers as an Incremental CFL Parser

Earley's original algorithm was designed to answer, for a given a sequence of symbols, the language membership question. Fortuitously, a trivial extension of his algorithm also answers the incremental parsability question described in Section 3.1, with favorable performance characteristics:

**THEOREM 1.** *Given CFG  $G$  where every non-empty production rule is inhabited, a symbol string  $\alpha$  of length  $i$ , and Earley charts  $c_{0..i}$  resulting from running the Earley recognition algorithm with  $G$  and string  $\alpha$ , there exists a symbol string  $\gamma$  where  $\alpha \circ \gamma \in L(G)$  iff there exist any items at chart index  $i$ .*

In other words,  $\alpha$  is a prefix of  $L(G)$  when chart  $i$  contains *any* items (contrast to  $a \in L(G)$  when chart  $i$  contains an item that satisfies certain conditions). A proof sketch is provided in Appendix H.

Earley parsing is known to have an  $O(n^3)$  performance bound, or  $O(n^2)$  for unambiguous grammars. However, many real-world grammars have  $O(n)$  performance characteristics [Earley 1970]. For such grammars, each individual character requires  $O(1)$  incremental complexity, satisfying the characteristics in Section 3.1. The data structure used to hold Earley charts must be carefully chosen to avoid increasing the asymptotic complexity of parse state copying; we discuss a structure with amortized constant addition and copy complexity in Appendix D.

## 4.3 Right Quotienting

The Earley algorithm allows efficient incremental detection of language membership, but as mentioned in Section 3.2, the right context of the generation must be taken into account. We accomplish this by finding an explicit representation of the right quotient of the languages grammar with respect to the right context; any member of the quotient language will be a valid FItM completion.

Appendix I.2 describes an efficient method to obtain an explicit *left* quotient of a context-free language  $\mathcal{G}$  with a regular language  $\mathcal{R}$ . A left quotient  $\mathcal{L}_L \setminus \mathcal{L} = \{r \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}^* \mid \exists l \in \mathcal{L}_L, l \circ r \in \mathcal{L}\}$  is a similar operation to the right quotient; we can use the result of the algorithm shown in Appendix I.2 as the input of a simple procedure to transform it into a right quotient. Let the function REVERSE reverse a language, such that  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{L} \Leftrightarrow (\alpha_n, \dots, \alpha_1) \in \text{REVERSE}(\mathcal{L})$ ; this function can be implemented for a CFG by reversing each production rule. Given a left quotient operation  $\mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{G}$ , we can simply calculate the right quotient  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{R} = \text{REVERSE}(\text{REVERSE}(\mathcal{R}) \setminus \text{REVERSE}(\mathcal{G}))$ .

## 5 LEXED CONTEXT-FREE LANGUAGES

Most programming languages cannot be accurately recognized with a context-free grammar. For example, nearly every programming language uses a lexer to transform source text into a sequence of language symbols; this procedure is often described as using the leftmost-longest, or “maximal munch”, lexing rule. A programming language specifies a number of lexemes; each lexeme, in turn, is recognized by a regular language. The leftmost-longest rule states that the longest prefix of the source string that matches any lexeme’s language must be accepted as the first symbol; the lexer will then be run on the remainder of the source string. The procedure repeats until there is no text remaining. Furthermore, most programming languages treat whitespace and comments in a special manner. We must take both of these factors into account.

### 5.1 Definition

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a formal language over alphabet  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$  (i.e. the alphabet of ASCII or Unicode characters). We call  $\mathcal{L}$  a *Lexed Context-Free Language* (LCFL) if the following properties hold:

- (1) There exists an alphabet  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$  (i.e. an alphabet of language-specific lexemes), a subset of this alphabet  $\Sigma_C$  (i.e. comments and whitespace), and CFL  $\mathcal{G}$  over  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}} \setminus \Sigma_C$ .
- (2) There exists a partial function  $\text{Lex} : \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}^* \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}^*$  subject to the following constraints:
  - (a) For each lexeme  $g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$ , there is a regular language  $\mathcal{T}_g$  over alphabet  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}$ , where  $\epsilon \notin \mathcal{T}_g$ .
  - (b) There is an ordering over each  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$ , referred to as the *precedence* of each lexeme.
  - (c)  $\text{Lex}(\epsilon) = \epsilon$
  - (d)  $\text{Lex}$  implements the leftmost-longest rule; i.e.  $\forall (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}^*, \text{Lex}(l_1, \dots, l_n) = T \circ \text{Lex}(l_{m+1}, \dots, l_n)$  where  $m = \max(\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}, (l_1, \dots, l_i) \in \mathcal{T}^g\})$  and  $T = \max(\{g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}} \mid (l_1, \dots, l_m) \in \mathcal{T}^g\})$ . If no such  $m$  exists, then  $\text{Lex}(l_1, \dots, l_n)$  is undefined.
- (3) After lexing, members of  $\Sigma_C$  are filtered out from the stream of symbols, and the result is given to the underlying parser; i.e.  $\forall a \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}, a \in \mathcal{L} \Leftrightarrow (\text{defined}(\text{Lex}(a)) \wedge \text{filter}(l \in \text{Lex}(a) \mid l \notin \Sigma_C)) \in \mathcal{G}$

This definition corresponds to the lexer-parser separation of most programming languages.

As discussed in Section 7, even this specification is only an approximation of the grammar for real-world languages such as Python. However, this extension already adds significant complexity.

### 5.2 Incremental Lexing

Our incremental parser for LCFLs contains two components: an underlying incremental CFL parser such as the one described in Section 4.2, and an incremental lexer.

For a given lexeme  $g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$ , let the lexeme’s recognition language  $\mathcal{T}_g$  have a corresponding NFA  $\phi = (Q_g, \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}, s_0^g, \delta_g, F_g)$ . We assume that we have removed from  $Q_g$  any state  $q$  for which there does not exist an  $\alpha$  such that  $\delta_g^*(q, \alpha) \cap F \neq \emptyset$ ; i.e. a final state is unreachable from  $q$ . For a given string  $\alpha$ , let  $\text{Pos}(\alpha) = \{g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}} \mid \delta_g^*(s_0^g, \alpha) \neq \emptyset\}$ ; i.e. the set of lexemes for which the matching language contains at least one member which has  $\alpha$  as a prefix. Let  $\text{Fin}(\alpha) = \{g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}} \mid \delta_g^*(s_0^g, \alpha) \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$ ; i.e. the set of lexemes for which  $\alpha$  is a member of the matching language.

An incremental LCFL parser requires a tight feedback loop between the incremental lexer and underlying CFL parser. Recall that the last Earley chart specifies the set of *scannable terminals*. In contrast to the usual lexer-parser model, where the parser can wait until a complete symbol appears before returning a parse error, an incremental lexer must have access to the current set of scannable terminals in order to avoid incorrectly accepting a character.

To illustrate why, consider a Python string  $\alpha$  where  $\alpha[i] = \text{“a”}$ . In this case,  $Pos(\alpha[i])$  contains both the lexeme for the binary operator “and”, and the lexeme for identifiers. The exact type of symbol that will be emitted depends on the remainder of  $\alpha$ . If the only scannable terminals at this point are (for example) numerals or open parentheses, then the lexer should emit a failure immediately upon seeing the “a”. In contrast, if the only scannable terminals are binary operators, then “a” should be accepted, as  $\alpha[(i+1) \dots (i+2)]$  may equal “nd”. Even still, it is possible for  $\alpha[(i+3)]$  to then equal the character “y”, after which the lexer should immediately emit an error if it was expecting a binary operator. This also means that if the lexer was expecting, for example, an identifier, it should not emit an error after encountering  $\alpha[(i+2)]$ ; if  $\alpha[(i+3)]$  were a space, then it would be acceptable to emit an error then.

If the lexer successfully emits a symbol that is a member of  $\Sigma_C$ , it is ignored. Otherwise, the symbol is given to the underlying CFL parser; this operation will always succeed because the symbol is a scannable terminal, meaning that incremental parsability of the underlying parser is always maintained. After the underlying parser accepts the symbol, the set of scannable terminals are read from the last Earley chart. All lexemes in  $\Sigma_C$  are added to this set. There is one exception to this: when a lexeme in  $\Sigma_C$  must always be followed by a lexeme in  $\Sigma_G \setminus \Sigma_C$  (for example, a comment must always be followed by a newline), then the ignored lexeme is only added as a scannable terminal if the non-ignored lexeme is already a scannable terminal.

The leftmost-longest rule leads to complex behavior. If for some string  $\alpha$  and indices  $i, j$ ,  $Fin(\alpha[i \dots j]) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $Fin(\alpha[i \dots (j+1)]) = \emptyset$ , and  $Pos(\alpha[i \dots (j+1)]) \neq \emptyset$ , then it is possible that there is some  $k > j$  where  $Fin(\alpha[i \dots k]) \neq \emptyset$ . If so, then the match of  $i \dots j$  no longer matters; only the match at  $i \dots k$ , and the substring starting at index  $k+1$ . Otherwise, the lexer must instead consider the substring which starts at index  $j+1$ . This behavior requires a backtracking or branching lexer to implement. Because we already implement parser and lexer states which are cheap to copy, we implemented this with a branching lexer. When  $Fin(\alpha[i \dots j]) \neq \emptyset$ , the lexer splits into two branches; one branch  $b_{emit}$  where a symbol is emitted for the highest-priority lexeme, and one branch  $b_{long}$  that keeps lexing with  $i$  as the start point. If  $b_{long}$  finds a match for  $\alpha[i \dots k]$  where  $k > j$ , then  $b_{emit}$  is deleted. Otherwise, if  $Pos(\alpha[i \dots k]) = \emptyset$  before then,  $b_{long}$  is deleted. Algorithm 2 (Appendix) sketches an implementation of this procedure.

As we will discuss in Section 7.1, many languages do not actually use a strict leftmost-longest lexer. They exhibit partially undocumented behavior that enables a slightly simpler implementation.

Finally, it may be the case that there are two lexemes  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  such that  $Pos(\alpha[i \dots j]) = \{g_1, g_2\}$ , but  $\forall \beta \in \Sigma_C^*$ ,  $(\alpha[i \dots j] \circ \beta) \in \mathcal{T}_{g_2} \rightarrow (\alpha[i \dots j] \circ \beta) \in \mathcal{T}_{g_1}$ ; meaning that for any  $k > j$ ,  $g_2 \in Fin(\alpha[i \dots k]) \Rightarrow g_1 \in Fin(\alpha[i \dots k])$ . If  $g_1$  has a higher precedence, but only  $g_2$  is a scannable terminal, the lexer would incorrectly accept this state, even though there is no possible completion.

For example, it might be the case that  $\mathcal{T}_{g_2}$  matches the literal “and”, while  $\mathcal{T}_{g_1}$  matches all identifiers. If  $\alpha = \text{“an”}$ , the only  $\beta$  for which  $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{T}_{g_2}$  is “d”; this would also lead to a match in  $\mathcal{T}_{g_1}$ . In Python, this does *not* create an issue, as  $g_2$  has a higher precedence. In a language where  $g_1$  had higher precedence, however, it would be necessary to perform a regular language inclusion calculation [Hovland 2010] to properly reject this lexer state.

The incremental lexer does not greatly affect the asymptotic performance characteristics of the parser. First, we must discuss the branching behavior. Theoretically, there may be up to  $|\alpha|$  active



branches, as  $b_{emit}$  may itself branch before  $b_{long}$  is deleted. Note that there cannot be an exponential explosion of branches: if  $b_{long}$  creates another branch, then  $b_{emit}$  (and its child branches) are all deleted. However, even if Python did use leftmost-longest matching, we are unaware of any Python program for which there would ever be more than 3 active branches at once (detailed in Section 7.1), as there are very few instances where  $Fin(\alpha[i \dots k]) = \emptyset$  and  $Pos(\alpha[i \dots k]) \neq \emptyset$  for some  $k > j$  where  $Fin(\alpha[i \dots j]) \neq \emptyset$ .

The initialization step of the lexer on an empty string requires a constant number of operations. As the lexer is accepting a character (accumulation), it steps through any active lexeme automata; however, the number of operations involved in this is bounded by a constant for a given grammar. As mentioned earlier, the underlying CFL parser maintains incremental parsability; for the lexer, incremental parsability can be computed as part of the accumulation step by checking if  $Pos(\alpha[i \dots j]) \neq \emptyset$  (in constant-bounded time for a given grammar). The language membership check first tests if no text has been encountered since emitting the previous symbol for the selected branch; if so, the membership check is run on the underlying Earley parser.

### 5.3 Right Quotient of LCFLs

To obtain the right quotient of an LCFL, we can take advantage of the fact that the entire right context is available; we do not need to accept characters of the right context incrementally. We first use a lexer to create a stream of symbols that correspond to the right context, then use the method described in Section 4.3 to obtain an explicit quotient grammar for the underlying CFL with respect to this stream of symbols. Finally, we parse text in the quotient language using the LCFL parser described above.

The first step is to lex the right context,  $\beta$ . An immediate issue is that the lexer cannot always start from the first character of  $\beta$ . Consider the well-formed Python `"#'#"#\n` as a right context. All of the following are possible:

- The preceding text ends in an unclosed double-quoted string, in which case the first double-quote will close the string. The lexer can then start from the comment after this quote.
- The preceding text ends in `"""foo"""`; the initial quote will close a triple-quoted string.
- The preceding text ends in an unclosed single-quoted string, and the first three characters are part of this symbol. The lexer begins lexing the right context at the fourth character.
- The preceding text ends in a double-quoted string, but the last character was a backslash, thus escaping the initial double-quote. The first five characters are part of the first symbol.
- The preceding text ends inside a comment which captures the entire right context before the newline. The right context thus only contains a newline.
- The preceding text ends in `"""foo`; this right context never closes the triple quotes, resulting in a syntax error.
- None of the above are true; the first symbol in the right context begins at the first character.

However, it is unknown which case is true ahead of time, as the preceding text is yet to be generated!<sup>2</sup> Note that in the first two cases, the lexer must skip one character of the right context and begin lexing at the second character. In both of these cases, the stream of symbols will be the same—the right context’s lexer only depends on the number of skipped characters, not the type of the symbol that these skipped characters may be a part of. For a right-context string  $\beta$ , let the right quotient  $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}/\beta$  be the union of several sublanguages  $\mathcal{L}'_0 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{L}'_{|\beta|}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}'_n$  represents the quotient language where there exists a symbol boundary after  $n$  characters of  $\beta$ .

More specifically, for a string  $\alpha$  to be a member of  $\mathcal{L}'_n$ , the following conditions must hold:

<sup>2</sup>Running the lexer “in reverse” from right to left avoids the first-index issue, but it entails other issues which are far more difficult to solve; see Appendix J for further discussion.

**Valid Boundary**  $Lex(\alpha \circ \beta[1 \dots n])$  is defined; that is,  $\alpha \circ (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$  ends on a valid symbol boundary. Note that for  $n = 0$ , this condition simplifies to just that  $Lex(\alpha)$  is defined.

**Longest Symbol**  $\nexists m > n, |Lex(\alpha \circ \beta[1..m])| = |Lex(\alpha \circ \beta[1 \dots n])|$ ; i.e. there is no symbol that uses more than  $n$  characters of  $\beta$ ; the leftmost-longest rule would select that instead.

**Underlying Language Membership**  $filter(l \in Lex(\alpha \circ \beta[1 \dots n]) | l \notin \Sigma_C) \in (\mathcal{G} / filter(l \in Lex(\beta[(n+1) \dots ] | l \notin \Sigma_C)))$ ; i.e. the stream of symbols must pass the language membership test for the underlying CFL's quotient.

While accumulating the parse state of the LCFL's quotient language  $\mathcal{L}'$ , the program accumulates a parser state for each sublanguage. For a given string  $\alpha$ , if  $\exists n$  such that  $\alpha$  is incrementally parsable in  $\mathcal{L}'_n$ , then  $\alpha$  is incrementally parsable in  $\mathcal{L}'$ ; similarly,  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}'$  if  $\exists n, \alpha \in \mathcal{L}'_n$ .

After incrementally parsing a given string in quotient language  $\mathcal{L}'_n$  the *Valid Boundary* and *Underlying Language Membership* components of a language membership test can be checked by giving  $\beta[1 \dots n]$  to the lexer and parser. The *Longest Symbol* condition can be checked by then continuing to run the lexer on  $\beta[(n+1) \dots |\beta|]$ .

However, this procedure is extremely inefficient. Any operation must be repeated on  $|\beta| + 1$  sublanguages, resulting in a massive performance penalty. Furthermore, for each sublanguage, the language membership test requires up to  $O(|\beta|)$  time to compute. It would have been sufficient to simply check language membership in  $\mathcal{L}'_{|\beta|}$ ; this is equivalent to parsing the rest of the file.

We first describe a class of sublanguages which are redundant; i.e. sublanguages  $\mathcal{L}'_n$  where there exist  $m < n$  such that  $\forall \alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{L}'_n \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{L}'_m$ . We also identify a class of sub-languages which are completely uninhabited. This procedure leaves  $O(1)$  sublanguages which are inhabited and not redundant. We then describe a means to efficiently test language membership in one of these relevant sublanguages. We then discuss one failure mode and provide an algorithm modification to mitigate this issue. Finally, we detail several areas of potential algorithmic improvement.

**5.3.1 Redundant and Uninhabited Sublanguages.** As mentioned earlier, some sublanguages do not need to be checked, as any matches are also matched by a sublanguage which skips fewer characters. For example, consider the right context “nd b in c”n”. As part of the quotient process for computing  $\mathcal{L}'_4$ , the program lexes the text “ in c” and computes a quotient grammar with respect to the two non-whitespace symbols that are produced by this. To test whether a string  $\alpha$  is a member of  $\mathcal{L}'_4$ , the program appends “nd b” to  $\alpha$ , and checks whether the stream of symbols produced by lexing this modified string is a member of the quotient grammar. However, whenever this check succeeds,  $\alpha$  is also a member of  $\mathcal{L}'_2$ ; the only difference is that the symbol for “b” was lexed as part of the right context and incorporated as part of the quotient grammar. We add the following condition to remove redundancy:

**First Satisfying Boundary** There does not exist  $m < n$  where the other three conditions hold. The last symbol of  $Lex(\alpha \circ \beta[1 \dots n])$  begins within  $\alpha$  and is longer than  $n$  characters.

This stipulation means that the *Underlying Language Membership* test will be efficient on non-redundant sublanguages, as there is at most one symbol which must be handled by the parser during a language membership test.

Furthermore, some sublanguages are completely uninhabited. For example, when checking if any language is in  $\mathcal{L}'_1$ , the *Longest Symbol* check will always fail for the above example—there is no possible  $\alpha$  such that the leftmost-longest matching rule will capture “n”, but not “nd”, “nd b”, or some other, longer, prefix of  $\beta$ . More formally, the Python grammar does not include any lexeme  $g$  where  $\exists \alpha, \alpha \circ \beta[1] \in \mathcal{T}_g \wedge \nexists g^* \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}, n > 1, \alpha \circ \beta[1 \dots n] \in \mathcal{T}_g$ .

Finally, while checking any of the conditions, there is a large amount of repeated and wasted computation. The *Valid Boundary* and *Longest Symbol* always use the same  $\beta$ ; if any information

about  $\beta$  may be precomputed, this would increase the efficiency. The computation of this information may also serve as an efficient means to eliminate redundant or uninhabited sublanguages.

Algorithm 1 both computes the set of nonredundant, inhabited, sublanguages and precomputes information to enable an efficient check of the *Valid Boundary* and *Longest Symbol* conditions. An analysis of this algorithm’s complexity is given in Appendix E; its runtime complexity is linear in the size of the right context, and only needs to be run once to enable any number of language membership tests.

In summary, CALCULATEBOUNDARYPOINTS first, for each lexeme  $g$ ’s regular language  $\mathcal{T}_g$ , calculates the NFA representation  $\mathcal{N}_g = (Q_g, \Sigma_g, s_0^g, \delta_g, F_g)$ . The algorithm then finds the set of NFA states which are the successor to any reachable state; by stepping through  $\beta$  with all reachable states as the initial set (lines 3-6), the algorithm finds all possible automaton states which may occur while parsing a single symbol which begins in the previous text; i.e.  $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \Sigma_L^+} \delta_g^*(s_0^g, \alpha \circ \beta[1 \dots n])$ . This step also prevents the construction of redundant sublanguages, as we do not consider other starting points of a symbol.

The next step of the algorithm pre-computes information about  $\beta$  to enable efficient *Valid Boundary* checks. It steps backwards through the NFA  $\mathcal{N}_g$  to find the set of states  $\text{Active}[0, \text{end}]$  where  $\delta_g^*(\text{Active}[0, \text{end}], \beta[1 \dots \text{end}]) \cap F_g \neq \emptyset$  (lines 10-16). Testing the *Valid Boundary* condition for  $\mathcal{L}'_n$  thus becomes a simple constant-time check of if any active state in the lexer after lexing  $\alpha$  is also in  $\text{Active}[0, n]$ .

Finally, the REMOVE SUBSUMED procedure removes any states  $s$  from  $\text{Active}[0, n]$  where  $\exists m > n, \delta_g^*({s}, \beta[1 \dots m]) \cap F_g \neq \emptyset$ ; this eliminates the possibility of *Longest Symbol* failure for the same lexeme. For any  $n$  where  $\text{Active}[0, n]$  is empty, the sublanguage  $\mathcal{L}'_n$  is uninhabited and no longer needs to be accounted for. It is still necessary to guard against *Longest Symbol* failures caused by other lexemes, but this can now be done by simply checking  $\text{Active}[0, m]$  for other lexemes where  $m > n$ , rather than needing to iterate through  $\beta$ .

However, there are a few additional difficulties involved in taking the right quotient of a LCFL. Consider the simple LCFL with an underlying CFL  $\mathcal{G}$  that has the following grammar:

$S := \text{a\_seq} \mid \text{b\_seq} \text{c\_seq}$

and a mapping of regular languages ( $\mathcal{T}_{\text{a\_seq}} = \text{a}^+, \mathcal{T}_{\text{b\_seq}} = \text{b}^+, \mathcal{T}_{\text{c\_seq}} = \text{c}^+$ ).

For a right context of  $\beta = \text{“cc”}$ , the calculation of  $\mathcal{L}'_2$  will proceed as follows. The remainder of  $\beta$  after index 2 is just the empty string; and  $\text{Lex}(\epsilon) = \epsilon$ . The quotient CFL calculation simply returns the original CFL, as  $\mathcal{G}/\epsilon = \mathcal{G}$ . However, even though  $\text{a\_seq} \in \mathcal{G}$ , it is the case that  $\nexists \gamma, \text{“a”} \circ \gamma \in \mathcal{L}'_2$ . The last symbol in  $\mathcal{L}'_2$  must be a prefix of  $\text{c\_seq}$ , but this is not legal after encountering an “a”.

To account for this, when computing  $\mathcal{L}'_n$  for  $n > 0$ , we modify  $\mathcal{G}$  such it only contains members that end in  $\text{c\_seq}$ . More generally, every string in  $\mathcal{G}$  must end in some  $g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$  for which  $\text{Active}[0, n] \neq \emptyset$ , as the lexer constrains the last symbol to be one of these lexemes. This transformation on  $\mathcal{G}$ ’s grammar is described in Algorithm 6, in the Appendix.

Finally, we know of two special cases that may need to be accounted for, depending on the language. First, as described at the end of Section 5.2, it may be possible to have a higher-precedence lexeme be more general than a lower-precedence lexeme; in this case, it would be necessary to use a regular language inclusion calculation to remove states from  $\text{Active}[0, \text{end}]$ .

Second, consider a CFG  $\mathcal{G}$  for which there exists strings of symbols  $\alpha, \beta$  such that  $\alpha \circ \beta \in \mathcal{G}$  but  $\nexists \gamma \neq \epsilon, \alpha \circ \gamma \circ \beta \in \mathcal{G}$ . One example would be the language where each member consists of a single Python symbol. If the right context consists of one double-quote, then some possible members of the quotient language would be a matching double-quote, or the beginning of a comment—both of these left contexts, if prepended to a double-quote, would result in a valid parse containing a single symbol. However, a single quote would not be a valid member of the quotient language, even if

---

**Algorithm 1** Find all suffix indices which are a possible boundary of the first symbol

---

```

1: procedure CALCULATEBOUNDARYPOINTS(Suffix)
2:    $\forall g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{N}_g \leftarrow \text{REGEXTONFA}(\mathcal{T}_g)$ 
3:    $\forall g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}, \text{States}[0, g] \leftarrow \bigcup_{c \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}} \text{STEP}(\text{REACHABLE}(\text{INITIAL}(\mathcal{N}_g)), c)$   $\triangleright$  Exclude NFA states
   that require the boundary to be the beginning of the right context
4:   for Idx, Char  $\in$  Suffix do
5:      $\forall g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}, \text{States}[\text{Idx} + 1, g] \leftarrow \text{STEP}(\text{States}[\text{Idx}, g], \text{Char})$ 
6:   end for
7:   Boundaries  $\leftarrow \{\}$ 
8:   for  $g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$  do
9:     Active  $\leftarrow \{\}$   $\triangleright$  For all states  $s \in \text{Active}[i, j]$ ,  $\text{STEP}(s, \text{Suffix}[i:j]) \cap \text{FINAL}(\mathcal{N}_g) \neq \emptyset$ 
10:    for Idx, Char  $\in \text{REVERSE}(\text{Suffix})$  do
11:       $\forall \text{end} \in \text{Active}[\text{Idx}+1, *], \text{Active}[\text{Idx}, \text{end}] \leftarrow \text{STEPBACK}(\text{Active}[\text{Idx}+1, \text{end}], \text{Char})$ 
12:      if Idx  $\neq 0$  then
13:         $\text{Active}[\text{Idx}, \text{Idx}] \leftarrow \text{States}[\text{Idx}, g] \cap \text{FINAL}(\mathcal{N}_g)$ 
14:      end if
15:       $\text{REMOVE SUBSUMED}(\text{Active}, \text{Idx})$ 
16:    end for
17:     $\forall \text{end} \in \text{Active}[0, *], \text{Boundaries}[\text{end}] \leftarrow \text{Boundaries}[\text{end}] + (g, \text{Active}[0, \text{end}])$ 
18:  end for
19:  return Boundaries
20: end procedure
21: procedure REMOVE SUBSUMED(Active, Idx,  $\mathcal{N}_g$ )
22:   SeenStates  $\leftarrow \{\}$ 
23:   for  $\text{end} \in \text{Active}[\text{Idx}, *]$  do  $\triangleright$  In decreasing iteration order of end
24:      $\text{Active}[\text{Idx}, \text{end}] \leftarrow \text{Active}[\text{Idx}, \text{end}] \setminus \text{SeenStates}$ 
25:      $\text{SeenStates} \leftarrow \text{SeenStates} \cup \text{Active}[\text{Idx}, \text{end}]$ 
26:   end for
27: end procedure

```

---

the same lexeme is used to represent single-quoted and double-quoted strings. Therefore, in such situations, the incremental parsability test for  $\mathcal{L}'_n$  must also check if there exists a state in  $\text{Active}[0, n]$  that is reachable from an active NFA state. This issue is not present for most programming languages, as it is usually always possible to complete the symbol-in-progress and then begin a new symbol.

## 6 WHITESPACE-SENSITIVE LANGUAGES

Several programming languages, including Python, Haskell, and F#, are sensitive to whitespace. In Python, for example, indentation is used to delineate blocks of code. The parser itself does not handle indentation; rather, this feature is implemented in the lexer, which emits special `INDENT` and `DEDENT` symbols according to a straightforward algorithm [Foundation 2022]: When the first non-whitespace character on a line is encountered, if this character is not the beginning of a comment, the Python lexer counts the number of spaces prior to this character. This number is the *indentation level* of the line. The lexer maintains a stack of indentation levels that have been encountered so far. If the indentation level of the current line is greater than that of the previous line, the previous indentation level is added to the stack. The lexer then inserts `INDENT` after the newline. Alternatively, if the current line's indentation level is less than that of the previous line, the

<pre> if foo:      IF NAME COLON   if bar:    NL INDENT IF NAME COLON     pass     NL INDENT PASS   pass      NL DEDENT PASS             NL DEDENT </pre>	<pre> if foo:      IF NAME COLON   if bar:    NL INDENT IF NAME COLON     pass     NL INDENT PASS             NL DEDENT DEDENT </pre>
---	---

Fig. 3. Despite having identical text on the last two lines, the lexer adds an extra DEDENT on the right.

lexer pops indentation levels off of the stack until an indentation level matches; inserting DEDENT for each pop. If indentation level has decreased, but no previous level is matched, the lexer emits a syntax error. This procedure is given as Algorithm 4 (INDEX), in Appendix B

This indentation rule is easy to implement in an incremental lexer and parser. The incremental parsability check is not negatively affected by this rule; until a non-comment character is encountered, there always exists some text completion for which the next indentation level is correct, as the indentation level is not calculated for whitespace-only lines.

However, whitespace sensitivity becomes an issue for right quotienting. Consider the right context, “\n pass\n”. Figure 3 shows how this text may correspond to multiple streams of symbols, depending on the text that will be generated by the LLM before the right context.

If there were only a few possible cases, then it would be possible to handle the diversity of symbol streams via a similar mechanism to the one presented in Section 5.3, where the program constructs several sublanguages and parses each sublanguage in parallel. However, even this simple example may lead to many different parses, and so we cannot naively construct a sublanguage for every possible indentation structure of the right context. We instead make sense of the right context by describing the set of possible symbol streams as a regular language:  $NL (INDENT | DEDENT^*) PASS NL DEDENT\{1,4\}$ .

Previously, we had taken the right quotient of a language’s grammar with respect to a single string, but the method described in Appendix I.2 also works to take the right quotient of a CFG with any regular language—including the regular language which describes a given right context. Therefore, our method explicitly constructs this regular language; we then take the quotient of the programming language’s grammar with respect to this language. Therefore, the quotient grammar will accept *any* string which matches the right context’s indentation.

## 6.1 Construction of the regular language

Without loss of generality, we assume that the right context begins on a symbol boundary (if computing the quotient language  $\mathcal{L}'_n$ , first skip  $n$  characters of the right context).

We run Algorithm 5 (in Appendix) to obtain a regular language that represents possible right contexts. There are two key differences between this algorithm, versus the traditional method for inserting indentation symbols.

First, if a newline has not been seen yet in the right context, the previous indentation level is completely unknown. At this point, it is possible to the lexer to emit an arbitrary number of DEDENT symbols; or an INDENT if the level is not zero;  $(INDENT | DEDENT^*)$  is appended to the language.

Second, when a given indentation level  $n$  is lower than any previously seen, this may correspond to a variable number of DEDENT symbols; at minimum, 1 DEDENT, but up to the difference between the new level and the lowest level seen so far. When this occurs, it means that for any string  $\alpha$  which is a member of the quotient language, indentation level  $n$  must be present in the indentation stack

when the lexer reaches the end of  $\alpha$ . Therefore, the program saves the list of all such indentation levels, and checks this condition during a language membership query.

## 6.2 A Completeness-Soundness-Complexity Tradeoff

As seen in Figure 4, this procedure leads to a quotient language that incorrectly accepts certain strings. A string  $\alpha$  may be incorrectly accepted under the following conditions:

- (1) There exists a string  $\alpha'$  that *should* be accepted, such that  $\text{INDEX}(\alpha') = \text{INDEX}(\alpha)$ ; i.e. some correct string has the same general indentation structure, but different numbers of spaces.
- (2) All unmatched indentation levels in the right context (ExpectedPrevLevels in Algorithm 5, appendix) exist in the indentation stack (or the current indent level) at the end of INDEX.

For example, in Figure 4 (left), there exists a string  $\alpha'$  if line 2 is modified to have an indentation level of 2, instead of 5. For Figure 4 (right), an appropriate  $\alpha'$  would be if line 2 had an indentation level of 4, and line 3 had a level of 5. In both of these cases, such modifications would not change the output of INDEX. The right context of Figure 4 (right) has unmatched indentation levels of 0 and 4; the example left context has levels with both of these values, so it is (incorrectly) accepted.

It is possible to use a sublanguage-based approach to improve soundness with a small increase in runtime complexity, but with much fewer sublanguages than a naive enumeration of every possible indent and dedent permutation. For example, after the first newline is encountered, instead of adding (INDENT | DEDENT\*), we can split the parse into two sublanguages:  $\mathcal{L}'_I$  and  $\mathcal{L}'_D$ .

In  $\mathcal{L}'_I$ , we only add the INDENT symbol to the right context language; the underlying CFL of the quotient language thus only contains strings for which there is an indent after the next newline. For example, the beginning of an `if` statement would be a member. We then constrain the lexer such that the final indentation level of the left context must be less than  $n$ , where  $n$  is the first indentation level after a newline in the right context.

In  $\mathcal{L}'_D$ , we add DEDENT\* to the right context language; the underlying CFL of the quotient language would only contain strings for which there is zero or more dedents after the next newline. The beginning of an `if` statement would *not* be a member. The lexer would be constrained such that the final indentation stack must include  $n$ , or that the current indentation level equals  $n$ .

With just two sublanguages, our parser can avoid errors such as that in Figure 4 (left); the example in that figure is not a member of either sublanguage. It is possible to create more sublanguages, where the right context's regular language is broken up into even more fine-grained specializations. However, pushing the soundness-complexity tradeoff too far leads towards intractability. We find that two sublanguages provides a useful balance between computational efficiency and accuracy.

Finally, it is possible to trade completeness for soundness. If we exclude all programs with variable indentation levels, forcing them to increase by a constant number, this would avoid a large class of incorrect programs. While the number and type of symbols inserted after the first newline still present an issue for this approach, the extra symbols after subsequent newlines are fixed under this rule. However, this assumption excludes valid programs with inconsistent indentation. The trade-off between soundness, completeness, and complexity is an area for future work.

## 7 CASE STUDY: PYTHON 3

We have described an approach for incremental constrained generation of languages with several context-sensitive features, such as leftmost-longest lexing and the use of indentation to delineate code blocks. To evaluate the real-world efficacy of our incremental parsing framework, we chose Python as a difficult language to parse because it has these context-sensitive features, plus several additional peculiarities. For example, the lexer does not exhibit exact leftmost-longest behavior; additionally, the indentation rules are affected by parentheses and line continuations. Despite these

if foo:	IF NAME COLON	if foo:	IF NAME COLON
if foo:	NL INDENT IF NAME COLON	try bar:	NL INDENT IF NAME COLON
pass	NL (INDENT DEDENT*) PASS	if baz:	NL INDENT PASS
	NL DEDENT{1,4}	pass	NL (INDENT DEDENT*) PASS
		except e:	NL DEDENT{1,2} EXCEPT...
		pass	NL INDENT PASS
			NL DEDENT{2,5}

Fig. 4. Results of Algorithm 5 (appendix) for two right contexts, and specific left contexts which incorrectly match the quotient language. (Left) On line 3, the INDENT is part of the right context’s language, even though no indent is actually taken. (Right) On line 5, DEDENT should only be emitted once, given this specific left context, but there may exist a left context for which it is repeated twice. On line 7, DEDENT should be repeated three times, but there may exist a left context for which it is only repeated twice. The combination of these means that the quotient language incorrectly accepts an if statement that lines up with an except clause.

challenges, it is possible to extend our approach for incremental parsing to a nearly-complete subset of Python 3 (see Appendix F). In this section, we describe the adaptations necessary to handle Python’s specific traits; in Section 8, we show that despite the extra challenges that Python parsing entails, our approach is effective for constrained generation.

### 7.1 Many Languages, Including Python 3, Do Not Use Leftmost-Longest Lexing

The first characteristic we discuss is very subtle, but it concerns the basic lexing rule. Like many other languages, Python’s lexing rule is stated as leftmost-longest:

Where ambiguity exists, a token<sup>3</sup> comprises the longest possible string that forms a legal token, when read from left to right. [Foundation 2022]

However, Python actually uses a slightly different rule. This can be seen with input “0or 1”. Python’s lexer contains patterns for decimal integers ( $\backslash d^+$ ), octal integers ( $0o[0-7]^+$ ), the literal “or”, and an ignored whitespace pattern ( $[\backslash t \backslash f]^+$ ). The longest match at the beginning of the string is the integer “0”, as neither “0o” and “0or” fit any of the patterns. The remaining string should then match “or”, a space, and the integer “1”; this would result in a valid Python program.

However, despite what the documentation implies, this behavior is not what occurs in practice. The Python lexer instead gives an error that 0or is an invalid octal literal.

Java exhibits similar, albeit documented, behavior. There is a contextual keyword non-sealed that may appear before the keyword class. If whitespace is omitted between the two keywords (“non-sealedclass”), javac will return an error, rather than use the leftmost-longest rule to match the non-sealed keyword [Gosling et al. 2023].

We interpret the true lexing behavior as follows. After lexing string  $\alpha$ , if the lexer encounters a character  $c$  such that  $\nexists \beta, \exists g \in \Sigma_G, \alpha \circ c \circ \beta \in \mathcal{T}_g$  ( $\alpha \circ c$  is not the prefix of any valid lexeme), it only successfully emits a symbol if  $\exists g, \alpha \in \mathcal{T}_g$  (the entirety of  $\alpha$  forms a symbol)—reporting failure, instead of emitting the longest prefix of  $\alpha$  which matches some  $\mathcal{T}_g$ . An implementation of this behavior in an incremental lexer is given as Algorithm 3, in the appendix. Because this behavior accepts a subset of source code in comparison to a traditional leftmost-longest implementation, it can alternatively be implemented by adding rejection criteria within a leftmost-longest parser.

<sup>3</sup>Symbol, in our usage.

There are very few cases where this rule and the leftmost-longest rule differ in behavior, but it illustrates an important idea: most real-world programming languages are not formally specified, and it is unlikely that any re-implementation will capture all of a language’s properties. Therefore, while many of the methods presented in this paper are based on a theoretical treatment of a programming language, our goal must be to empirically improve the quality of code generation by a meaningful amount, not to create a perfect right-quotienting incremental parser.

## 7.2 Modifications to the Indentation Rule

Python’s indentation rule differs from the rule presented in Section 6 in two ways.

First, indentation after a line continuation character is ignored. This can be trivially handled by adding an ignored lexeme which represents a line continuation. Even if the right context begins on a newline, the sublanguge approach for LCFLs effortlessly handles the situation.

Second, Python’s indentation rule interacts with the parentheses nesting level. Indentation is ignored when the parentheses (and square bracket or curly brace) nesting level is greater than zero. However, because parentheses within strings and comments are ignored for this purpose, we must still run the full lexer to find the parentheses nesting level, as opposed to being able to run a lightweight pre-processing step.

While lexing a given sublanguge’s right context, our lexer maintains two branches in parallel; each branch tracks the initial parentheses level, and the current parentheses offset. One branch begins with an initial parentheses level of zero (referred to as the un-nested branch), while the other branch begins with an initial parentheses level minimum of one (referred to as the nested branch). The parentheses offset begins at zero, is incremented when an open parentheses or bracket is encountered, and is decremented when a close parentheses is encountered. The current parentheses level equals the initial parentheses level plus the offset.

When a newline is encountered, if the current parentheses level of a branch equals zero, then the newline is processed according to the method presented in Section 6; otherwise, the newline is ignored. If the current parentheses level for a branch drops below zero, the branch is removed. If the nested branch’s current parentheses level has a minimum of zero, it splits into two sub-branches; one new un-nested branch where the current parentheses level equals zero (the initial level equals the negative of the current offset), and a nested branch where the minimum current parentheses level is one (minimum initial level is the negative of the current offset plus one).

When the end of the file is encountered, the nested branch is removed. If the current level of the un-nested branch is nonzero, that branch is also removed, and the quotient language is uninhabited.

While checking whether a string is a member of the quotient language, the lexer ensures that the current parentheses level of the left context equals the initial parentheses level of the right context.

## 8 EXPERIMENTS

We have implemented an incremental right-quotienting parser, incorporating the modifications for lexed languages, whitespace-sensitive languages, and Python-specific features.<sup>4</sup> We evaluate the effectiveness of our incremental parser through a simulated code completion task.

The Stack [Kocetkov et al. 2022] is a large dataset of publicly-available code sourced from GitHub. For our evaluations, we use a subset of this dataset (“the-stack-smol-x1”), which contains 10,000 randomly selected Python files. We exclude 459 files for which `ast.parse` returns an error (mostly Python 2 files), and 2 files which use parts of the grammar that we do not implement (see Appendix F); this leaves 9539 files. For each file, with file length of  $n$ , we randomly choose an insertion point  $p$  between  $0.1n$  and  $0.9n$ . We set  $q = \min(n, p + 0.2n)$ . Text between indices 0 and  $p$  is selected as

<sup>4</sup>Link omitted for review; see supplemental material.



the prefix, while text between indices  $q$  and  $n$  are selected as the (possibly empty) suffix. This is done for 10 random insertion points for each file, obtaining 95390 experiments.

For each experiment, we use SantaCoder [Allal et al. 2023] with a FlitM task to generate code. We utilize greedy sampling to choose tokens; if the end of sequence token has not been generated after 500 tokens, we stop generation. SantaCoder has a maximum context length of 2048 tokens; therefore, the maximum combined left and right context length is 1545 tokens (due to the three “control” tokens mentioned in Section 1.1). If the context consists of too many LLM tokens, we truncate the beginning of the left context and end of the right context to obtain a balanced input which does not exceed the LLM’s limits.

For constrained generation, we first obtain the quotient language of Python with respect to the right context. During generation, we perform a greedy search over tokens for which the incremental parsability check is successful. A EOS token is only allowed to be selected if the language membership test succeeds. Occasionally, the LLM generates a sequence that contains valid stopping points, but never selects EOS prior to the token limit. In this case, we select the stopping point with the highest EOS probability (weighted by generation length) for which the language membership test succeeds. If none exist, our method reports failure.

## 8.1 Results

Out of the 95390 experiments, there are 85333 instances (89.5%) where constrained generation produces a valid parse. In contrast, unconstrained generation succeeds in 61998 instances (65.0%). This includes 41 instances (<0.1%) where constrained generation fails but unconstrained generation succeeds, compared to 23776 instances (24.9%) where only constrained generation succeeds.

We include a number of generation examples, both successful and unsuccessful, in Appendix K. Furthermore, of the 10057 unsuccessful generation examples, we further distinguish between two cases. In 401 instances, the incremental parser identified a left context as being in the quotient language, but the Python parser rejected the generated text. An example of this error is shown in Appendix K.2.1, in which the generated example exhibits the mismatched-indentation issue mentioned in Section 6.2. A full list of Python exceptions raised when parsing these examples is listed in the Appendix as Table 1; Appendix F contains further information. The 41 instances where only unconstrained generation succeeds are a subset of these 401 instances.

In the remaining 9656 instances, the incremental parser successfully constrains the generated text to be a prefix of the quotient language. However, the code generation model itself does not ever produce text that is a member of the quotient language. An example of this behavior is shown in Appendix K.2.2, where the LLM continuously produces import statements, without ever generating code which completes the left context. In none of these 9656 cases did unconstrained generation succeed; improvements in code generation models should help to eliminate these errors.

## 8.2 Number of sublanguages

The amount of time required to evaluate whether a given character can be added to the left context scales linearly with the number of sublanguages that the right-quotient operation generates. The primary source of sublanguages comes the procedure described in Section 5.3; each of these are further split into two sublanguages using the procedure from Section 6.2. The operation of taking the right quotient of Python’s CFL grammar with the regular language of symbols returned by the lexer usually eliminates at least one of the indentation sublanguages—if an indent symbol is inserted at a location that doesn’t make sense in the broader context of the grammar, then the sublanguage containing that indent symbol is uninhabited and may be deleted.




Fig. 5. Histogram of how many sublanguages are implied by the right context, over the evaluation dataset. LCFL Sublanguages shows for how many values of  $n$  it is the case that  $\mathcal{L}'_n \neq \emptyset$ ; i.e. how many values of BOUNDARIES are non-empty at the end of CALCULATEBOUNDARYPOINTS. LCFL + Indent Sublanguages shows how many remain after the right-quotient operations in Section 7 are applied. This value corresponds to a multiplicative complexity factor of parsing the quotient language, compared to parsing the vanilla grammar.

For each of the 95390 experiments, we record the number of sublanguages which the LCFL right-quotienting operation returns. We then apply the remainder of the Python right-quotienting operation. A histogram of the number of sublanguages present at each step is presented as Figure 5.

### 8.3 Checked Unconstrained Generation

As discussed in Section 3.3, it is possible to simply run unconstrained generation, and check each prefix for parsability in context using `ast.parse`. This method sometimes generates code for which there can never be a valid completion, and so it succeeds on fewer test cases than constrained generation—85151 (89.3%), rather than 85333 (89.5%) instances. This includes 270 cases where checked unconstrained generation succeeds and constrained generation fails, and 452 cases where the reverse is true.

### 8.4 Non-Random Insertion Points

In the above experiments, we remove text at random insertion points in the code. While this procedure provides an excellent test for robustness, it does not reflect real-world conditions for performance evaluation—while it is common for left context to end in a partial symbol, based on our personal usage of commercial code generation tools, we believe that it is less common for the right context to begin with a partial symbol. Similarly, it may be rare for the right context to begin on a different indentation level than the left context has ended on.

Based on these observations, we implemented a second set of experiments. When removing text to generate problem instances, we randomly choose two locations within the same indentation block, and constrain the endpoint of the removed text to be on a symbol boundary. This is repeated 10 times for each of the 9539 relevant dataset files, to again obtain 95390 test cases. The rest of the experiment proceeds identically to the original experiment.

There are 90359 (94.7%) instances where constrained generation succeeds under these conditions, compared to 65353 (68.5%) for unconstrained generation. This includes 53 instances where constrained generation fails but unconstrained generation succeeds, and 25059 where only constrained generation succeeds. There are 395 instances where the incremental parser incorrectly identified a left context as being in the quotient language; of these, constrained generation succeeded in 50 instances. There are 4636 test cases where the incremental parser never identified a left context; constrained generation succeeded in 3 of these cases.

## 9 RELATED WORK

Even before the recent proliferation of machine-learning based methods, there has been a long history of program generation methods, both via generating whole programs formally from a specification [Lee and Chang 1974; Manna and Waldinger 1980, 1971], and by predicting method calls based on statistical models [Raychev et al. 2014]. More recently, the proliferation of large language models has enabled the use of machine learning to generate source code [Allal et al. 2023; Fried et al. 2023; Li et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2021].

There have been many methods which use machine learning, but also incorporate the grammar of a programming language. For example, a large body of existing work focuses on AST node prediction; i.e. an AST with holes is given to a neural network, and the network fills these holes in a top-down manner [Kim et al. 2021; Li et al. 2018; Liu et al. 2022; Mukherjee et al. 2021], or a neural network predicts the next node of a serialized AST [Svyatkovskiy et al. 2019]. However, AST node prediction does not account for several complexities of real-world FiM generation. For example, a line completion such as “return fib(n-2) + fib(n-1)” has the net effect of editing the AST node containing “fi”, then performing nontrivial edits on the structure of the AST itself. In contrast, this addition is trivial for a text-based code completion method.

Alternatively, some methods incorporate the type of symbol during training, but don’t consider the context-free grammar of a language [Takerngsaksiri et al. 2023]. Similarly, when using a LLM to generate text, it is possible to constrain the output to include certain sequences [Hu et al. 2019], but the supported constraints are much simpler than a programming language’s grammar.

At the same time, several projects have focused on extracting structured machine-readable data from a Large Language Model [Automorphic 2023; Microsoft 2023b; Sengottuvelu 2023], or on adding some other constraints to the model’s response [Microsoft 2023a; SRI 2023]. Further work has focused on generating text that conforms to an arbitrary context-free grammar [Jones 2023; Slatton 2023], including the ability to incorporate LLM tokens which span multiple symbols [Willard and Louf 2023]. However these methods have several drawbacks. First, they are largely implemented using a branching recursive descent parser, meaning that in the worst case, parsing will take exponential time and space, and may not handle left recursion. Second, these methods do not handle common context-sensitive features of programming languages, such as leftmost-longest lexing, and indentation sensitivity. Finally, these methods focus on generating text from scratch, rather than inserting text at an insertion point; there is no facility for handling the right context.

## 10 FUTURE WORK

### 10.1 Preventing Context Escape

While our method effectively generates valid code, it still allows code which may not be desirable in an interactive completion setting. For example, if a user places their cursor within the parentheses of a function call, it can usually be inferred that the intention is to add or edit a parameter, without exiting the parameter list. However, it is still syntactically valid for the LLM to generate a close parentheses, construct a newline, output the name of another function, and finally generate an open parentheses. We refer to this phenomenon as *Context Escape*.

We note that there are two options for taking into account both the left and right contexts surrounding an insertion point. The method presented in this paper constructs a quotient language with respect to the right context, incrementally parses the left context, and continues parsing the generated code as the LLM outputs it. However, it is possible to design a left-right quotient operator; i.e. obtaining an explicit grammar containing all strings that the LLM may generate.

Preliminary experiments with this approach result in CFGs which may contain enough information to help prevent context escape. For example, if the insertion point is inside of a function

declaration, one of the nonterminals near the root of the CFG will often have two production rules. One rule, if expanded, usually allows generation within the function body, but does not allow the closing of the function and creation of another. The other production rule usually “closes” the function, and generates the beginning of another function; i.e., allowing context escape. We believe that a set of carefully chosen language-specific heuristics can be used to remove production rules which allow context escape, improving generation quality for interactive completion.

## 10.2 Static Analyses Beyond Well-Formedness

This paper presents lexing and parsing infrastructure for partial programs that contain a single insertion point. However, well-formedness is just one static property of a program. In terms of the program synthesis literature, our algorithm can be understood as a lexer and parser for partial programs containing a single *hole* or *slot*, albeit one that may extend across token boundaries and that does not fit into a single place in the AST.

A natural question is whether we can use the well-defined notions of left and right quotienting around a partial program to statically analyze other properties of a partial program. This could be useful for a variety of reasons; for example, during code generation, we might automatically reject partial programs that are impossible to transform into well-typed programs (e.g., due to the presence of undefined variables in the partial generated code).

These program analyses can also help address issues that are introduced by code generation tasks, such as hallucination of PII or credentials. Similarly, biased code generation can be prevented by statically analyzing self-compositions [Phan 2013] of a partial program, where a sensitive variable on each side of the self-composition is assigned a value from a set of protected classes. Such an analysis could be used, for example, to determine whether a (partial) code suggestion from an LLM results in different program behavior for Person objects on which the gender field is set differently.

Possible applications of partial static analyses based on the left and right quotient operations introduced in this paper are manifold. General code recommendation quality could be improved by incorporating analyses into RLHF objectives. Given a fixed model, static analyses can be used to greedily reject bad code recommendations, thereby saving compute and allowing wider beam searches along more promising generation prefixes. We leave these type of static analyses, and their incorporation into both training and inference, as future work.

## 11 CONCLUSION

In this work, we have demonstrated that the Earley parsing algorithm can be used to incrementally parse a quotient language, enabling syntactically correct constrained generation. We have introduced extensions to this incremental parser to allow for context-sensitive features present in many programming languages, such as leftmost-longest lexing and whitespace sensitivity. Finally, we apply this incremental parsing framework to Python 3, and show that it effectively reduces syntactically incorrect generations for real-world codebases.

## REFERENCES

- Loubna Ben Allal, Raymond Li, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Christopher Akiki, Carlos Munoz Ferrandis, Niklas Muennighoff, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Manan Dey, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Yangtian Zi, Joel Lamy Poirier, Hailey Schoelkopf, Sergey Troshin, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Manuel Romero, Michael Lappert, Francesco De Toni, Bernardo García del Río, Qian Liu, Shamik Bose, Urvashi Bhattacharyya, Terry Yue Zhuo, Ian Yu, Paulo Villegas, Marco Zocca, Sourab Mangrulkar, David Lansky, Huu Nguyen, Danish Contractor, Luis Villa, Jia Li, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Sean Hughes, Daniel Fried, Arjun Guha, Harm de Vries, and Leandro von Werra. 2023. SantaCoder: Don't Reach for the Stars! <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.03988> arXiv:2301.03988 [cs]
- Inc. Amazon Web Services. 2023. AI Code Generator - Amazon CodeWhisperer - AWS. <https://aws.amazon.com/codewhisperer/>.

- Automorphic. 2023. *Trex*. automorphic-ai.
- Mohammad Bavarian, Heewoo Jun, Nikolas Tezak, John Schulman, Christine McLeavey, Jerry Tworek, and Mark Chen. 2022. Efficient Training of Language Models to Fill in the Middle. arXiv:2207.14255 [cs]
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Matusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models Are Few-Shot Learners. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.14165> arXiv:2005.14165 [cs]
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2107.03374> arXiv:2107.03374 [cs]
- Dave Clarke. 2012. If  $L$  Is Context-Free and  $R$  Is Regular, Then  $L/R$  Is Context-Free?
- Jay Earley. 1970. An Efficient Context-Free Parsing Algorithm. *Commun. ACM* 13, 2 (Feb. 1970), 94–102. <https://doi.org/10.1145/362007.362035>
- Python Software Foundation. 2022. Lexical Analysis. [https://docs.python.org/3/reference/lexical\\_analysis.html](https://docs.python.org/3/reference/lexical_analysis.html).
- Daniel Fried, Armen Aghajanyan, Jessy Lin, Sida Wang, Eric Wallace, Freda Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Wen-tau Yih, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2023. InCoder: A Generative Model for Code Infilling and Synthesis. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.05999> arXiv:2204.05999 [cs]
- Inc. Github. 2023. GitHub Copilot · Your AI Pair Programmer. <https://github.com/features/copilot>.
- James Gosling, Bill Joy, Guy Steele, Gilad Bracha, Alex Buckley, Daniel Smith, and Gavin Bierman. 2023. The Java® Language Specification.
- Dag Hovland. 2010. The Inclusion Problem for Regular Expressions. In *Language and Automata Theory and Applications (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Adrian-Horia Dediu, Henning Fernau, and Carlos Martín-Vide (Eds.), Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 309–320. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-13089-2\\_26](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-13089-2_26)
- J. Edward Hu, Huda Khayrallah, Ryan Culkin, Patrick Xia, Tongfei Chen, Matt Post, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2019. Improved Lexically Constrained Decoding for Translation and Monolingual Rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 839–850. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1090>
- Evan Jones. 2023. Llama : Add Grammar-Based Sampling. <https://github.com/ggerganov/llama.cpp/pull/1773>.
- Seohyun Kim, Jinman Zhao, Yuchi Tian, and Satish Chandra. 2021. Code Prediction by Feeding Trees to Transformers. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE) (ISCE '21)*. IEEE Press, Madrid, Spain, 150–162. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00026>
- Denis Kocetkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Jia Li, Chenghao Mou, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Yacine Jernite, Margaret Mitchell, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. 2022. The Stack: 3 TB of Permissively Licensed Source Code. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.15533> arXiv:2211.15533 [cs]
- R. C. T. Lee and S. K. Chang. 1974. Structured Programming and Automatic Program Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Very High Level Languages*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 60–70. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800233.807046>
- Jian Li, Yue Wang, Michael R. Lyu, and Irwin King. 2018. Code Completion with Neural Attention and Pointer Networks. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-18*. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, Stockholm, Sweden, 4159–4165.
- Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, Qian Liu, Evgenii Zheltonozhskii, Terry Yue Zhuo, Thomas Wang, Olivier Dehaene, Mishig Davaadorj, Joel Lamy-Poirier, João Monteiro, Oleh Shliazhko, Nicolas Gontier, Nicholas Meade, Armel Zebeze, Ming-Ho Yee, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, Jian Zhu, Benjamin Lipkin, Multasham Oblokulov, Zhiruo Wang, Rudra Murthy, Jason Stillerman, Siva Sankalp Patel, Dmitry Abulkhanov, Marco Zocca, Manan Dey, Zhihan Zhang, Nour Fahmy, Urvasi Bhattacharyya, Wenhao Yu, Swayam Singh, Sasha Luccioni, Paulo Villegas, Maxim Kunakov, Fedor Zhdanov, Manuel Romero, Tony Lee, Nadav Timor, Jennifer Ding, Claire Schlesinger, Hailey Schoelkopf, Jan Ebert, Tri Dao, Mayank Mishra, Alex Gu, Jennifer Robinson, Carolyn Jane Anderson, Brendan Dolan-Gavitt, Danish Contractor, Siva Reddy, Daniel Fried,

- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Yacine Jernite, Carlos Muñoz Ferrandis, Sean Hughes, Thomas Wolf, Arjun Guha, Leandro von Werra, and Harm de Vries. 2023. StarCoder: May the Source Be with You! <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.06161> arXiv:2305.06161 [cs]
- Peter Linz. 2012. *An Introduction to Formal Languages and Automata* (5th ed ed.). Jones & Bartlett Learning, Sudbury, MA.
- Fang Liu, Ge Li, Bolin Wei, Xin Xia, Zhiyi Fu, and Zhi Jin. 2022. A Unified Multi-Task Learning Model for AST-level and Token-Level Code Completion. *Empirical Software Engineering* 27, 4 (April 2022), 91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-022-10140-7>
- Zohar Manna and Richard Waldinger. 1980. A Deductive Approach to Program Synthesis. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 2, 1 (Jan. 1980), 90–121. <https://doi.org/10.1145/357084.357090>
- Zohar Manna and Richard J. Waldinger. 1971. Toward Automatic Program Synthesis. *Commun. ACM* 14, 3 (March 1971), 151–165. <https://doi.org/10.1145/362566.362568>
- Microsoft. 2023a. Guidance. Microsoft.
- Microsoft. 2023b. TypeChat. <https://microsoft.github.io/TypeChat/>.
- Rohan Mukherjee, Yeming Wen, Dipak Chaudhari, Thomas Reps, Swarat Chaudhuri, and Christopher Jermaine. 2021. Neural Program Generation Modulo Static Analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., Virtual, 18984–18996.
- Quoc-Sang Phan. 2013. Self-composition by symbolic execution. *OpenAccess Series in Informatics* 35 (01 2013). <https://doi.org/10.4230/OASIS.ICCSW.2013.95>
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language Models Are Unsupervised Multitask Learners.
- Veselin Raychev, Martin Vechev, and Eran Yahav. 2014. Code Completion with Statistical Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 419–428. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2594291.2594321>
- Rahul Sengottuvelu. 2023. Jsonformer: A Bulletproof Way to Generate Structured JSON from Language Models.
- Erez Shinan. 2023. Lark - A Parsing Toolkit for Python.
- Grant Slatton. 2023. Added Context Free Grammar Constraints · Grantslatton/Llama.Cpp@007e26a. <https://github.com/grantslatton/llama.cpp/commit/007e26a99d485007f724957fa8545331ab8d50c3>.
- SRI. 2023. LQML. SRI Lab, ETH Zurich.
- Alexey Svyatkovskiy, Ying Zhao, Shengyu Fu, and Neel Sundaresan. 2019. Pythia: AI-assisted Code Completion System. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining (KDD '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2727–2735. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330699>
- Wannita Takerngsaksiri, Chakkrit Tantithamthavorn, and Yuan-Fang Li. 2023. Syntax-Aware On-the-Fly Code Completion. arXiv:2211.04673 [cs]
- Yue Wang, Weishi Wang, Shafiq Joty, and Steven C. H. Hoi. 2021. CodeT5: Identifier-aware Unified Pre-trained Encoder-Decoder Models for Code Understanding and Generation. arXiv:2109.00859 [cs]
- Brandon T. Willard and Rémi Louf. 2023. Efficient Guided Generation for Large Language Models. arXiv:2307.09702 [cs]

## A INCREMENTAL LEXER AND PARSER INTERACTION

Algorithm 2 demonstrates an implementation of an incremental lexer for the leftmost-longest lexing rule.

Note that this algorithm utilizes branching behavior. Branch creation has similar semantics as fork; program state is copied and execution resumes in parallel. A “handle” to the new branch is created in the parent branch, which may be used to later trigger deletion of the child branch. To test for incremental parsability and language membership after a given character, a test is performed in all branches; it succeeds if the test passes in any branch. The incremental parsability test always succeeds for a branch; this test really checks if there exist any active branches at all. The language membership test succeeds when the condition on line 7 succeeds in any branch.

Note that while parallelism and synchronization provide a useful abstraction to discuss the high-level algorithm, our actual implementation does not use parallelism. We instead use a data structure to explicitly represent branch states, and iterate over branches to determine incremental parsability, language membership, and the set of active branches after accepting the next character.

---

### Algorithm 2 Incremental lexing and parsing (true leftmost-longest)

---

```

1: procedure INCREMENTALLEXPARSE
2:    $s :=$  Initial Parser State
3:    $t :=$  Scannable Terminals of  $s$  ▷ Including comments, whitespace, etc.
4:    $SiP := \epsilon$  ▷ Symbol-in-Progress
5:   while True do
6:     collect True as Incremental Parsability ▷ Disjunction across all active branches
7:     collect  $(SiP = \epsilon) \wedge \text{IsCOMPLETE}(s)$  as Language Membership
8:      $SiP :=$  Next Character
9:      $p := \text{Pos}(SiP), f := \text{Fin}(SiP)$ 
10:     $sb = \text{NULL}$  ▷ A branch that may become invalid due to leftmost-longest rule
11:    if  $p \cap t = \emptyset$  then
12:      fail this branch
13:    else if  $f \cap t \neq \emptyset$  then
14:       $h :=$  Highest Priority Lexeme in  $f$ 
15:      if  $h \in t$  then
16:        fail branch  $sb$  if  $sb \neq \text{NULL}$  ▷  $sb$  no longer contains longest match
17:        create branch  $sb$ ; if in new branch then
18:           $s := \text{STEPARSER}(s, h)$  ▷ Guaranteed to be incrementally parsable as  $h \in t$ 
19:           $t :=$  Scannable Terminals of  $s$ 
20:           $SiP := \epsilon$ 
21:        continue
22:      end if
23:    end if
24:  end while
25: end procedure

```

---

Algorithm 3 describes an incremental lexer that implements Python’s lexing rule.

While this algorithm does not require branching, the branching framework is still useful to maintain in order to handle sublanguages as a result of the right quotient operations.

---

**Algorithm 3** Incremental lexing and parsing (Python’s behavior)

---

```

1: procedure INCREMENTALLEXPARSE
2:    $s :=$  Initial Parser State
3:    $t :=$  Scannable Terminals of  $s$                                 ▶ Including comments, whitespace, etc.
4:    $SiP := \emptyset$                                               ▶ Symbol-in-Progress
5:    $p = \emptyset, f = \emptyset, h = \text{NULL}$ 
6:   while True do
7:      $nc :=$  Next Character
8:      $SiP' := SiP + nc$ 
9:      $p' := \text{Pos}(SiP'), f' := \text{Fin}(SiP')$ 
10:    if  $p' = \emptyset$  then ▶ Next character results in invalid symbol, backtrack by one char
11:      if  $SiP = \epsilon \vee f = \emptyset$  then
12:        fail ▶ Previous text was not a complete symbol
13:      end if
14:      if  $h \in t$  then ▶  $h$  is never null because  $f \neq \emptyset$  at this line
15:         $s := \text{STEPARSER}(s, h)$ 
16:         $t :=$  Scannable Terminals of  $s$ 
17:         $SiP' := nc$ 
18:         $p' := \text{Pos}(SiP'), f' := \text{Fin}(SiP')$ 
19:      else
20:        fail ▶ Previous text was a complete symbol, but not a scannable terminal
21:      end if
22:    end if
23:    if  $p' \cup t = \emptyset$  then
24:      fail ▶ Future parses are only nonscannable terminals
25:    end if
26:     $p := p', f := f', SiP := SiP'$ 
27:     $h :=$  Highest Priority Lexeme in  $f$                                 ▶ NULL if  $f = \emptyset$ 
28:    yield Text is Incrementally Parsable,
29:    Text is Language Member if  $h \neq \text{NULL} \wedge h \in t \wedge \text{ISCOMPLETE}(\text{STEPARSER}(s, h))$ 
30:  end while
31: end procedure

```

---



## B INDENTATION IMPLEMENTATION

Algorithm 4 describes the classic Python indentation algorithm, excluding rules related to line continuations and parentheses.

---

### Algorithm 4 Indentation algorithm

---

```

1: procedure INDLEX( $\alpha$ )
2:   In  $\leftarrow$  Lex( $\alpha$ )                                 $\triangleright$  Regular leftmost-longest lexer
3:   Out  $\leftarrow$   $\epsilon$ 
4:   CurrentLevel  $\leftarrow$  0
5:   IndentStack  $\leftarrow$  []
6:   for Sym  $\in$  In do
7:     Out  $\leftarrow$  Lang  $\circ$  Sym
8:     if Sym is Newline then
9:       NewLevel  $\leftarrow$  SPACESAFTERNEWLINECHAR(Sym)
10:      if NewLevel > CurrentLevel then                     $\triangleright$  Seen indent
11:        PUSH(IndentStack, CurrentLevel)
12:        CurrentLevel  $\leftarrow$  NewLevel
13:        Out  $\leftarrow$  Out  $\circ$  INDENT
14:      else if NewLevel  $\leq$  CurrentLevel then
15:        while NewLevel < CurrentLevel do
16:          Out  $\leftarrow$  Out  $\circ$  DEDENT
17:           $\triangleright$  POP is safe because IndentStack = []  $\Leftrightarrow$  CurrentLevel = 0
18:          CurrentLevel  $\leftarrow$  POP(IndentStack)
19:          if CurrentLevel < NewLevel then
20:            raise IndentationError                         $\triangleright$  Impossible to dedent to this level
21:          end if
22:        end while
23:      end if
24:    end if
25:    return Out
26:  end for
27: end procedure

```

---

Algorithm 5 describes the construction of a regular language to represent all possible sequences of indentation in the right context.

---

**Algorithm 5** Construction of the regular language for the right context
 

---

```

1: procedure RIGHTCONTEXTTOREGULARLANG( $\beta$ )
2:   In  $\leftarrow$  Lex( $\beta$ ) ▷ Regular leftmost-longest lexer
3:   Lang  $\leftarrow$   $\epsilon$ 
4:   CurrentLevel  $\leftarrow$  NULL ▷ If initialized to 0, reduces to INDEX
5:   IndentStack  $\leftarrow$  [], ExpectedPrevLevels  $\leftarrow$  {}
6:   for Sym  $\in$  In do
7:     Lang  $\leftarrow$  Lang  $\circ$  Sym
8:     if Sym is Newline then
9:       NewLevel  $\leftarrow$  SPACESAFTERNEWLINECHAR(Sym)
10:      if CurrentLevel = NULL then ▷ Unknown previous indent level
11:        if NewLevel > 0 then
12:          Lang  $\leftarrow$  Lang  $\circ$  (INDENT | DEDENT*)
13:        else
14:          Lang  $\leftarrow$  Lang  $\circ$  DEDENT*
15:        end if
16:        CurrentLevel  $\leftarrow$  NewLevel
17:      else if NewLevel > CurrentLevel then ▷ Seen indent, same as INDEX
18:        PUSH(IndentStack, CurrentLevel)
19:        CurrentLevel  $\leftarrow$  NewLevel
20:        Lang  $\leftarrow$  Lang  $\circ$  INDENT
21:      else if NewLevel  $\leq$  CurrentLevel then
22:        ReqDedents  $\leftarrow$  0 ▷ How many dedents are caused by concrete indents
23:        OptDedents  $\leftarrow$  0
24:        while NewLevel < CurrentLevel do
25:          ReqDedents  $\leftarrow$  ReqDedents + 1
26:          if IndentStack = [] then ▷ Matching level must be in left context
27:            OptDedents  $\leftarrow$  CurrentLevel - NewLevel - 1
28:            ExpectedPrevLevels  $\leftarrow$  ExpectedPrevLevels  $\cup$  {NewLevel}
29:            CurrentLevel  $\leftarrow$  NewLevel
30:            break
31:          else ▷ Matching indentation level begins in right context
32:            CurrentLevel  $\leftarrow$  POP(IndentStack)
33:            if CurrentLevel < NewLevel then
34:              raise IndentationError ▷ Impossible to dedent to this level
35:            end if
36:          end if
37:        end while
38:        Lang  $\leftarrow$  Lang  $\circ$  DEDENT{ReqDedents, ReqDedents+OptDedents}
39:      end if
40:    end if
41:    return Lang, ExpectedPrevLevels
42:  end for
43: end procedure

```

---

## C CONSTRAIN LAST SYMBOL OF A CFG

Algorithm 6 describes a procedure to create a grammar such that  $\forall \alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \Sigma^+, \alpha \in \text{CONSTRAINLASTSYMBOL}(G, \Sigma_{end}) \Leftrightarrow \alpha \in G \wedge \alpha_n \in \Sigma_{end}$ ; i.e. all member strings end in a specific set of symbols. Note that  $\epsilon \notin \text{CONSTRAINLASTSYMBOL}(G, \Sigma_{end})$ . A proof of correctness for this algorithm is left for future work.

---

**Algorithm 6** Constrain last symbol of  $G$  to be a member of  $\Sigma_{end}$

---

```

1: procedure CONSTRAINLASTSYMBOL( $G = (V, \Sigma, R, S), \Sigma_{end} \subseteq \Sigma$ )
2:    $V^* \leftarrow \{\text{STAR}(g) | g \in V\} \cup V$  ▷ STAR creates a new nonterminal name
3:    $S^* \leftarrow \text{STAR}(S)$ 
4:    $R^* \leftarrow R$ 
5:   for  $(g, (g_1, \dots, g_n)) \in R$  do
6:     if  $g_n \in \Sigma$  then ▷ Ends on terminal
7:       if  $g_n \in \Sigma_{end}$  then ▷  $R^*$  only includes rule if correct last symbol
8:          $R^* \leftarrow R^* \cup \{(\text{STAR}(g), (g_1, \dots, g_n))\}$ 
9:       end if
10:    else ▷ Ends on nonterminal
11:       $R^* \leftarrow R^* \cup \{(\text{STAR}(g), (g_1, \dots, \text{STAR}(g_n)))\}$ 
12:    end if
13:  end for
14:  return  $(V^*, \Sigma, R^*, \text{STAR}(S))$ 
15: end procedure

```

---

## D DATA STRUCTURES FOR INCREMENTAL EARLEY PARSING

Given a sequence of Earley charts after parsing string  $\alpha$ , if we want to obtain incremental parses of both  $\alpha \circ x$  and  $\alpha \circ y$ , a classic implementation of the Earley algorithm would copy all charts after parsing  $\alpha$  (resulting in  $O(n)$  extra complexity for each character), or it would create the chart for  $\alpha \circ x$ , remove the last chart to obtain the state after parsing  $\alpha$ , and then create the chart for  $\alpha \circ y$  (thus leading to extra work later if we wanted to later parse, for example,  $\alpha \circ x \circ z$ ). Our initial implementation copied all Earley charts for each character. This copying occupied a significant fraction of the running time when parsing longer files.

It is insufficient to use singly linked list to represent a sequence of Earley charts; the completer requires efficient random access to prior charts.

To solve this, we note that Earley chart indices do not need to be contiguous. For a CFG  $G$ , we create a global *Earley Chart Collection*  $h$ ; a sequence of Earley charts in a data structure with  $O(1)$  random read access and an amortized  $O(1)$  append operation, such as an arraylist. A parse state is a tuple containing a pointer to  $h$ , and the index of the final chart for a specific sequence of characters. Index 0 is set to the initial Earley chart, and the parse state corresponding to the empty string is  $s_0 = (h, 0)$ .

The accumulation operation for state  $s = (h, n)$  with character  $c$  appends a new chart to the end of  $h$ , at index  $m$ . The usual Earley algorithm steps are run, except with different indices: instead of the scanner destination being index  $n + 1$ , the destination is  $m$ . The predictor and completer are run on the chart at index  $m$ . Finally, the tuple  $(h, m)$  is given as the new state.

For example, let the state after parsing  $\alpha$  be  $(h, 10)$ , and let 10 be the highest chart index in  $h$ . To parse  $\alpha \circ x$ , we add a new chart to  $h$  at index 11, and run the scanner; any items which have  $x$  as a scannable terminal are scanned from chart 10 to chart 11. The state representing  $\alpha \circ x$  is  $(h, 11)$ , but  $(h, 10)$  is still a valid state for  $\alpha$ .

To then parse  $\alpha \circ y$ , we add a new chart to  $h$  at index 12; any items which have  $y$  as a scannable terminal are scanned from chart 10 to chart 12, completely skipping chart 11. The state representing  $\alpha \circ y$  is  $(h, 12)$ , but  $(h, 11)$  still represents  $\alpha \circ x$ , and  $(h, 10)$  still represents  $\alpha$ .

It can be seen that this modified data structure results in charts which are identical to those obtained by the classic Earley algorithm, modulo chart renumbering.

## E COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS FOR ALGORITHM 1

The `CALCULATEBOUNDARYPOINTS` procedure first steps through each character in  $\beta$ , with each step taking time proportional to the complexity of the lexer,  $\sum_{g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}} |\mathcal{N}_g|$ . Then, for each lexeme  $g$  (line 8), it iterates through  $\beta$  again (line 10). After each iteration of this loop, the algorithm maintains the invariant that for every index  $i$ , for every state  $s \in \mathcal{N}_g$ , there is only one end for which  $s \in \text{Active}[i, \text{end}]$ . Therefore, assuming that `Active` uses an appropriate data structure which excludes empty values, there are at most  $|\mathcal{N}_g|$  iterations of the loop on line 11, and the cumulative amount of time taken by `STEPBACK` is  $O(|\mathcal{N}_g|)$ . Line 13 similarly has  $O(|\mathcal{N}_g|)$  time complexity. At this point, there are at most  $|\mathcal{N}_g| + 1$  values of end where `Active[Index, end]  $\neq \emptyset$` , but any given state may appear more than once. Finally, the call to `REMOVESUBSUMED` re-establishes the invariant. For each value of end, the algorithm performs two set operations that have complexity  $O(|\mathcal{N}_g|)$ ; therefore, `REMOVESUBSUMED` has time complexity  $O(|\mathcal{N}_g|^2)$ . Thus, the overall time complexity of `CALCULATEBOUNDARYPOINTS` is  $O(\sum_{g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}} |\mathcal{N}_g|^2 |\beta|)$ , where  $\sum_{g \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}} |\mathcal{N}_g|^2$  is a relatively small constant for a given programming language.

## F DESCRIPTION OF OUR PYTHON 3 SUBSET

There are two cases where we know that our Python parser rejects valid Python files.

First, when a file is written with mixed tabs and spaces, tabs bring the indentation level to the next multiple of 8. Our lexer instead always treats tabs as 8 spaces for indentation purposes.

Second, Python uses a PEG-based parser, whereas the Earley algorithm only works with BNF grammar specifications. Therefore, we use the EBNF specification of the Python grammar shipped with the Lark package [Shinan 2023], and use Lark’s EBNF to BNF translator to obtain the grammar rules. This grammar deviates from Python’s grammar in subtle ways; for example, by disallowing trailing comma placements at the end of certain parameter lists.

In our test dataset, we inspected all files for which the Python parser succeeds, but our parser fails, and made reasonable adjustments to the EBNF grammar as necessary to resolve these cases. We are left with one file that our parser is unable to recognize due to inconsistent indentation, and one file which unpacks a tuple in an unusual way that the EBNF specification does not accept.

However, our Python parser accepts certain invalid Python sources. Table 1 shows all errors that occurred while parsing code that is the output of the constrained generation process; i.e. cases which were accepted by our parser but rejected by the Python parser.

First, in certain situations where different mixtures of tabs and spaces are used for the same indentation level, the lexer should raise a syntax error; we instead treat the tab as eight spaces and potentially accept the parse.

Second, there are many different varieties of strings in Python. The contents of each string can vary significantly; for example, `r"\u123"` is a valid Python symbol, but `"\u123"` is not. Of particular concern are “f-strings”, which can contain an almost-arbitrary Python expression within, with a restriction that backslashes and the delimiter character cannot appear within the Python expression. While these can be parsed through an even tighter coupling of the lexer and parser, support for these cases have diminishing returns. Our Python lexer allows the string prefix to be any valid value (“u”, “f”, and so on), and treats the string body permissively. The lexer allows for

escaped closing delimiters and escaped backslashes, but doesn't impose any restrictions on other items, such as `"\u"`.

Finally, Lark's EBNF specification deviates from Python's grammar in more significant ways; for example, the EBNF specification does not sufficiently distinguish lvalues and rvalues. Many of the syntactic errors our constrained generation method produces exist due to the mismatch between the Python parser's PEG and Lark's EBNF grammar—any parser derived from the Lark EBNF specification will have these issues. While substantial modification to the EBNF grammar was out of scope for this project, and it was not our goal to write a PEG to EBNF conversion algorithm, this speaks to the care which must be applied when implementing our method for a given language, and the empirical improvements that can still be obtained with an imperfect language specification.

<b>Error</b>	<b>Count</b>
SyntaxError: invalid syntax	137
SyntaxError: cannot assign to function call	80
SyntaxError: cannot assign to operator	33
SyntaxError: cannot assign to literal	29
SyntaxError: non-default argument follows default argument	21
SyntaxError: f-string: single '}' is not allowed	17
SyntaxError: illegal target for annotation	15
TabError: inconsistent use of tabs and spaces in indentation	9
IndentationError: unexpected unindent	8
SyntaxError: f-string: unmatched ')	4
SyntaxError: (unicode error) 'unicodescape' codec can't decode bytes in position 0-24: unknown Unicode character name	4
SyntaxError: f-string: unmatched ']	3
SyntaxError: f-string: unmatched '('	3
SyntaxError: f-string: invalid syntax	3
SyntaxError: f-string: expecting '}'	3
SyntaxError: cannot mix bytes and nonbytes literals	3
SyntaxError: 'operator' is an illegal expression for augmented assignment	3
IndentationError: unexpected indent	3
SyntaxError: trailing comma not allowed without surrounding parentheses	2
SyntaxError: cannot delete function call	2
SyntaxError: cannot assign to list comprehension	2
SyntaxError: cannot assign to conditional expression	2
SyntaxError: cannot assign to None	2
SyntaxError: (unicode error) 'unicodescape' codec can't decode bytes in position 0-1: truncated \xXX escape	2
SyntaxError: only single target (not tuple) can be annotated	1
SyntaxError: f-string: unmatched '['	1
SyntaxError: f-string: empty expression not allowed	1
SyntaxError: f-string: closing parenthesis '}' does not match opening parenthesis '['	1
SyntaxError: f-string expression part cannot include a backslash	1
SyntaxError: cannot assign to lambda	1
SyntaxError: cannot assign to comparison	1
SyntaxError: cannot assign to await expression	1
SyntaxError: bytes can only contain ASCII literal characters.	1
SyntaxError: (unicode error) 'unicodescape' codec can't decode bytes in position 470-471: truncated \uXXXX escape	1
SyntaxError: (unicode error) 'unicodescape' codec can't decode bytes in position 27-29: truncated \xXX escape	1

Table 1. All syntax errors originating from incorrectly accepting a string as part of the quotient language.

## G OPERATIONS ON FORMAL LANGUAGES

We define several operations that we use in following sections of the appendix.

For a regular language  $\mathcal{R}$  corresponding to NFA  $(Q, \Sigma, s_0, \delta, F)$ , let  $\mathcal{R}[x, y]$  be the language corresponding to the automaton  $(Q, \sigma, \{x\}, \delta, \{y\})$ ; i.e. the language which “connects” automaton state  $x$  to state  $y$ .

For CFG  $(V, \Sigma, R, S)$  corresponding to CFL  $\mathcal{G}$  and a string  $\alpha : (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ , let  $\mathcal{G}[\alpha]$  be the CFL corresponding to the CFG  $(V \cup \{S'\}, \Sigma, R \cup \{S', \alpha\}, S')$ ; i.e. the CFG which contains the same production rules, but whose start rule contains one production, equal to  $\alpha$ .

## H PROOF SKETCH OF THEOREM 1

Recall Theorem 1 as follows:

**THEOREM 1.** *For a CFG  $G$  where every non-empty production rule is inhabited, symbol string  $\alpha$  of length  $i$ , and Earley charts  $c_{0\dots i}$  resulting from running the Earley recognition algorithm with  $G$  and string  $\alpha$ , there exists a symbol string  $\gamma$  where  $\alpha \circ \gamma \in L(G)$  iff there exist any items at chart index  $i$ .*

We leave a comprehensive proof of this theorem for future work, but provide a proof sketch as follows. The two directions of this implication are handled separately:

**LEMMA 1.** *If there exists a symbol string  $\gamma$  where  $\alpha \circ \gamma \in L(G)$ , there exists at least one item at chart index  $i$ .*

The contrapositive of this statement is trivially true: if there are no items at chart index  $i$ , then there is no  $\gamma$  for which the Earley algorithm will succeed on  $\alpha \circ \gamma$ ; and thus no  $\gamma$  such that  $\alpha \circ \gamma \in L(G)$ . If there are no items at chart index  $i$ , there will not be items at any higher chart index. The Earley recognizer succeeds when there exists an item  $[S \rightarrow \beta \bullet (0)]$  in the final chart; if there are no items at all, then the recognizer cannot succeed.

**LEMMA 2.** *If there exists at least one item at chart index  $i$ , there exists a symbol string  $\gamma$  where  $\alpha \circ \gamma \in L(G)$ .*

We show how to construct such a  $\gamma$ . An Earley item may be in one of two categories. First, it may be of the form  $[S \rightarrow \beta \bullet \delta (0)]$ . Because every production in  $G$  is inhabited, there must be exist a string that matches  $\beta \circ \delta$ , and so there must exist a string which is a member of  $L(G)[\delta]$ . In this case, such a string would trivially satisfy the constraint for  $\gamma$ .

Alternatively, an Earley item may be of the form  $[E \rightarrow \beta \bullet \delta (j)]$  for  $E \neq S$  or  $j \neq 0$ . In this case, after parsing a string which matches  $\delta$ , the algorithm would search for an item in chart  $j$  of the form  $[F \rightarrow \nu \bullet E\pi(k)]$ , and then add the item  $[F \rightarrow \nu E \bullet \pi(k)]$ . This process could be repeated—there is a string that is a member of  $L(G)[\pi]$ .

The process will eventually terminate: the item  $[E \rightarrow \beta \bullet \delta (j)]$  can only exist in chart index  $i$  if there existed an item  $[F \rightarrow \nu E \bullet \pi(k)]$  present in any chart prior to its creation. Therefore, each item must only be processed at most once, and there are a finite number of items that may exist at any given chart index. Eventually, an item of the form  $[S \rightarrow \beta \bullet \delta (0)]$  will be reached, and we may finish the construction of  $\gamma$ .

## I EARLEY PARSING FOR THE LEFT QUOTIENT OF A CFG WITH A CFL

It is well-known that the quotient of a context-free language with a regular language is also context-free [Clarke 2012]. We present an algorithm to efficiently compute this quotient, using a modification of the Earley algorithm. First, we describe an extension to the Earley parsing algorithm which can decide whether there exists a string in a regular language that matches a CFL. Second,

we show that it is possible to extract an explicit representation of a quotient grammar, using the artifacts created by the Earley parser.

### 1.1 Application of Earley Parsing to Regular Languages

Given a context-free grammar  $G = (V, \Sigma, R, S)$  corresponding to context-free language  $\mathcal{G}$ , and a NFA  $\phi = (Q, \Sigma, s_0, \delta, F)$  corresponding to regular language  $\mathcal{R}$ , we first would like to determine if  $\exists \alpha \in \Sigma^*, \alpha \in \mathcal{R} \wedge \alpha \in \mathcal{G}$ .

We create a mapping of automaton states to Earley charts; for automaton state  $q$ , chart  $c_q$  contains a set of Earley items. At all times, this mapping maintains these two invariants:

**INVARIANT 1.** *If the item  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet \beta (i)]$  appears in Earley chart  $c_j$ , then  $\exists \gamma \in \Sigma^*, \gamma \in \mathcal{R}[i, j] \wedge \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\alpha]$ .*

Intuitively, this means that there is string which “connects” NFA state  $i$  to state  $j$  where the parser can construct the sequence  $\alpha$  of terminals and nonterminals from this string.

**INVARIANT 2.** *If the item  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet \beta (i)]$  appears in Earley chart  $c_j$ , then  $(E, (\alpha \circ \beta)) \in R$ .*

This means that the items of an Earley chart are meaningful in the context of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Each operation in the Earley algorithm has an analogue that maintains these invariants:

When an item  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet a\beta (i)]$  is added to chart  $c_j$ , if  $a$  is terminal, then for every  $k \in \delta(j, a)$ , we add the item  $[E \rightarrow \alpha a \bullet \beta (i)]$  to chart  $c_k$ . For every string  $\gamma \in \mathcal{R}[i, j]$ , it is clear that  $(\gamma \circ a) \in \mathcal{R}[i, k]$ . Similarly, for every string  $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}[\alpha]$ ,  $(\gamma \circ a) \in \mathcal{G}[\alpha \circ a]$ , maintaining Invariant 1. Invariant 2 is trivially maintained, as  $\alpha \circ (a\beta) = (\alpha a \circ \beta)$ .

When an item  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet A\beta (i)]$  is added to chart  $c_j$ , where  $A$  is a nonterminal, we add the item  $[E \rightarrow \bullet \gamma (j)]$  to chart  $j$  for every production  $(E, \gamma) \in R$ . This trivially maintains Invariant 1, as  $\mathcal{R}[j, j]$  includes the empty string. Invariant 2 is trivially maintained.

When a *complete* item  $[A \rightarrow \alpha \bullet (i)]$  is added to chart  $c_j$ , if there exists a *completable* item  $[E \rightarrow v \bullet A\pi(k)]$  in chart  $c_i$ , then the item  $[E \rightarrow vA \bullet \pi(k)]$  is added to chart  $c_j$ . Note that unlike in a traditional Earley parser, the *complete* item might exist in chart  $c_j$  before the *completable* item is added to chart  $c_i$ . Therefore, in addition to running this procedure when a *complete* item is added, an implementation must also do so when a *completable* item is added. This can be done efficiently with additional bookkeeping; when a *complete* item is added, the program should record that the procedure must be run if chart  $c_i$  gains a *completable* item with the dot before an  $A$ .

Invariant 2 is again trivially maintained by this operation. The addition of  $[E \rightarrow vA \bullet \pi(k)]$  to chart  $c_j$  maintains Invariant 1. We know that  $\exists \gamma, \eta \in \Sigma^*, \gamma \in \mathcal{R}[k, i] \wedge \gamma \in \mathcal{G}[v] \wedge \eta \in \mathcal{R}[i, j] \wedge \eta \in \mathcal{G}[A]$ . By the basic properties of a NFA,  $(\gamma \circ \eta) \in \mathcal{R}[k, j]$ ; similarly,  $(\gamma \circ \eta) \in \mathcal{G}[v \circ \alpha]$ . Because of Invariant 2, there exists a rule  $(A, \alpha) \in R$ ; therefore,  $\mathcal{G}[v \circ \alpha] = \mathcal{G}[v \circ A]$ , thus maintaining Invariant 1.

Finally, we initialize  $c_{s_0}$  with item  $[S \rightarrow \bullet \alpha (i)]$  for all productions  $(S, \alpha) \in R$ . This trivially establishes both invariants.

Running the algorithm consists of adding items which satisfy the above constraints until a fixpoint is reached. It is apparent that the traditional Earley algorithm is just a special case of this procedure, applied to a trivial “chain” NFA.

**THEOREM 2 (SOUNDNESS).**  $(\exists q \in F, \alpha \in (\Sigma \cup V), [S \rightarrow \alpha \bullet (s_0)] \in c_q) \Rightarrow \exists \gamma \in \Sigma^*, \gamma \in \mathcal{R} \wedge \gamma \in \mathcal{G}$

Theorem 2 states that if there exists an Earley item of the form  $[S \rightarrow \alpha \bullet (s_0)]$  in chart  $c_q$  for some final NFA state  $q$ , then there exists some string that is present in both  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$ ; i.e. the two languages overlap.

Invariant 1 states that for a given NFA state  $q$  where  $\alpha \in (\Sigma \cup V)$ ,  $[S \rightarrow \alpha \bullet (s_0)] \in c_q$ , then there exists a string  $\gamma \in \Sigma^*$  where  $\gamma \in \mathcal{R}[s_0, q] \wedge \alpha \in \mathcal{G}[\alpha]$ . Since  $q \in F$ ,  $\mathcal{R}[s_0, q] = \mathcal{R}$ . Additionally,



by Invariant 2,  $(S, \alpha) \in R$ , and so  $\mathcal{G}[\alpha] = \mathcal{G}$ , proving that if this modified Earley algorithm accepts a regular language, the decision was made correctly.

CONJECTURE 1 (COMPLETENESS).  $(\exists \gamma \in \Sigma^*, \gamma \in \mathcal{R} \wedge \gamma \in \mathcal{G}) \Rightarrow \exists q \in F, \alpha \in (\Sigma \cup V), [S \rightarrow \alpha \bullet (s_0)] \in c_q$

Conjecture 1 states that if  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  overlap, the modified Earley algorithm will succeed. Consider a single string  $s$  in  $\mathcal{R}$ , and a trace of states  $q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{|s|}$  that is created by stepping through  $\phi$  with each character. If we were to run the traditional Earley algorithm on  $s$ , we would obtain a sequence of charts  $e_0, e_1, \dots, e_{|s|}$ . We posit that after running our modified Earley algorithm, it holds that  $\forall i \in [|s|], s_i \subseteq c_{q_i}$ , modulo a consistent replacement of the *span start* within each Earley item. In other words, if we run the traditional Earley algorithm on any string in  $\mathcal{R}$ , each chart seen while stepping through  $\phi$  after running our modified Earley algorithm will contain at least all items from the corresponding chart of the traditional algorithm. We leave a formal proof of this conjecture for future work.

## 1.2 Explicit Left Quotient Extraction

Now that we have given an algorithm to “parse” a regular language with a CFG, we present a method for extracting an explicit representation of the left quotient.

Our first step is to add extra bookkeeping to the algorithm presented above. When an item is created, we record its *creation method*. Note that each chart is a set of Earley items; a given item cannot appear more than once. However, when an item *would* be created if it weren’t already in a given chart, the algorithm must track this. Therefore, each item may have multiple creation methods.

An item may be *initialized*; i.e. it was one of the items created in  $c_{s_0}$  from the starting non-terminal  $S$ . Alternatively, it may be *scanned* from a previous item, *predicted* from a parent item, or *completed* from a *complete* item into a *completable* item.

The overall idea of extracting an explicit representation of the quotient grammar is that, for any items  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet \beta(i)]$  in  $c_q$  for  $q \in F$ ,  $\beta$  will complete an instance of the nonterminal  $E$  which started in chart  $c_i$ . If that  $E$  was created due to a prediction from some other item  $[F \rightarrow \nu \bullet E\pi(j)]$  in chart  $c_i$ , then  $\beta \circ \pi$  will complete an instance of the nonterminal  $F$  which started in chart  $c_j$ . However, there may be multiple such places where  $\beta$  is used. To enable re-use, we create a new production rule  $(E_i, \beta)$  to represent the unfulfilled remainder of  $E$  that started in chart  $i$ . Instead of using  $\beta \circ \pi$  as the unfulfilled remainder of  $F$  that began in chart  $j$ , we can now represent it as  $E_i \circ \pi$ ; in a latter step,  $(F_j, E_i \circ \pi)$  will be added to  $N$  itself.

The algorithm traces these back until it finds an *initialized* item at chart  $c_{s_0}$ , it then sets the new start nonterminal of the extracted grammar to represent completions of  $s_0$  for that chart.

The full algorithm for extracting an explicit quotient grammar is given in Algorithm 7. A formal proof of correctness is left for future work.

## 1.3 An example of left quotient extraction

Consider a simple CFG  $G = (\{S\}, \{a, b\}, \{(S, \epsilon), (S, aSa), (S, bSb)\}, S)$ , and a regular language  $\mathcal{R} = aa?a$  (represented as the automaton in Figure 6).

We compute the left quotient of  $\mathcal{R} \setminus L(G)$  as follows.

First, we initialize chart 1 of the automaton with top-level Earley items  $[S \rightarrow \bullet (1)]$ ,  $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa (1)]$ , and  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb (1)]$ . All three of these items are annotated as *initialized* items, and added to a queue.

The completer processes  $[S \rightarrow \bullet (1)]$  in chart 1. Nothing immediately occurs, but the program tracks that if an item of the form  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet S\beta (i)]$  is added to chart 1, the completer must be run.

---

**Algorithm 7** Extract an explicit grammar from a set of Earley charts.

---

```

procedure EXTRACTGRAMMAR( $\mathcal{G} = (V, \Sigma, R, S), \mathcal{R} = (Q, \Sigma, s_0, \delta, F), \{c_q | q \in Q\}$ )
  Frontier  $\leftarrow \{(s, q) | s \in c_q, q \in F\}$ 
  Seen  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ 
   $N \leftarrow \{(E_i, \beta) | ([E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet \beta(i)], q) \in \text{Frontier}\}$ 
  while Frontier  $\neq \emptyset$  do
     $(s, q) \leftarrow \text{POP}(\text{Frontier})$ 
    if  $(s, q) \in \text{Seen}$  continue end if
    Seen  $\leftarrow \text{Seen} \cup \{(s, q)\}$ 
    for Creation Method of  $s$  do
      if  $s = [E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet \beta(i)]$  scanned from item  $s'$  in chart  $j$  then
        PUSH(Frontier,  $(s', j)$ )
      else if  $s = [E \rightarrow \bullet \gamma(q)]$  predicted from  $s' = [F \rightarrow \alpha \bullet E\beta(i)]$  then
         $N \leftarrow N \cup \{(F_i, E_q \circ \beta)\}$ 
        PUSH(Frontier,  $(s', q)$ )
      else if  $s = [E \rightarrow \nu A \bullet \pi(i)]$  completed into completable item  $s'$  in chart  $j$  then
        PUSH(Frontier,  $(s', j)$ )
         $\triangleright$  The complete item is irrelevant
      else if  $s = [S \rightarrow \bullet \alpha(s_0)]$  initialized then
         $N \leftarrow N \cup \{(S', S_q)\}$ 
      end if
    end for
  end while
  return  $(V \cup \{S'\}, \Sigma, N \cup R, S')$ 
end procedure

```

---




Fig. 6. An automaton corresponding to the regular expression  $aa?b$

$[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(1)]$  in chart 1 is processed by the scanner:  $[S \rightarrow a \bullet Sa(1)]$  is added to charts 2 and 3.

Nothing occurs when processing  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(1)]$  in chart 1.

$[S \rightarrow a \bullet Sa(1)]$  in chart 2 is processed by the predictor:  $[S \rightarrow \bullet(2)]$ ,  $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(2)]$ , and  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(2)]$  are added to chart 2 (and the queue of unprocessed items).

$[S \rightarrow a \bullet Sa(1)]$  in chart 3 is processed by the predictor:  $[S \rightarrow \bullet(3)]$ ,  $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(3)]$ , and  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(3)]$  are added to chart 3 (and the queue of unprocessed items).

The completer processes  $[S \rightarrow \bullet(2)]$  in chart 2. It adds  $[S \rightarrow aS \bullet a(1)]$  to chart 2, and the program additionally notes that if another item of the form  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet S\beta(i)]$  is added to chart 2, the completer must be run.

$[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(2)]$  in chart 2 is processed by the scanner; it adds  $[S \rightarrow a \bullet Sa(2)]$  to chart 3.

Nothing happens when  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(2)]$  in chart 2 is processed

The completer processes  $[S \rightarrow \bullet(3)]$  in chart 3. It adds  $[S \rightarrow aS \bullet a(1)]$  to chart 3, and the program additionally notes that if another item of the form  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet S\beta(i)]$  is added to chart 3, the completer must be run.

Nothing happens when  $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(3)]$  in chart 3 is processed.

$[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(3)]$  in chart 3 is processed by the scanner; it adds  $[S \rightarrow b \bullet Sb(3)]$  to chart 4.

$[S \rightarrow aS \bullet a(1)]$  in chart 2 is processed by the scanner, adding  $[S \rightarrow aSa \bullet (1)]$  to chart 3.

$[S \rightarrow a \bullet Sa(2)]$  in chart 3 is processed by the predictor. Three items would have been created, but they are already present in chart 3. The program notes that these items have an additional creation method. Additionally, the completion trigger is encountered, adding  $[S \rightarrow aS \bullet a(2)]$  to chart 3.

Nothing happens when  $[S \rightarrow aS \bullet a(1)]$  in chart 3 is processed.

$[S \rightarrow b \bullet Sb(3)]$  in chart 4 is processed by the predictor;  $[S \rightarrow \bullet(4)]$ ,  $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(4)]$ , and  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(4)]$  are added to chart 4.

$[S \rightarrow aSa \bullet (1)]$  in chart 3 is processed by the completer. Nothing happens immediately, but the program notes that if an item of the form  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet S\beta(i)]$  is added to chart 1, the completer must be run.

Nothing happens when  $[S \rightarrow aS \bullet a(2)]$  in chart 3 is processed

$[S \rightarrow \bullet(4)]$  in chart 4 is processed by the completer. The item  $[S \rightarrow bS \bullet b(3)]$  is added to chart 4, and the program notes that if an item of the form  $[E \rightarrow \alpha \bullet S\beta(i)]$  is added to chart 4, the complete must be run.

Finally, nothing happens when the remaining items in the queue ( $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(4)]$ ,  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(4)]$ , and  $[S \rightarrow bS \bullet b(3)]$ , all in chart 4) are processed.

In summary, the charts and creation methods are as follows:

Chart 1 contains:

- (1)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet(1)]$  (*initialized*)
- (2)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(1)]$  (*initialized*)
- (3)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(1)]$  (*initialized*)

Chart 2 contains:

- (1)  $[S \rightarrow a \bullet Sa(1)]$  (*scanned from 1-2*)
- (2)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet(2)]$  (*predicted from 2-1*)
- (3)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(2)]$  (*predicted from 2-1*)
- (4)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(2)]$  (*predicted from 2-1*)
- (5)  $[S \rightarrow aS \bullet a(1)]$  (*completed from 2-2 into 2-1*)

Chart 3 contains:

- (1)  $[S \rightarrow a \bullet Sa(1)]$  (*scanned from 1-2*)
- (2)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet(3)]$  (*predicted from 3-1, predicted from 3-5*)
- (3)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(3)]$  (*predicted from 3-1, predicted from 3-5*)
- (4)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(3)]$  (*predicted from 3-1, predicted from 3-5*)
- (5)  $[S \rightarrow a \bullet Sa(2)]$  (*scanned from 2-3*)
- (6)  $[S \rightarrow aS \bullet a(1)]$  (*completed from 3-2 into 3-1*)
- (7)  $[S \rightarrow aSa \bullet (1)]$  (*scanned from 2-5*)
- (8)  $[S \rightarrow aS \bullet a(2)]$  (*completed from 3-2 into 3-5*)

Chart 4 contains:

- (1)  $[S \rightarrow b \bullet Sb(3)]$  (*scanned from 3-4*)
- (2)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet(4)]$  (*predicted from 4-1*)
- (3)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet aSa(4)]$  (*predicted from 4-1*)

- (4)  $[S \rightarrow \bullet bSb(4)]$  (*predicted* from 4-1)  
 (5)  $[S \rightarrow bS \bullet b(3)]$  (*completed* from 4-2 into 4-1)

We now begin the explicit quotient extraction procedure.

4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5 are added to Frontier (note that it is irrelevant whether Frontier is a stack or queue; we use a queue in this example).

Rules  $(S_3, Sb)$  is added to  $N$ , representing that  $\mathcal{R}[3, 4] \setminus L(G)[S] = L(G)[Sb]$ . Similarly,  $(S_4, \epsilon)$ ,  $(S_4, aSa)$ ,  $(S_4, bSb)$ , and  $(S_3, b)$  are added.

4-1 is processed; it was *scanned* from 3-4, so 3-4 is added to the frontier. The second tuple element can be interpreted as

4-2 was *predicted* from 4-1. 4-1, 4 is added to the frontier (though we will skip processing it, as it has already been seen).  $(S_3, S_4b)$  is added to  $N$ . The same thing occurs when processing 4-3 and 4-4, though the production rules added to  $N$  are duplicates.

4-5 is *completed* into 4-1; 4-1 is added to the frontier, but this will later be skipped as a duplicate.

3-4 is *predicted* from both 3-1 and 3-5. These two indices are added to the frontier, and  $(S_1, S_3a)$  and  $(S_2, S_3a)$  are added to  $N$ .

3-1 was *scanned* from 1-2; 1-2 is added to the frontier.

3-5 was *scanned* from 2-3; 2-3 is added to the frontier.

1-2 was *initialized*; we add  $(S', S_1)$  to  $N$ .

2-3 was *predicted* from 2-1; we add  $(S_1, S_2a)$  to  $N$  and 2-1 to the frontier.

2-1 was *scanned* from 1-2; we add it to the frontier but then skip it.

The frontier is empty. The rules added to  $N$  are concatenated with the original CFG; the following quotient grammar is obtained, with  $S'$  as the top-level nonterminal:

```
S'  -> S_1

S_1 -> S_2 a
    | S_3 a

S_2 -> S_3 a

S_3 -> S_4 b
    | S b
    | b

S_4 -> (empty)
    | a S a
    | b S b

S   -> (empty)
    | a S a
    | b S b
```

This represents the left quotient of  $\mathcal{R} \setminus L(G)$ .

## J LEFTMOST-LONGEST LEXING IS INHERENTLY DIRECTIONAL

One might think that to avoid the issue of lexer starting location, it is possible to start lexing from the well-defined end of the right context. Indeed, our initial attempt at implementing right context lexing used this approach. Each lexeme is defined by a regular language; these languages can be easily reversed, and so it seems natural that matching these reversed regular languages on reversed

strings should yield the expected result, but in reverse. However, while it is possible to reverse a match on a string in isolation, the leftmost-longest matching rule induces directionality that leads to unexpected behavior.

Consider the palindromic string “”###””. Using Python’s lexemes, this text should be lexed as a double-quoted string containing an octothorpe, and then a comment containing the double quote character. Using the reversed lexeme recognizer languages, instead of just capturing the (reversed) comment that contains the first character and is delimited by the octothorpe at index 2, the first match will actually be a comment whose body contains the first three characters, and is delimited by the octothorpe in the fourth position. The remainder is just one double quote character.

Even if a solution can be found for LCFLs, right-to-left lexing becomes even more difficult when considering the additional context-sensitive features mentioned in Section 7. For example, indent and dedent symbols are inserted based on the current line’s indentation level in relation to the previous indentation level. When lexing from left to right, an increase in indentation level is always simple to handle—an indent symbol is emitted immediately. In contrast, it is unclear how to efficiently determine the previous indentation level when lexing right to left. Line continuations, multiline strings, parentheses, or any combination of these may arbitrarily delay the determination of the current and previous indentation levels, and the complexity of the rules involved in these features means that any attempt to calculate indentation level with a pre-processing step will run into the same issues as a left-to-right lexer.

## K EXAMPLE GENERATIONS

Each generation is labeled with the data index in the `-stack-smol-x1` [Kocetkov et al. 2022] as of August 2023.

### K.1 Successful Generations

*K.1.1 Example 1.* Data index 8440. Author: DevvyDoo, 2021. MIT Licensed.

```
<204 lines omitted>
def exitDoorEnterOff(self):
    pass

def exitDoorExitOff(self):
    pass
<24 lines omitted>

def enter(self):
    self.fsm.request('off')
    return

def exit(self):
    self.fsm.request('off')
    return
```

*K.1.2 Example 2.* Data index 1804. Author: Omid Shojaee, unknown year. MIT Licensed.

```
<59 lines omitted>
TEMPLATES = [
```

```

{
  'BACKEND': 'django.template.backends.django.DjangoTemplates',
  'DIRS': [BASE_DIR / 'templates/', ],
  'APP_DIRS': True,
  'OPTIONS': {
    'context_processors': [
      'django.template.context_processors.debug',
      'django.template.context_processors.request',
      'django.contrib.auth.context_processors.auth',
      'django.contrib.messages.context_processors.messages',
    ],
  },
},
]
<18 lines omitted>
AUTH_PASSWORD_VALIDATORS = [
  {
    'NAME': 'django.contrib.auth.password_validation.UserAttributeSimil...
  },
  {
    'NAME': 'django.contrib.auth.password_validation.MinimumLengthValid...
  },
<38 lines omitted>

```

*K.1.3 Example 3.* Data index 8551. Author: Empire, 2015. BSD 3-Clause Licensed.

```

import argparse

class Config():
    def __init__(self):
        self.parser = argparse.ArgumentParser()
        self.parser.add_argument("--data_path", type=str, default="../../../Ru...
        self.parser.add_argument("--n_epochs", type=int, default=200, help=...
        self.parser.add_argument("--batch_size", type=int, default=64, help=...
        self.parser.add_argument("--lr", type=float, default=0.0002, help="...
        self.parser.add_argument("--b1", type=float, default=0.5, help="ada...
        self.parser.add_argument("--b2", type=float, default=0.999, help="a...
        self.parser.add_argument("--n_cpu", type=int, default=4, help="numb...
        self.parser.add_argument("--latent_dim", type=int, default=100, hel...
        self.parser.add_argument("--n_classes", type=int, default=2, help="...
        self.parser.add_argument("--size", type=int, default=17814, help="s...

```

## K.2 Example unsuccessful generations

*K.2.1 Example 1: Incremental Parser Incorrectly Reports Success.* Data index 7396. Author: Chris Wacek, 2014. MIT Licensed.

```

<prefix and beginning of constrained generation omitted>
    if item_constraint is not None:
        if isinstance(item_constraint, (tuple, list)):
            type_array = []
            for i, elem in enumerate(item_constraint):
                if isinstance(elem, dict):
                    uri = "{0}_{1}".format(name, i)
                    item_detail = elem
                    if '$ref' in item_detail:
                        item_detail = (
                            util.resolve_ref_uri(
                                klassbuilder.resolver.resolution_scope,
                                item_detail['$ref']),
                                item_detail)
                    else:
                        subtype = klassbuilder.construct(
                            uri + "_%s" % i, item_detail)

                    type_array.append(subtype)

            item_constraint = classbuilder.TypeProxy(type_array)

        elif isinstance(item_constraint.get('type'), 'object'):
            """ We need to create a ProtocolBase object for this an...
            uri = "{0}_{1}".format(name, "<anonymous_list_type>")
            item_constraint = klassbuilder.construct(
                uri, item_constraint)

```

K.2.2 *Example 2: No Stopping Point Found.* Data index 8. Author: JE-Chen, 2022. MIT Licensed.  
The left context and generated code are as follows:

```

<8 lines omitted>
# Diffie-Hellman Proof-of-Possession Algorithms
#
# ASN.1 source from http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5280.txt
#
from pyasn1.type import univ
from pyasn1.type import namedtype
from pyasn1.type import tag
from pyasn1.type import constraint
from pyasn1.type import namedval
from pyasn1.type import char
from pyasn1.type import useful
from pyasn1.type import univ
from pyasn1.type import useful

```

```
from pyasn1.type import char
<Continues until computation budget exhausted>
```

Our incremental parser correctly identifies that no prefix of the generated text is a member of the quotient language, given the following suffix text:

```
tic(univ.Sequence):
    componentType = namedtype.NamedTypes(
        namedtype.OptionalNamedType('issuerAndSerial', IssuerAndSerialNumbe...
        namedtype.NamedType('hashValue', MessageDigest())
    )
<61 lines omitted>
```

## L SOURCE CODE ATTRIBUTION

A number of code examples from this paper are included in The Stack dataset [Kocetkov et al. 2022]. Full attributions are located in Table 2. The licenses under which these examples are used are included in this section.

Location	Author	Year	GitHub Repository	License
Figure 2	BlockScience	2018-20	kivo360/cadCAD	MIT
Section K.1.1	DevvyDoo	2021	DevvyDont/TT-CL-Edition	MIT
Section K.1.2	Omid Shojaee	Unk	omidshojaee/omidshojaee.com	MIT
Section K.1.3	Empire	2015	Oneconsult/Empire	BSD-3
Section K.2.1	Chris Wacek	2014	salbertson/python-jsonschema-objects	MIT
Section K.2.2	JE-Chen	2022	JE-Chen/je_old_repo	MIT

Table 2. Source attributions for code included in The Stack, and which are included here. Any source code not highlighted as being generated is unmodified aside from omitting surrounding text. Generated code is highlighted.

### L.1 MIT License

Copyright <Year> <Copyright Holder>

Permission is hereby granted, free of charge, to any person obtaining a copy of this software and associated documentation files (the "Software"), to deal in the Software without restriction, including without limitation the rights to use, copy, modify, merge, publish, distribute, sublicense, and/or sell copies of the Software, and to permit persons to whom the Software is furnished to do so, subject to the following conditions:

The above copyright notice and this permission notice shall be included in all copies or substantial portions of the Software.

THE SOFTWARE IS PROVIDED "AS IS", WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE AND NONINFRINGEMENT. IN NO EVENT SHALL THE AUTHORS OR COPYRIGHT HOLDERS BE LIABLE FOR ANY CLAIM, DAMAGES OR OTHER LIABILITY, WHETHER IN AN ACTION OF CONTRACT, TORT OR OTHERWISE, ARISING FROM, OUT OF OR IN CONNECTION WITH THE SOFTWARE OR THE USE OR OTHER DEALINGS IN THE SOFTWARE.



## L.2 BSD 3-Clause License

Copyright <Year> <Copyright Holder>

Redistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or without modification, are permitted provided that the following conditions are met:

- Redistributions of source code must retain the above copyright notice, this list of conditions and the following disclaimer.
- Redistributions in binary form must reproduce the above copyright notice, this list of conditions and the following disclaimer in the documentation and/or other materials provided with the distribution.
- Neither the name of the copyright holder nor the names of its contributors may be used to endorse or promote products derived from this software without specific prior written permission.

THIS SOFTWARE IS PROVIDED BY THE COPYRIGHT HOLDERS AND CONTRIBUTORS "AS IS" AND ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE ARE DISCLAIMED. IN NO EVENT SHALL THE COPYRIGHT HOLDER OR CONTRIBUTORS BE LIABLE FOR ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, EXEMPLARY, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PROCUREMENT OF SUBSTITUTE GOODS OR SERVICES; LOSS OF USE, DATA, OR PROFITS; OR BUSINESS INTERRUPTION) HOWEVER CAUSED AND ON ANY THEORY OF LIABILITY, WHETHER IN CONTRACT, STRICT LIABILITY, OR TORT (INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE OR OTHERWISE) ARISING IN ANY WAY OUT OF THE USE OF THIS SOFTWARE, EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE.