
Subject: Re: NTL and C4251

Posted by [jmansion](#) on Tue, 25 Apr 2006 13:19:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>OK, I believe that it can save some time as long
>as you have description ready before starting the job...

You must type a lot faster than I do then. I think its actually most handy when evolving the grammar. I like to write the grammar, and then write some candidate inputs and see if they feel right, for the things I want to express. And then change things around a bit and try again.

Having that sort of tool makes it easy - I don't add the AST code and semantic actions until I'm happy with the structure, and there's no way I could iterate that fast even using Java or C# with a hand-written parser, let alone C++.

I can't believe that anyone would argue that parser creation isn't a whole lot faster with a good generator tool, particularly if you care about whether your off-the-cuff implementation actually handles an ambiguous grammar in a particular way through accident - I'd rather have a formal grammar specification and a tool that can warn me of ambiguities. Not least, it also makes it easier to create alternate implementations in other languages.

Its certainly the case that a hand-written parser can be faster and have better diagnostics support, if you work hard enough at it.

James
