The language N(M) is context-free for each PDA M.

#### Proof.

Let 
$$M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, \#, F)$$
 be a PDA, and let  $L = N(M)$ .

W.I.o.g. we can assume the following:

For all  $(q', B_1 B_2 \cdots B_k) \in \delta(q, a, A)$ , we have  $k \leq 2$ .

Otherwise, we replace  $(q', B_1 B_2 \cdots B_k) \in \delta(q, a, A)$  (k > 2) by the following transitions:

 $\begin{array}{rcl} (q_1, B_1 B_2) & \in & \delta(q, a, A), \\ \{(q_2, B_2 B_3)\} & = & \delta(q_1, \varepsilon, B_2), \\ & \vdots \\ \{(q', B_{k-1} B_k)\} & = & \delta(q_{k-2}, \varepsilon, B_{k-1}), \\ \text{where } q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{k-1} \text{ are new states.} \end{array}$ 

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ = のへで

Idea: A grammar *G* that simulates the computations of *M* through leftmost derivations.

Let  $G := (N, \Sigma, P, S)$ , where  $N := \{S\} \cup [Q \times \Gamma \times Q],$   $P := \{S \to (q_0, \#, q) \mid q \in Q\}$   $\cup \{[q, A, q'] \to a \mid (q', \varepsilon) \in \delta(q, a, A)\}$   $\cup \{[q, A, q'] \to a[q_1, B, q'] \mid (q_1, B) \in \delta(q, a, A), q' \in Q\}$  $\cup \{[q, A, q'] \to a[q_1, C, q_2][q_2, B, q'] \mid (q_1, BC) \in \delta(q, a, A), q', q_2 \in Q\}.$ 

#### Claim:

 $\forall p,q \in Q \forall A \in \Gamma \, \forall x \in \Sigma^* : [q,A,p] \rightarrow^*_{\mathrm{lm}} x \text{ iff } (q,A,x) \vdash^*_M (p,\varepsilon,\varepsilon).$ 

 $\mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}$ 

▲□▶▲□▶▲目▶▲目▶ = 目

# Proof of Claim.

First we prove by induction on *i* that  $(q, A, x) \vdash_{M}^{i} (p, \varepsilon, \varepsilon)$  implies that  $[q, A, p] \rightarrow_{\mathrm{Im}}^{i} x$ . For i = 1, if  $(q, A, x) \vdash_{M} (p, \varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ , then  $(p, \varepsilon) \in \delta(q, x, A)$  and  $x \in \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ . Hence, *G* contains the production  $[q, A, p] \rightarrow x$ , and so,  $[q, A, p] \rightarrow_{\mathrm{Im}} x$ . Now assume that the above implication has been established for i - 1, let x = ay, and let

$$(q, A, ay) \vdash_M (q_1, B_2B_1, y) \vdash_M^{i-1} (p, \varepsilon, \varepsilon),$$

that is,  $(q_1, B_2B_1) \in \delta(q, a, A)$ .

 $\mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}$ 

-

<ロ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < □ > <

# Proof of Claim (cont.)

As *M* can only read and replace the topmost symbol on the pushdown, it follows that  $y = y_1 y_2$ , and that the above computation can be factored as follows:

$$(q_1, B_1, y_1) \vdash_M^{k_1} (q_2, \varepsilon, \varepsilon) \text{ and } (q_2, B_2, y_2) \vdash_M^{k_2} (p, \varepsilon, \varepsilon),$$

where  $q_2 \in Q$ , and  $k_1 + k_2 = i - 1$ .

From the I.H. we obtain the leftmost derivations

$$[q_1,B_1,q_2]
ightarrow^{k_1}_{\mathrm{lm}}y_1$$
 and  $[q_2,B_2,p]
ightarrow^{k_2}_{\mathrm{lm}}y_2.$ 

 $\mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}$ 

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

# Proof of Claim (cont.)

Because of the transition in step 1, we have

$$([q, A, p] \rightarrow a[q_1, B_1, q_2][q_2, B_2, p]) \in P,$$

and therewith we obtain the following leftmost derivation in G:

$$egin{aligned} [q, A, p] & o_{\mathrm{lm}} & a[q_1, B_1, q_2][q_2, B_2, p] \ & o_{\mathrm{lm}}^{k_1} & ay_1[q_2, B_2, p] \ & o_{\mathrm{lm}}^{k_2} & ay_1y_2 = ay = x, \end{aligned}$$

that is, we have  $[q, A, p] \rightarrow_{\text{lm}}^{i} x$ .

 $\mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}$ 

Ξ.

<ロ> < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

# Proof of Claim (cont.)

Now we prove the converse implication, again by induction on *i*.

For i = 1,  $[q, A, p] \rightarrow x$  implies that  $x \in \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$  and  $(p, \varepsilon) \in \delta(q, x, A)$ , that is,  $(q, A, x) \vdash_M (p, \varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ .

Now assume that the implication has been proved for i - 1, and assume that

$$[q, A, p] \rightarrow a[q_1, B_1, q_2][q_2, B_2, p] \rightarrow_{\operatorname{lm}}^{i-1} x \in \Sigma^*.$$

Then  $x = ax_1x_2$ , where  $[q_1, B_1, q_2] \rightarrow_{\lim}^{k_1} x_1$ ,  $[q_2, B_2, p] \rightarrow_{\lim}^{k_2} x_2$ , and  $k_1 + k_2 = i - 1$ . From the I.H. we obtain  $(q_1, B_1, x_1) \vdash_M^{k_1} (q_2, \varepsilon, \varepsilon)$  and  $(q_2, B_2, x_2) \vdash_M^{k_2} (p, \varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ .

-

Y)Q(

# Proof of Claim (cont.)

Hence, we have

$$(q_1, B_2B_1, x_1) \vdash_M^{k_1} (q_2, B_2, \varepsilon).$$

As  $(q_1, B_2B_1) \in \delta(q, a, A)$ , this yields the following computation:

$$\begin{array}{ll} (q,A,x) &=& (q,A,ax_1x_2) \vdash_M (q_1,B_2B_1,x_1x_2) \\ & \vdash_M^{k_1} (q_2,B_2,x_2) \vdash_M^{k_2} (p,\varepsilon,\varepsilon), \end{array}$$

that is, we have  $(q, A, x) \vdash^{i}_{M} (p, \varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ .

 $\mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}$ 

Ξ.

For all  $x \in \Sigma^*$  we have the following equivalent statements:

$$egin{aligned} & x \in L(G) & ext{iff} \quad S o_{ ext{lm}}^* x \ & ext{iff} \quad S o [q_0, \#, q] o_{ ext{lm}}^i x ext{ for some } q \in Q ext{ and } i \geq 1 \ & ext{iff} \quad (q_0, \#, x) dash_M^i \ (q, arepsilon, arepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that L(G) = N(M).

# Corollary 3.21

For each language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ , the following statements are equivalent:

- (1)  $L \in CFL(\Sigma)$ , that is, L is generated by a context-free grammar.
- (2) L is generated by a context-free grammar in CNF.
- (3) L is generated by a context-free grammar in Greibach NF.
- (4) There exists a PDA M such that L = N(M).
- (5) There exists a PDA M such that L = L(M).

#### 3.5. Closure Properties

# 3.5. Closure Properties

# Theorem 3.22

The class of context-free languages CFL is closed under the operations of union, product, Kleene star, and morphism.

# Proof.

- (a) Let  $G_1 = (N_1, \Sigma, P_1, S_1)$ ,  $G_2 = (N_2, \Sigma, P_2, S_2)$ ,  $N_1 \cap N_2 = \emptyset$ . For  $G_3 := (N_1 \cup N_2 \cup \{S\}, \Sigma, P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \{S \to S_1 | S_2\}, S)$ , we have  $L(G_3) = L(G_1) \cup L(G_2)$ .
- (b) For  $G_4 := (N_1 \cup N_2 \cup \{S\}, \Sigma, P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \{S \to S_1S_2\}, S)$ , we have  $L(G_4) = L(G_1) \cdot L(G_2)$ .
- (c) W.I.o.g.:  $S_1$  does not occur on the right-hand side of  $P_1$ . For  $G_5 := (N_1 \cup \{S\}, \Sigma, P_1 \cup \{S \rightarrow \varepsilon | S_1 | SS_1\} \setminus \{S_1 \rightarrow \varepsilon\}, S)$ , we have  $L(G_5) = (L(G_1))^*$ .

(d) Let  $h : \Sigma^* \to \Gamma^*$  be a morphism. For  $G_6 := (N_1, \Gamma, \{A \to h(r) \mid (A \to r) \in P_1\}, S_1)$ , where *h* is extended to a morphism  $h : (N_1 \cup \Sigma)^* \to (N_1 \cup \Gamma)^*$  by taking h(A) = A for all  $A \in N_1$ , we have  $L(G_6) = h(L(G_1))$ .

## Theorem 3.23

The class CFL is not closed under intersection nor under complement.

#### Proof.

 $L_1 := \{ a^i b^j c^j \mid i, j > 0 \} \in \text{CFL} \text{ and } L_2 := \{ a^i b^j c^j \mid i, j > 0 \} \in \text{CFL},$ 

but 
$$L_1 \cap L_2 = \{ a'b'c' \mid i > 0 \} \notin CFL$$
, that is,

CFL is not closed under intersection.

$$L_1 \cap L_2 = \overline{(\overline{L}_1 \cup \overline{L}_2)}$$
, that is,

CFL is not closed under complement, either.

Prof. Dr. F. Otto (Universität Kassel)

The class CFL is closed under intersection with regular languages, that is, if  $L \in CFL$  and  $R \in REG$ , then  $L \cap R \in CFL$ .

#### Proof.

Let  $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, Z_0, F)$  be a PDA, and let  $A = (P, \Sigma, \eta, p_0, G)$  be a DFA. We define a PDA  $M' := (Q \times P, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta', (q_0, p_0), Z_0, F \times G)$  by taking  $\delta'((q, p), a, A) = \{((q', p'), \alpha) | (q', \alpha) \in \delta(q, a, A), p' = \eta(p, a)\},\$  $\delta'((q, p), \varepsilon, A) = \{((q', p), \alpha) | (q', \alpha) \in \delta(q, \varepsilon, A)\},\$ 

where  $q, q' \in Q, p, p' \in P, a \in \Sigma, A \in \Gamma$ , and  $\alpha \in \Gamma^*$ . Then it is easily seen that  $L(M') = L(M) \cap L(A)$ .

<ロト</p>

Let  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$  be a context-free language, and let  $w \in \Sigma^*$ . Then the left quotient  $w \setminus L := \{ u \in \Sigma^* \mid wu \in L \}$  is a context-free language.

#### Proof.

Let  $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, Z_0, F)$  be a PDA without  $\varepsilon$ -transitions, and let  $w \in \Sigma^*$ . Actually, we only consider the special case that  $w = b \in \Sigma$ .

We define a PDA  $M' := (Q \cup \{p_0\}, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta', p_0, Z_0, F)$  by taking

$$\delta'(p_0, \varepsilon, Z_0) = \delta(q_0, b, Z_0)$$
 and  
 $\delta'(q, a, A) = \delta(q, a, A)$  for all  $q \in Q, a \in \Sigma$ , and  $A \in \Gamma$ .

Then  $N(M') = b \setminus N(M)$ .

3

<ロ > < 同 > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > <

## Remark:

We saw in Section 3 that the language

 $L := \{ a^{i}b^{j}c^{k}d^{\ell} \mid i, j, k, \ell \geq 0, \text{ and } i > 0 \text{ implies } j = k = \ell \}$ 

satisfies the Pumping Lemma for context-free languages.

# Claim:

L is not context-free.

# Proof.

Assume that L is context-free. Then also the language

$$L' := L \cap a \cdot b^* \cdot c^* \cdot d^* = \{ ab^n c^n d^n \mid n \ge 0 \}$$

is context-free, and so is the language  $a \setminus L' = \{ b^n c^n d^n \mid n \ge 0 \}$ , which, however, is not context-free by the Pumping Lemma, a contradiction!

Thus, it follows that *L* is not context-free.

Prof. Dr. F. Otto (Universität Kassel)

The class CFL is closed under inverse morphisms, that is, if  $L \in CFL(\Delta)$ , and if  $h : \Sigma^* \to \Delta^*$  is a morphism, then  $h^{-1}(L) = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid h(w) \in L \} \in CFL(\Sigma).$ 

#### Proof.

Let  $h : \Sigma^* \to \Delta^*$  be a morphism, and let  $M = (Q, \Delta, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, Z_0, F)$  be a PDA s.t. L(M) = L. We construct a PDA  $M' = (Q', \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta', q'_0, Z_0, F')$  for  $L' := h^{-1}(L) = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid h(w) \in L \} :$  $- Q' := \{ [q, x] \mid q \in Q, \text{ and } x \text{ is a suffix of } h(a), a \in \Sigma \},$  $- q'_0 := [q_0, \varepsilon],$  $- F' := \{ [q, \varepsilon] \mid q \in F \}, \text{ and}$ 

-  $\delta'$  is defined by:

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ ■ めのの

(1) 
$$\delta'([q, ax], \varepsilon, A) = \{([p, x], \gamma) | (p, \gamma) \in \delta(q, a, A)\}$$
  
 $\cup \{([p, ax], \gamma) | (p, \gamma) \in \delta(q, \varepsilon, A)\},$   
(2)  $\delta'([q, \varepsilon], a, A) = \{([q, h(a)], A)\}$  for all  $a \in \Sigma$ .

The second component of the states of M' is used as a "buffer" for storing the word h(a) for a letter  $a \in \Sigma$  read. This word is then processed through a simulation of a computation of M.

It follows that 
$$h^{-1}(L) \subseteq L(M')$$
.

Concersely, let  $w = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n \in L(M')$ .

A transition reading a letter  $a \in \Sigma$  can only be applied if and when the buffer is empty, that is, each accepting computation of M' on input w can be written as follows:

500

<ロ > < 団 > < 団 > < 亘 > < 亘 > 、

$$([q_{0}, \varepsilon], Z_{0}, a_{1}a_{2} \cdots a_{n})$$

$$\vdash_{M'} ([p_{1}, \varepsilon], \alpha_{1}, a_{1}a_{2} \cdots a_{n}) \quad (\text{simulating } \varepsilon\text{-transitions of M})$$

$$\vdash_{M'} ([p_{1}, h(a_{1})], \alpha_{1}, a_{2} \cdots a_{n}) \quad (h(a_{1}) \text{ is "read"})$$

$$\vdash_{M'} ([p_{2}, \varepsilon], \alpha_{2}, a_{2} \dots a_{n}) \quad (\text{for } (p_{1}, \alpha_{1}, h(a_{1})) \vdash_{M}^{*} (p_{2}, \alpha_{2}, \varepsilon))$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\vdash_{M'} ([p_{n}, h(a_{n})], \alpha_{n}, \varepsilon) \quad (h(a_{n}) \text{ is "read"})$$

$$\vdash_{M'} ([p_{n+1}, \varepsilon], \alpha_{n+1}, \varepsilon) \quad (\text{for } (p_{n}, \alpha_{n}, h(a_{n})) \vdash_{M}^{*} (p_{n+1}, \alpha_{n+1}, \varepsilon)).$$

It follows that

 $(q_0, Z_0, h(a_1a_2 \cdots a_n)) = (q_0, Z_0, h(a_1)h(a_2) \cdots h(a_n)) \vdash_M^* (p_{n+1}, \alpha_{n+1}, \varepsilon).$ As *M'* accepts,  $p_{n+1} \in F$ , which implies that *M* accepts, too. Thus,  $L(M') = h^{-1}(L)$ , which yields  $h^{-1}(L) \in CFL(\Sigma)$ .

3

< ロ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > 、

In analogy to Corollary 2.29 we have the following closure property.

Corollary 3.27

The class CFL is closed under finite transductions, that is, if  $T \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Delta^*$  is a finite transduction, and if  $L \in CFL(\Sigma)$ , then  $T(L) \in CFL(\Delta)$ .

 $\mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}$ 

Ξ.

<ロ > < 同 > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > <