

Closure properties of CFLs

Closure ?

- The CFL are closed under some operation means after performing that particular operation on those CFLs, The resultant language is CFL.

Closure properties of CFLs

The context free languages **are closed** under the following operations:-

- Union
- Concatenation
- Closure and positive closure
- Homomorphism

Closure properties of CFLs

The context free languages **are not closed** under the following operations:-

- Intersection
- Complement

Closed under Union

- If L1 and L2 are Context free languages then $L=L1 \cup L2$ is also Context free.

Proof:-

- Let L1 and L2 be CFLs generated by the CFGs

$$G1=(V1, T1, P1, S1)$$

$$G2=(V2, T2, P2, S2)$$

- We assume that V1 and V2 are disjoint
- Also S3 is not in V1 or V2

- Construct a grammar

$$G3=(V3, T3, P3, S3)$$

$$V3=V1 \cup V2 \cup \{S3\},$$

$$T3=T1 \cup T2$$

$$\text{P3} = \text{P1} \cup \text{P2} \cup \{ S3 \rightarrow S1 | S2 \}$$

Closed under Union

- If w is in L_1 , then the derivation $S_3 \Rightarrow S_1 \Rightarrow w$ is a derivation in G_3 . As every production of G_1 is a production of G_3
- Similarly every word in L_2 has a derivation in G_3 beginning with $S_3 \Rightarrow S_2$.
- **$L(G_3)$ contains those strings that are derivable from S_1 as well as derivable from S_2**
- Thus $L_1 \cup L_2 \subseteq L(G_3)$
- **As all the strings of G_1 and G_2 can be derived from G_3 and can be represented in VTPS format, Thus it is Closed under Union**

Closed under Concatenation

- If L1 and L2 are Context free languages then $L=L1.L2$ is also Context free.

Proof:-

- Let L1 and L2 be CFLs generated by the CFGs

$$G1=(V1, T1, P1, S1)$$

$$G2=(V2, T2, P2, S2)$$

- We assume that V1 and V2 are disjoint
- Also S4 is not in V1 or V2

- For $L1.L2$,

- Construct a grammar

$$G4=(V1 \cup V2 \cup \{S4\}, T1 \cup T2, P4, S4)$$

$$P4=P1 \cup P2 \cup \{S4 \rightarrow S1S2\}$$

- The proof that $L(G4)=L(G1)L(G2)$ is similar to the proof for union

Closed under Concatenation

For L1.L2,

- Construct a grammar

$$G4 = (V1 \cup V2 \cup \{S4\}, T1 \cup T2, P4, S4)$$

$$P4 = P1 \cup P2 \cup \{S4 \rightarrow S1S2\}$$

- The proof that $L(G4) = L(G1)L(G2)$ is similar to the proof for union
- All the strings $S1$ followed by strings $s2$ can be generated by the grammar $G4$
- $G4$ can be represented in VTPS format
- Thus, $G4$ is closed under Concatenation

Closed under Concatenation

- If L1 and L2 are two context free languages, their concatenation L1.L2 will also be context free.

For example,

- $L1 = \{ a^n b^n \mid n \geq 0 \}$
- $L2 = \{ c^m d^m \mid m \geq 0 \}$
- $L3 = L1.L2 = \{a^n b^n c^m d^m \mid m \geq 0 \text{ and } n \geq 0\}$
- L1 says number of a's should be equal to number of b's
- L2 says number of c's should be equal to number of d's.
- Concatenation says first number of a's should be equal to number of b's, then number of c's should be equal to number of d's.
- We can create a PDA which will first push for a's, pop for b's, push for c's then pop for d's.
- So it can be accepted by pushdown automata, hence context free.
- Thus, CFL are closed under Concatenation.

Closed under Kleene Closure

- If L_1 is Context free languages then $L=L_1^*$ is also Context free.

Proof:-

- Let L_1 be CFL generated by the CFG

$$G_1=(V_1, T_1, P_1, S_1)$$

- Also S_5 is not in V_1

For L_1^* ,

- Construct a grammar

$$G_5=(V_1 \cup \{S_5\}, T_1, P_5, S_5)$$

$$P_5=P_1 \cup \{S_5 \rightarrow S_1 S_5 \mid \epsilon\}$$

- The proof that $L(G_5)=L(G_1)^*$ can be done similarly

Closed under Concatenation

- For L_1^* ,
 - Construct a grammar $G_5 = (V_1 \cup \{S_5\}, T_1, P_5, S_5)$ where P_5 is P_1 plus the production
 - $S_5 \rightarrow S_1 S_5 \mid \epsilon$
- The proof that $L(G_5) = L(G_1)^*$ can be done similarly
- All the strings for S_1^* can be generated by the grammar G_5
 - G_5 can be represented in VTPS format
 - Thus, G_5 is closed under Kleene Closure

Not Closed under Intersection

- Let us take two languages L1 and L2
- $L1 = \{a^i b^j c^j \mid i \geq 1 \text{ and } j \geq 1\}$ and
- $L2 = \{a^i b^j c^j \mid i \geq 1 \text{ and } j \geq 1\}$
- L1 says number of a's should be equal to number of b's
- L2 says number of b's should be equal to number of c's.
- Both are CFLs
- A PDA to recognize L1 stores a's on its stack and cancels them against b's then accepts its input after reading one or more c's.

Not Closed under Intersection

- L1 can be generated as
- S->AB
- A->aAb | ab
- B->cB | c
- where A generates $a^i b^i$ and B generates c^j

- L2 can be generated as
- S->CD
- C->aC|a
- D->bDc | bc
- where D generates $b^j c^j$ and C generates a^i

Not Closed under Intersection

- However, $L_1 \cap L_2 = L$
- $L = \{a^i b^i c^i \mid i \geq 1\}$
- L_1 says number of a's should be equal to number of b's
- L_2 says number of b's should be equal to number of c's.
- A string in both the languages must have equal numbers of all three symbols
- But push down automata can compare only two symbols. So it cannot be accepted by pushdown automata, hence not context free.
- Thus, L is not CFL
- Hence, proved

Not Closed under Complementation

- Let L_1, L_2 are 2 CFLs
- Lets assume that complement of a CFL is a CFL itself.
- Thus, L_1', L_2' both are CFLs
- Then $L = (L_1' \cup L_2')$ is also a CFL
- $L_1 \cap L_2 = (L_1' \cup L_2')$
- we know that intersection is not closed
- Thus, L' may or may not be CFL
- Hence, Not Closed under Complementation

Intersection with Regular Sets

- CFL are closed under intersection with regular sets
- If L is a CFL and R is a regular set then $L \cap R$ is always a CFL