A grammar can only have <u>finitely</u> many productions. However, any EBNF rule can be translated into an equivalent *finite* set of BNF productions as follows.

Working from the inside outwards, eliminate all occurrences of (...), [...], and { ... }:

- Replace each $(x_1 \mid ... \mid x_k)$ with a new nonterminal (D, say) that is defined by these k productions: $D ::= x_1 \mid ... \mid x_k$
- Replace each $[x_1 \mid ... \mid x_k]$ with a new nonterminal (D, say) that is defined by these k+1 productions: $D ::= \langle empty \rangle \mid x_1 \mid ... \mid x_k$
- Replace each $\{x_1 \mid \dots \mid x_k\}$ with a new nonterminal (D, say) that is defined by these k+1 productions: $D ::= \langle empty \rangle \mid Dx_1 \mid \dots \mid Dx_k$

Here k may be 1. Thus { Digit } can be replaced with a new nonterminal (DigitSeq, say) that is defined by:

DigitSeq ::= <empty> | DigitSeq Digit

```
Example: We now use the above method to translate
    Expr ::= [+ | -] Term \{(+ | -)\}
                                         (*)
into a finite set of BNF productions.
defined by: Op ::= + \mid -
  2. Next, replace {Op Term} with a nonterminal Rest
  defined by: Rest ::= <empty> Rest Op Term
  3. Finally, replace [+ | -] with a nonterminal OptSign
  defined by OptSign ::= <empty> | + | -
  (***) becomes: Expr ::= OptSign Term Rest
The result is the following set of 8 BNF productions:
    Expr ::= OptSign Term Rest
  OptSign ::= \langle empty \rangle | + | -
    Rest ::= <empty> | Rest Op Term
      Op ::= + | -
```

While the above method always works, it will often <u>not</u> find a simplest finite set of grammar productions that is equivalent to the given EBNF rule!

```
For example, here is a simpler set of grammar productions that is equivalent to the EBNF rule

Expr ::= [+ | -] Term {(+ | -) Term}

considered above:
```