

# A Very Simple Grammars Book

Philip W. Howard

October 15, 2019

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>I Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Historical Background . . . . .	3
1.2 Formal Languages . . . . .	3
<b>2 Recursive Definitions</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Constructing Recursive Definitions . . . . .	10
2.2 Summary . . . . .	12
2.3 Problems . . . . .	12
<b>II Regular Languages</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3 Regular Expressions</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 M . . . . .	17
3.2 Language Families . . . . .	17
3.3 Why Regular Languages? . . . . .	20
3.4 Exercises . . . . .	21
<b>4 Finite Automata</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1 Non-deterministic Finite Automata . . . . .	26
4.2 Thompson's . . . . .	28
4.3 Subset Construction . . . . .	31
<b>5 Theory</b>	<b>41</b>

<i>CONTENTS</i>	iii
<b>III Context Free Grammars</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>6 Context Free Grammars</b>	<b>51</b>
6.1 Derivations . . . . .	54
6.2 Ambiguous Grammars . . . . .	55
<b>7 Pushdown Automata</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>IV Beyond Context Free Languages</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>A The First Appendix</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>B The Second Appendix</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Afterword</b>	<b>64</b>

# List of Figures

1.1	Formal language processor . . . . .	4
4.1	Sample Finite Automaton . . . . .	24
4.2	FA for double letters . . . . .	26
4.3	Transition Table . . . . .	26
4.4	Sample Non-deterministic Finite Automaton . . . . .	27
4.5	Thompson's Construction . . . . .	29
4.6	NFA produced by Thompson's . . . . .	32
4.7	Transition table for DFA . . . . .	39
5.1	Union of to regular expressions . . . . .	42
5.2	Complement of a Regular Language . . . . .	43
5.3	FA with a loop . . . . .	45
5.4	FA illustrating the pumping lemma . . . . .	46
6.1	Syntax tree . . . . .	56
6.2	Derivations from an ambiguous grammar . . . . .	57

# Preface

I've been teaching Introduction to Grammars (aka Computer Theory) at Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) for several years. OIT offers a very hands-on program, so why include a theory course? The most obvious answer is that it lays the theoretical background for a compiler class. I don't find that answer particularly compelling because to be successful in a compiler class a student needs a practical knowledge of some of the concepts included in a grammars class, but the student does not need the theoretical content to be successful in compilers.

To me, the primary reason for including the grammars class in our curriculum is precisely because it is a theory class. Requiring students to think abstractly, and to work on abstract problems (some of which are quite difficult) allows them to develop skills and thought processes that can be missed in a purely practical, hands-on program of study. These additional skills and thought processes will make them better equipped to solve some of the complex problems they may face in their professional careers.

So why did I decide to write a text for this class? There is a Computer Theory text that I really like, but it has become criminally expensive (as I'm writing this, Amazon would be glad to sell you a new paperback edition for over \$500). I could not, in clear conscience, ask my students to purchase a book at that price. I found an Open text that could be legally downloaded free; a print-on-demand paperback version could be purchased for under \$10. It was a good text, but it was "too mathematical" for my purposes. I want my students to be able to wrestle with concepts without getting bogged down with too much notation. So I decided to attempt my own.

I hope that this book proves useful to my students, and if it is discovered by others, that it is useful to them as well.

Phil Howard



# Part I

## Introduction

My grammars students often wonder why we include a theory course in an otherwise very hands-on program. My answer, “Because grammars is fun!” doesn’t seem to carry much weight, so I offer the following list of benefits to studying this topic:

1. The grammars course lays the theoretical foundation for the compilers course. What does a compiler do? It implements several formal language processors. What is a formal language? That’s part of what is learned in the grammars course.
2. You will be better at what you’re being trained to do if you can think abstractly. A theory course helps you do that.
3. Many programming problems can be made much easier if you can transform the problem to a different domain. The grammars class illustrates ways this is done. If you “get” the mechanism, you can apply it elsewhere.
4. As you are stretched, you grow. By facing difficult challenges in your course work, you are better equipped to face difficult challenges in your professional work.
5. And besides, grammars is fun!



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Historical Background

This section needs work.

### 1.2 Formal Languages

Computer theory deals with what is known as “formal languages”. They aren’t formal in the sense that you use them when talking to important people (as opposed to the informality that you allow when shooting the breeze with friends). They are formal in the sense that they conform to a specific (usually mathematical) form. In particular, given a statement, it is always possible to answer the question, “Is that statement a valid statement in this formal language?” English does not meet this definition. Consider all the red ink used by English teachers while grading freshmen compositions. The writers thought their statements were valid English, the but teachers disagreed.

Figure [1.1](#) illustrates what a formal language processor does. Any arbitrary input can be fed into the processor, and it answers the question, “Is the input a valid statement in the language?”. It always returns “yes” or “no”. If the language is a formal language, there can be no “maybe”.



Figure 1.1: A formal language process is fed some input and it returns one of two answers: The input is a valid statement in the language or The input is not a valid statement in the language.

If you attempted to create a Language Processor for English, it should probably reject statements like, “Cup sky red Perl”. Rejecting that statement might be easy enough, but could you create a processor that accepts all valid English (including English poetry), and rejects all non-English. To get a sense of the difficulty of this challenge, I refer you to poetry by ee cummings (capitalization is correct). The poetry of ee cummings is considered valid (and even good) English poetry by those who get to decide such things, but it would likely be rejected by any sensible English language validity checker.

Those who study formal languages usually restrict themselves to very simple languages. As an example, consider the language of all strings consisting of any combination of the letters “a” and “b”. This language includes strings such as “aaaa” and “abababbbb”. It isn’t useful for anything outside the study of formal languages, but it is an example of a formal language.

The study of formal languages is tightly coupled with mathematical sets. In particular, a formal language is a set of strings. Specifically, the set of all strings that meet the definition of the language. This book assumes you are familiar with mathematical sets including the operations union, intersection, and subtraction. If you aren’t familiar with these operations, I’m sure there’s a Wikipedia page that can help you out.

Formal languages consist of the following:

1. An alphabet: a set of characters that the strings in the language are composed of. The alphabet for a language is often represented by the symbol  $\Sigma$ .
2. A definition of what strings are in the language.

Let’s illustrate with an example.

$$\Sigma = \{a\ b\}$$

All strings of five letters.

Given this definition, the string “aaxbb” would be rejected because ‘x’ is not in the alphabet. The string “aabb” would likewise be rejected because it consists of four letters, not five. However, the strings, “aaaaa”, “aabbb”, and “ababa” would all be included in the language (along with many others).

Formal languages can be broken into categories based on the mechanism used to specify the language. We will initially be interested in three types of definitions, which are discussed in the following chapters.

1. Recursive definitions (not to be confused with Recursive Languages discussed in Part [IV](#) of the book)
2. Regular Expressions
3. Context Free Grammars

## Chapter 2

# Recursive Definitions

Recursion is a useful technique in writing some computer programs. It is also a useful technique in specifying formal languages. Consider the following two definitions of the set EVEN:

1. The set of all positive integers divisible by 2
2. A recursive definition:
  - (a) 2 is in EVEN
  - (b) If  $x$  is in EVEN then  $x + 2$  is in EVEN.

Which of these two definitions is the most useful? Probably the first one. If you wanted to prove the 96 is in EVEN using the first definition, a simple division by 2 suffices. If you wanted to prove this using the second definition, it would take a bit longer. But there are other instances where a recursive definition is quite elegant.

Consider the following non-recursive definition of arithmetic expressions:

1.  $\Sigma = \{number + - * / ( )\}$
2. Can't have two operators in a row
3. Must have balanced parenthesis

4. Can't have two numbers in a row
5. Can't begin or end with an operator

Is this set of rules sufficient? Do they allow every valid arithmetic expression? Do they preclude every invalid expression? Could you argue from these rules that the following is (or isn't) a valid arithmetic expression?

$$(2 + 7)/3 - (((4 + 5) * (6) - 1) * 3 + 4)$$

How about:

$$())(2 + 7)/3 - (((4 + 5) * (6) - 1) * 3 + 4)$$

This last expression meets the definition given above, but is not a valid arithmetic expression because of the empty parenthesis. We could add a rule that states you can't have empty parenthesis, which would rule out the expression above. How about the expression:

$$)))4((($$

This expression has balanced parenthesis (the same number of opens as closes), but they happen to be in the wrong order. We could fix that by specifying that parenthesis have to be properly nested. Then what about the expression:

$$5(*)7$$

As you can see, there seems to be a never ending combination of ways to thwart our set of rules, so how can we know when we have a complete set? When we can't think of any new ways to break our set? What if someone more creative (or evil) comes along and finds a way to break the rules that we hadn't thought of.

Let's try a recursive definition for arithmetic expressions (called AE in the definition):

1. Any number is in AE
2. If  $f$  and  $g$  are in AE, then so are:
  - (a)  $f + g$
  - (b)  $f - g$
  - (c)  $f * g$
  - (d)  $f/g$
  - (e)  $(f)$

I claim (without proof) that this is a complete set of rules that always works.

How can we use this definition to prove an expression is a valid arithmetic expression? We do so by construction: invoke the various rules one at a time until the desired expression is constructed. Let's do so with the expression:

$$(2 + 7)/5$$

The construction is as follows:

1. 2 is in AE (Rule 1)
2. 7 is in AE (Rule 1)
3.  $2 + 7$  is in AE (Points 1 and 2 and Rule 2b)
4.  $(2 + 7)$  is in AE (Point 3 and Rule 2e)
5. 5 is in AE (Rule 1)
6.  $(2 + 7)/5$  is in AE (Points 4 and 5 and Rule 2d)

Having constructed the desired expression using the rules, we have proven that it is a valid arithmetic expression. (More formally, we have proven that it is in the language AE as defined above).

How do we prove that an expression is not in AE? This is a bit more complicated. Take the expression given above:

$$())(2 + 7)/3 - (((4 + 5) * (6) - 1) * 3 + 4)$$

Let's generalize it to the statement:

Valid statements in AE never have empty parenthesis.

Before proving this statement, we will prove a different one:

Valid statements in AE never start with a close parenthesis and never end with an open parenthesis.

The proof is as follows:

1. Numbers do not contain parenthesis, so Rule 1 cannot create an AE that starts with a close parenthesis or ends with an open parenthesis.
2. If  $f$  and  $g$  do not start with a close parenthesis or end with an open parenthesis, none of the Rule 2's will create a string that starts with a close parenthesis or ends with an open parenthesis.
3. Since there is no way to construct a string that starts with a close parenthesis or ends with an open parenthesis, such a string does not exist in AE.

Back to empty parenthesis: We could prove this using a similar mechanism to what we just used. However, we will use proof by contradiction just to illustrate this mechanism. With this style of proof, you assume the opposite of what you want to prove and then reason until you encounter a contradiction. Since you got to a contradiction, your assumption must have been false. Note: as we will see later, it is important that you only make a single assumption. The contradiction means at least one of your assumptions was false. If you've made multiple assumptions, you don't know which one is false.

Let's assume that a string in AE can contain empty parenthesis. Let's define  $s$  as the shortest string that contains empty parenthesis. The string  $s$  must be constructed using one of the rules. Which one? Let's consider them one at a time:

1. Numbers do not contain parenthesis, so  $s$  cannot be constructed using Rule 1.
2. The empty string is not a valid number. Rules 2a-2e add characters to the string, and no rules subtract characters from the string. Therefore, it is not possible to have an empty string in AE.
3. Rules 2a-2d do not add parenthesis to the string so they cannot create  $s$ .
4. Rule 2e will create an empty set of parenthesis if either:
  - (a)  $f$  is the empty string
  - (b)  $f$  begins with a close parenthesis or ends with an open parenthesis

However, we've already proven that neither of these can happen.

5. Since there is no way to construct  $s$ , our assumption must be false and we can conclude that a string in AE cannot contain empty parenthesis.

## 2.1 Constructing Recursive Definitions

We've seen several recursive definitions. What do they have in common? A recursive definition is always composed of two parts:

- Base Cases that identify some set of strings in the language. The base case for AE was "Any number is in AE".
- Recursive Rules of the form, "If  $x$  is in L, then so is  $f(x)$ ". Rules 2a-2e for AE are the recursive rules. Recursive rules can use multiple variables as illustrated in the definition of AE.

When constructing recursive definitions, it is important to keep in mind what the language is. For example, the language AE was a set of strings. As a result, rules 2a-2e were adding characters to the string, they were not performing arithmetic operations. The language EVEN was a set of numbers, so Rule b was performing an arithmetic operation to create a new number.



If the language is a set of strings, then the recursive rules always extend or combine strings. That is, they always make longer strings, they never remove characters from the string. In other words, you should never have a rule of the form, “If  $x$  is in  $L$ , then so is  $x$  without the trailing semicolon.”

As another example of a recursive definition, consider the following definition of Polynomial:

1. Any number is in Polynomial
2. The variable  $x$  is in Polynomial
3. If  $f$  and  $g$  are in Polynomial, then so are:
  - (a)  $f + g$
  - (b)  $f - g$
  - (c)  $fg$
  - (d)  $f/g$
  - (e)  $(f)$

Note 1: In Rule 3c,  $fg$  is used to represent the multiplication of  $f$  and  $g$ . Polynomials are mathematical expressions, so we are using the mathematical notation for multiplication. If we were using a programming language notation, this rule would probably read  $f * g$ .

Note 2: like AE, this is a set of strings so the arithmetic operators in Rule 3 are simply characters, no arithmetic operations are performed.

Given this definition, it should be easy enough to show that  $(24/4/2)$  is in Polynomial (note that it is also in AE). What is the meaning of this expression? is it 3 or 12 (based on which operation is performed first). It turns out this is an erroneous question. Both Polynomial and AE are sets of strings. We can answer the question, “Is this string in the language?”, but the question “What does this string mean?” is not relevant to these languages.

In programming languages, there is syntax and semantics. One way of thinking of these two is that syntax deals with the question, “Is this a valid statement in the formal language?” Semantics deals with the question, “What

is the meaning of this statement?” or even, “Does this statement have a valid meaning in the language?”. At this point, we are only concerned with syntax, not semantics.

## 2.2 Summary

Recursive definitions provide a mechanism to construct formal languages. A recursive definition consists of base cases and recursive rules that are used to extend the language. The mechanism we presented here isn’t very mathematically rigorous, so we can’t prove many properties about the languages that are generated by these definitions (a short-coming that won’t be found in the next several chapters). One thing we can say about languages generated by recursive definitions is that they are always infinite. That is, they always contain an infinite number of words. This is true because there is no limit on how many times a recursive rule can be invoked, and each invocation produces a new word in the language.

## 2.3 Problems

1. Given the definition of Polynomial given in this chapter argue either that the statement  $x^3 + 4x^2 - 7$  either is or is not in Polynomial.
2. The definition of Polynomial given in this chapter only allows a single variable. Extend the definition to allow two variables.
3. The language PALINDROME is the set of all strings that read the same forwards and backwards. Give a recursive definition of even-length PALINDROME over  $\Sigma = \{a\ b\}$ .
4. Extend your definition of PALINDROME to include both even and odd length strings.
5. Give a recursive definition of positive integers (or argue that it can’t be done).
6. Give a recursive definition of positive rational numbers (or argue that it can’t be done).

7. Give a recursive definition of positive real numbers (or argue that it can't be done).
8. Give a recursive definition for the set of strings over  $\Sigma = \{0123456789\}$  that cannot start with the digit zero.

# Part II

## Regular Languages

# Chapter 3

## Regular Expressions

Many programmers are familiar with regular expressions from non-compiler contexts. Examples include using an asterisk (\*) as a wildcard in a file name, or specifying patterns for the **grep** utility. Different programs use different syntax for specifying regular expressions. In this chapter a minimalist syntax for all regular expressions is presented. Most programs that interpret regular expressions enhance this syntax in various ways to make writing regular expressions easier, but the added syntax does not add extra capabilities. In this chapter, we are not interested in programs that make use of regular expressions, so we don't need the syntactic sugar that many of them add. Instead, we are interested in the formal languages that can be specified using regular expressions.

Regular expressions include the following features:

**Concatenation**      Concatenation is gluing two strings end-to-end. For example, concatenating “ab” with “bc” yields the string “abcd”.

**Alternation**      Alternation means to choose exactly one from a set of alternatives. Regular expressions use either the vertical bar (|) or the plus sign (+) to mean alternation. So the expression `a + b + c` means to choose either an 'a', a 'b', or a 'c'.

<b>Grouping</b>	Parenthesis can be used for grouping operations much as they can in algebraic expressions.
<b>Kleene Closure</b>	Kleene Closure means to take zero or more instances of a string. Kleene Closure is denoted by an asterisk (*). So, for example, $x^*$ means zero or more 'x' characters. Kleene Closure has higher precedence than concatenation so that $ab^*$ means $a(b^*)$ not $(ab)^*$ .

In addition to these operations, the  $\Lambda$  symbol is used to represent an empty string (a string with no characters in it).

The most common enhancements to this syntax are as follows:

<b>zero or one</b>	The question mark (?) indicates zero or one of an item so that $a?$ means the same as $(\Lambda + a)$ .
<b>one or more</b>	The plus sign (+) is similar to Kleene Closure, but it is one-or-more not zero-or-more so that $a+$ means the same as $aa^*$ .
<b>character range</b>	Square brackets ([]) can be used to specify a character range so that $[a-m]$ means any single character in the range 'a' through 'm'. This could be represented long-hand as $(a + b + c + d + \dots)$ .

These enhancements will be used in a few examples, and they are allowed in homework problems provided their use is clear. Note that the one-or-more enhancement uses the plus sign that can also be used for concatenation so any regular expression that uses **any** of these enhancements must use the vertical bar for alternation.

If we want a regular expression for integer constants, we could try

$[0-9]^+$

but this allows any number of leading zeros. A better expression would be:

$[1-9][0-9]^*$

This fixes the leading zero problem, but it does not allow the number zero. This can be fixed as follows:

$$0 \mid ([1-9][0-9]^*)$$

If we want to allow negative numbers, we could add an optional minus sign:

$$0 \mid (-?[1-9][0-9]^*)$$

There are exercises at the end of the chapter that can be used to practice writing regular expressions. You use the enhanced syntax or the minimal syntax for these exercises.

## 3.1 M

Manipulating Regular Expressions

Regular expressions look similar to algebraic expressions, so it might be tempting to manipulate them as if they were algebraic expressions. Some manipulations are possible, but the rules can be quite different from algebra. For example, in both regular expressions and algebra,

$$a(b + c) = ab + ac$$

but the following have no algebraic equivalent:

$$\begin{aligned} (a^*)^* &= a^* \\ (a + b^*)^* &= (a + b)^* \\ (a^*b^*)^* &= (a + b)^* \end{aligned}$$

## 3.2 Language Families

Each regular expression defines a language.<sup>1</sup> Remember that a formal language is a set of strings. Also recall that it is possible to have a set of sets, so

---

<sup>1</sup>These languages are not unique; it is possible to write multiple regular expressions for the same language.

what can we say about the set of all languages that can be defined by regular expressions? This set is known as Regular Languages. They are “regular” in the sense that they can be defined by a regular expression. Regular languages have a set of properties that they share. We will eventually explore what these properties are.

We can also think of the set of all regular expressions. This is yet another language (set of strings). We can give a recursive definition of this language, but we cannot give a regular expression for it because, as we shall see, it is not regular.

1. Every letter in  $\Sigma$  is in RE
2. If  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are in RE, then so are:
  - (a)  $r_1 r_2$
  - (b)  $r_1 + r_2$
  - (c)  $r_1^*$
  - (d)  $(r_1)$

So we now have three separate but related languages:

- The language (set of all strings) defined by a particular regular expression.
- The set of all languages definable by regular expressions.
- The set of all regular expressions.

It is important to keep these three languages separate. Consider the following questions, one for each category of language:

- What is the language defined by  $(a + b)^* a (a + b)^*$ ? This question is asking you to enumerate (or otherwise describe) a particular regular language.
- Is the language  $L$  regular? This is asking whether the specific language  $L$  is in the set of all languages definable by regular expressions.



- Is the statement,  $a + (b + c)$  a regular expression? This is asking “Is it a well-formed regular expression?” or “Is it in the language for regular expressions that we gave a recursive definition for?”

In the coming sections we want to examine properties of regular languages (properties of the entire family of regular languages, not of a particular regular language). We will do a couple of them now.

First of all, how do you prove a language is regular? The obvious solution is to write a regular expression that generates the language. One needs to be careful to make sure the regular language actually generates the correct language. For example, if one asked, “Is the language  $L$  of all strings over  $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$  which contain at least one  $a$  and at least one  $b$  regular?” The regular expression

$$(a + b)^*a(a + b)^*b(a + b)^*$$

would not be proof that it was. All strings generated by this regular expression contain at least one  $a$  and at least one  $b$ . However, the string  $ba$  is part of  $L$ , but it cannot be generated by the specified regular expression. In other words:

$$(a + b)^*a(a + b)^*b(a + b)^* \subset L$$

This is not sufficient proof that  $L$  is regular. It is always possible to give a regular subset of any language. This can be done by giving an alternation of a finite list of words from the language. The ability to show there is a regular subset of the language is not sufficient proof that the language is regular.

A regular expression that generates a language is adequate proof that the language is regular (provided the regular expression actually corresponds to the language). How can we prove a language isn’t regular? An inability to write a regular expression for the language is not sufficient proof. The statement, “I can’t write a regular expression for that language” might be because the language isn’t regular or it might be because you simply aren’t creative (or smart or persistent) enough to come up with one. Chapter 5 provides a mechanism to prove a language isn’t regular.

Theorem 1 gives the first property we will prove regarding regular languages.

**Theorem 1** *All finite languages are regular.*

The proof is quite simple. If a language is finite, every word in the language can be enumerated. The list might be very long, but it can be generated. A regular expression that corresponds to this language is simply the alternation of each word in the language:

$$(\text{word\_1}) + (\text{word\_2}) + \dots + (\text{word\_n})$$

Before proving other properties of regular languages, we have a question to answer.

### 3.3 Why Regular Languages?

We’ve identified a class of languages known as “Regular Languages” — namely, those languages that can be defined by regular expressions. Why is this class of languages interesting? From a theory point of view, they are interesting because they form the smallest class of languages in what’s known as the Chompsky Hierarchy of languages. Later parts of the text will deal with the larger classes of languages in the hierarchy, all of which are supersets of regular languages.

From a practical point of view, regular languages are useful because they are fast and efficient to process. By “process”, we mean answering the question, “Is this input a member of a particular regular language?” A common application of this is the **grep** utility included with most Linux distributions. With **grep**, you specify a regular expression and an input file, and **grep** identifies all lines of the file that include a match for the regular expression<sup>2</sup>. Most uses of regular expressions include “scanning” for a match. A text string (often the contents of a text file) is read looking for a match to the regular expression. How efficient are regular expressions scanners? Theorem 2, which won’t be proven until later, gives a bound on their efficiency.

**Theorem 2** *Any regular expression can be scanned for in  $O(N)$  with small time constant where  $N$  is the length of the input string.*

---

<sup>2</sup>This is a simplification of what **grep** does, but it is accurate for the purposes of this illustration

The next chapter discusses a “machine” that can perform this processing.

## 3.4 Exercises

1. Write a regular expression for a string containing any odd number of the letter **a**.
2. Write a regular expression for C (or Java) variable names. Valid characters include upper and lower case letters, digits, and the underscore (**\_**).
3. Write a regular expression for a string containing a positive even number of **a**’s followed by an odd number of **b**’s. The following are valid strings: **aaaabbb**, **aabaabaabbb**, **aaaaaabbbaabaabaab**. The following are not valid strings: **aaab**, **aaaabbbbaa**, **bbbaab**.
4. For the previous question, state why each of the non-valid strings are not valid.
5. Write a regular expression for a floating-point constant. The following rules apply:
  - (a) The integer part cannot have leading zeros unless the integer part is zero.
  - (b) If there is a decimal point, it must be followed by at least one digit.
  - (c) The decimal part must not have trailing zeros unless the decimal part is zero.

For the following problems, give an English definition of the language defined by the specified regular expressions. Don’t simply transliterate the regular expressions. For example, for the regular expression  $a^*b(a+b)^*$ , you should not say, “Any number of *a*’s followed by a *b* followed by any combination of characters.” Instead, you should say “All strings with a *b*.”

Assume  $\Sigma = \{a\ b\}$  unless otherwise specified.

6.  $(a+b)^*a(a+b)^*b(a+b)^*$

7.  $(aa + ab + ba + bb)^*$

8.  $(a + b)(aa + ab + ba + bb)^*$

9.  $((a + b)(a + b))^*$

# Chapter 4

## Finite Automata

There is a well-known children’s game called Chutes and Ladders. The goal is to be the first player to move their piece from the beginning (bottom) to the ending (top) of the board. On a player’s turn, they spin a spinner which lands on a number. The player advances their piece the specified number of squares on the board. If their piece lands on the bottom of a ladder, they climb the ladder thus making extra progress towards their goal. If their piece lands on the top of a chute, they slide down the chute winding up closer to the beginning. This game is considered a “children’s” game because it involves no strategy. The outcome of the game is completely determined by the sequence of numbers generated by the spinner (assuming the players don’t cheat).

What does this game have to do with regular expressions or finite automata? If we assume that the spinner only generates numbers less than ten (single digit numbers), then we could spin the spinner a bunch of times and write down each result. The result would be a string of digits. We could then ask the question, “Does this sequence of moves result in someone winning the game?” That still doesn’t sound like a regular expression question (although scanning a string sounds familiar), so let’s think of a Finite Automaton<sup>1</sup> (aka state machine).

A finite automaton consists of a finite number of states (or configurations) and transitions from state to state. How could we turn Chutes and Ladders into a state machine? Suppose there were three players. Each player’s marker

---

<sup>1</sup>“Automaton is the singular of the plural “Automata”.

could be on any of the squares on the board. Each configuration of markers (each player on each valid square in every combination) could be considered a state. There would be a large number of states, but the number would be finite. Transitions consist of moves such as “Player 2 moves forward three spaces”. Each state would have an outbound transition for each possible spinner result for each player. The finite automaton representation of the game makes it clear that there is no strategy involved. The machine process the input (the sequence of spins) without any human involvement. The outcome is determined solely by the sequence of spins. But the question still remains, “What does this have to do with regular expressions?”

Before we answer that question (through some other examples), let's define a standardized way of graphically representing finite automata. Finite automata consist of a finite number of states and transitions between states. One state is defined as the start state, and any number of states can be defined as final states. The start state in an FA is signified by an inbound arrow that doesn't originate from another state. Processing always starts in the start state. Final states are signified by a double circle. Transitions are labeled by the letter that is used to move from one state to another. This format is illustrated in Figure 4.1.




Figure 4.1: This is a sample FA. State 1 is the start state (it has an incoming arrow from nowhere). State 2 is a final state (signified by the double-circle). The transitions are labeled by what letter is used to move from one state to another.

Using the FA in Figure 4.1, and the input  $ytx$ , the processing starts in State 1 (the start state). The  $y$  is used to transition to State 3. The  $t$  is used to transition back to State 1. The  $x$  is used to transition to State 2. Since the input is exhausted while in a final state, the string is accepted by the FA.

Two conditions can cause a string to be rejected:

1. If the input is exhausted and the current state isn't a final state. The input  $yty$  illustrates this case.
2. If there is no outbound transition on the current letter. The input  $yx$  illustrates this case.

Given these rules for processing FA's, it can be shown that the FA in Figure 4.1 is equivalent to the regular expression  $(yt)^*(x + yz)$ . It is no coincidence that there is a regular expression that corresponds to the FA. It turns out that every FA is equivalent to some regular expression, and that each regular expression has an FA that is equivalent to it. We will prove this in a later section.

Figure 4.2 gives another FA. This FA shows a slightly different format. The start state has a '-' in the label. Final states have a '+' in them. The states can be thought of as follows:

1. State 1: the start state.
2. State 2: An  $a$  not preceded by an  $a$ .
3. State 3: A  $b$  not preceded by a  $b$ .
4. State 4: Have read a double letter.

Note that once a double letter has been found, the FA remains in the final state no matter what other letters are read.

FA's can also be represented in table form. These tables are called transition tables. The transition table for the FA in Figure 4.2 is given in Figure 4.3. There is one row for each state. The state name is given in the first column. The remaining columns indicate the new state based on the transition letter at the top of the column.




Figure 4.2: This FA accepts all strings that contain a double letter.

Current State	a	b
1-	2	3
2	4	3
3	2	4
4+	4	4

Figure 4.3: This transition table represents the same FA as Figure 4.2

## 4.1 Non-deterministic Finite Automata

The FA illustrated in Figure 4.1 is a Deterministic Finite Automaton (DFA). It is deterministic in the sense that for each character that is processed, the FA has exactly one choice on what to do. There is another class of FA's known as Non-deterministic Finite Automata (NFA's). With NFA's, for a given input, there is the potential for multiple choices on what to do. The choices can take two forms:

1. Multiple outbound edges labeled with the same letter. If that letter is read, any of the outbound edges labeled with that letter can be taken. This is illustrated by the edges from Node  $a$  labeled  $z$  in Figure 4.4.
2. Edges labeled  $\Lambda$ . These edges can be taken without consuming an input character. Node  $a$  has a  $\Lambda$  transition meaning you can leave Node  $a$  without consuming any characters.

The NFA in Figure 4.4 accepts the following strings:






Figure 4.4: This is a sample NFA. Node *a* has multiple outbound transitions on *z*. It also has an outbound transition on  $\Lambda$  meaning you could leave Node *a* without consuming any characters.

*z* This string is accepted by following the  $\Lambda$  transition to Node *b* and then using the *z* to transition to Node *e*.

*tx* This string is accepted by following the  $\Lambda$  transition to Node *b* and then using the *t* to transition to Node *c* and the *x* to transition to Node *e*.

*zx* This string is accepted by using the *z* to transition to Node *c* and then using the *x* to transition to Node *e*.

*zy* This string is accepted by using the *z* to transition to Node *d* and then using the *y* to transition to Node *e*.

NFA's aren't any more powerful than DFA's—anything you can do with an NFA you can also do with a DFA<sup>2</sup>. The reason for introducing NFA's is that converting from a regular expression to code that accepts strings matching that regular expression makes use of NFA's.

---

<sup>2</sup>Section 4.3 gives a construction that can turn any NFA into an equivalent DFA. This is sufficient to argue that anything that can be done with an NFA can also be done with a DFA.


## 4.2 Thompson's

The first step in converting a regular expression to executable code is to convert it to an equivalent NFA. For this conversion, we are going to use Thompson's Construction<sup>3</sup>. The beauty of Thompson's construction is that it is a mechanical process – one that doesn't require any creative thought. In other words, it can be automated. A computer program can be written to perform this conversion.

If two FA's each have a single start state and a single final state, and if the start state doesn't have any inbound edges and the final state doesn't have any outbound edges, then the two FA's can be composed by connecting the end state of one FA to the start state of the other using a  $\Lambda$  transition. Thompson's Construction makes use of this fact by showing how to compose FA's for each operation supported by regular expressions (concatenation, alternation, and Kleene Closure). An NFA can be built for any regular expression simply by composing it one small piece at a time using Thompson's three diagrams. Figure 4.5 shows the three base diagrams.

The trick to using Thompson's construction is to NOT be creative. Each FA built with Thompson's has a single start and a single final state. The diagram can be dropped as-is directly into the next step in the construction. Nodes never need to be erased, and each composition should be drawn exactly as shown in Figure 4.5.

Let's illustrate by doing several constructions. First, let's construct an NFA for  $a(b + c)$ . It's best to start with the inner most operation (in this case  $(b + c)$ ) and work out. So first draw the alternation diagram as shown below:




---

<sup>3</sup>Credited to Ken Thompson, the originator of the Unix operating system.






Figure 4.5: Thompson's Construction method makes use of these three diagrams. For each diagram, the FA(s) being composed are represented as two nodes (the start and end nodes) labeled  $FA$ ,  $FA1$ , or  $FA2$ .

The resulting diagram gets dropped into the  $FA\ 2$  position of the concatenation diagram as illustrated below. Note how the node labeled  $x$  in the above diagram is in the location of the node labeled  $c$  in the concatenation diagram, and the  $y$  node is in the  $d$  position.




As a second example, let's construct an NFA for  $a(b + c)^*$ . This is the same as the previous example, except that the alternation is wrapped in Kleene


Closure. The alternation is, again, the innermost operation, and it is the same as in the previous example:




This is now dropped into the Kleene Closure construction:



Finally, we drop this into the concatenation construction:



As a third example,  $a^*(b + c)$ , includes a concatenation of two complex items  $a^*$  and  $(b + c)$ . To construct this, first construct  $a^*$ , then construct  $(b + c)$  and then use the concatenation construction to combine them. Here is the resulting diagram:



It should be clear that Thompson’s construction creates lots of  $\Lambda$  transitions. This begs the question, “isn’t there an simpler way to draw these?”. The answer is in two parts. If by “simpler” you mean “easier construction”, my answer would be “no”. The whole point of Thompson’s construction is that it is a simple mechanical process. It requires no creative thought. But if by “simpler” you mean a less complex result (one without all the  $\Lambda$ s), then the answer is “yes”. The next section gives an algorithm to convert these complex NFAs into DFAs (diagrams without any  $\Lambda$  transitions. The goal is not to make the diagram simpler, the goal is to get a DFA because they are easier to process in code.

## 4.3 Subset Construction

To illustrate how an NFA could be processed, let’s consider again the NFA for  $a^*(b+c)$  presented in the last section, but presented again in Figure 4.6. In this figure, each node is labeled so they can be explicitly referred to. For each state, we can ask the question, “What states could I wind up in if I encounter a particular letter in the input?”. For example, suppose we haven’t consumed any input yet, what states could we be in? Clearly we could be in State 1, the start state, but because of the  $\Lambda$  transitions, we could also be in states 2, 4, 5, 6, 8. This set of states ( $= \{1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8\}$ )<sup>4</sup> forms a meta-state (let’s call it  $A$ ). From the meta-state  $A$ , where could we wind up if we read an  $a$ . Since the meta-state  $A$  includes state 2, we can follow the  $a$  to state 3. From

<sup>4</sup>When specifying sets of characters, it is often easier to read the list of items if each item is separated with a comma. This works unless the set included a comma (as sets of characters for a compiler often do). I will generally included commas for readability unless the set of characters includes punctuation (commas or other punctuation marks). I hope this will improve readability.

there we can follow  $\Lambda$ s to 2, 4, 5, 6, 8. This gives another meta-state. Let's call it  $B = \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8\}$ .




Figure 4.6: This is the NFA produced by Thompson's for the regular expression  $a^*(b + c)$

We could continue to find new meta-states by enumerating all possible outbound inputs from each meta-state and then following the  $\Lambda$ s from the resulting states. The results are presented in Table 4.1.

meta-state	NFA states	input	resulting states
A	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8	a	2, 4, 5, 6, 8
A	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8	b	7, 10
A	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8	c	9, 10
B	2, 4, 5, 6, 8	a	2, 4, 5, 6, 8
B	2, 4, 5, 6, 8	b	7, 10
B	2, 4, 5, 6, 8	c	9, 10
C	7, 10	a	-
C	7, 10	b	-
C	7, 10	c	-
D	9, 10	a	-
D	9, 10	b	-
D	9, 10	c	-

Table 4.1: The results of performing the subset construction on the NFA in Figure 4.6. An input of “-” means there are no valid inputs starting from this state. Resulting states of “-” mean there are no valid destinations from this state.

We need a formal algorithm for producing these tables. The steps are as follows:


1. From the start state, follow all  $\Lambda$ s. Follow as many as you can, not just one. This is known as the  $\Lambda$  closure of a state: all states reachable

from a given state following only  $\Lambda$ s. This set of states is labeled  $A$  in the table.

2. Make multiple rows, one for each character in the source-language, for each meta-state not already in the table. Initially this is only meta-state  $A$ , and for the example NFA in Figure 4.6, the characters in the source language are  $a, b, c$  meaning three rows for each meta-state.
3. For each NFA state in the meta-state, if there is an outbound transition on the input, write down the destination state in the resulting states column.
4. Extend the list of states in the resulting states column by forming the  $\Lambda$  closure of each state already in the column.
5. If there are any new unique sets of states in the resulting states column, give them a unique label and return to Step 2.

The process will stop once all existing rows are filled in and no new rows get generated.

Let's use these rules to derive a table for the NFA below. Note: this NFA was **not** generated with Thompson's.



Step 1 yields states 1 and 2, so this set becomes meta-state- $A$ . There are three letters in the source language ( $a, b, c$ ), so this yields the following rows:

meta-state	NFA states	input	resulting states
A	1, 2	a	
A	1, 2	b	
A	1, 2	c	

Completing the first row, we can follow an  $a$  from state 1 to 5, and from state 2 to 3. Add these two states to the resulting states column, and then follow the  $A$ s adding state 6. Label the set  $\{3, 5, 6\}$  as meta-state  $B$  and add rows to the table:

	meta-state	NFA states	input	resulting states
1	A	1, 2	a	B = 3, 5, 6
2	A	1, 2	b	
3	A	1, 2	c	
4	B	3, 5, 6	a	
5	B	3, 5, 6	b	
6	B	3, 5, 6	c	

Completing rows 2 and 3, there are no  $b$  nor  $c$  transitions out of any of the states in meta-state  $A$ , so the resulting states for both of these rows are empty.

Moving on to row 4, we can follow an  $a$  from state 6 to state 4. We can then follow  $A$ s from 4 to 1 and 1 to 2 yielding meta-state  $C$  containing states 1, 2, 4.

	meta-state	NFA states	input	resulting states
1	A	1, 2	a	B = 3, 5, 6
2	A	1, 2	b	
3	A	1, 2	c	
4	B	3, 5, 6	a	C = 1, 2, 4
5	B	3, 5, 6	b	
6	B	3, 5, 6	c	
7	C	1, 2, 4	a	
8	C	1, 2, 4	b	
9	C	1, 2, 4	c	

For row 5, we can follow a  $b$  from 3 to 4 and from 5 to 2. There are no  $A$ s from either 2 or 4, so meta-state  $D$  contains 2 and 4.

For row 6, we can follow a  $c$  from 5 to 6. There are no  $A$ s from 6, so meta-state  $E$  contains only 6. Adding these new rows to the table, we have:



	meta-state	NFA states	input	resulting states
1	A	1, 2	a	B = 3, 5, 6
2	A	1, 2	b	-
3	A	1, 2	c	-
4	B	3, 5, 6	a	C = 1, 2, 4
5	B	3, 5, 6	b	D = 2, 4
6	B	3, 5, 6	c	E = 6
7	C	1, 2, 4	a	
8	C	1, 2, 4	b	
9	C	1, 2, 4	c	
10	D	2, 4	a	
11	D	2, 4	b	
12	D	2, 4	c	
13	E	6	a	
14	E	6	b	
15	E	6	c	

Completing row 10, we can follow an  $a$  from 1 to 5 and 2 to 3. The  $\Lambda$  closure adds 6. This set of states is already labeled  $B$ , so we don't need to add any rows to the table.

For Row 11, there are no outbound edges on  $b$  so the resulting states is empty.

For Row 12, we can follow a  $c$  from 4 to 7. This new meta-state is labeled  $F$ .

	meta-state	NFA states	input	resulting states
1	A	1, 2	a	B = 3, 5, 6
2	A	1, 2	b	-
3	A	1, 2	c	-
4	B	3, 5, 6	a	C = 1, 2, 4
5	B	3, 5, 6	b	D = 2, 4
6	B	3, 5, 6	c	E = 6
7	C	1, 2, 4	a	B
8	C	1, 2, 4	b	-
9	C	1, 2, 4	c	F = 7
10	D	2, 4	a	
11	D	2, 4	b	
12	D	2, 4	c	
13	E	6	a	
14	E	6	b	
15	E	6	c	
16	F	7	a	
17	F	7	b	
18	F	7	c	

For row 10, we can follow the a from 2 to 3 and then the  $\Lambda$  to 6. This is meta-state  $G$ .

For row 11, there are no outbound transitions on  $b$ , so the resulting states is empty.

For row 12, we can follow a  $c$  from 4 to 7. This is already labeled  $F$ .

	meta-state	NFA states	input	resulting states
1	A	1, 2	a	B = 3, 5, 6
2	A	1, 2	b	-
3	A	1, 2	c	-
4	B	3, 5, 6	a	C = 1, 2, 4
5	B	3, 5, 6	b	D = 2, 4
6	B	3, 5, 6	c	E = 6
7	C	1, 2, 4	a	B
8	C	1, 2, 4	b	-
9	C	1, 2, 4	c	F = 7
10	D	2, 4	a	G = 3, 6
11	D	2, 4	b	-
12	D	2, 4	c	F
13	E	6	a	
14	E	6	b	
15	E	6	c	
16	F	7	a	
17	F	7	b	
18	F	7	c	
19	G	3, 6	a	
20	G	3, 6	b	
21	G	3, 6	c	

For Row 13, we can follow an  $a$  from 6 to 4 and then As to 1 and 2. This is already labeled  $C$ .

For Rows 13-18, there are no available outbound transitions, so the resulting states are empty.

The transitions for Row 19 are the same as for Row 13, so the result is  $C$ .

For Row 20, we can follow a  $b$  from 3 to 4 and then As give us meta-state  $C$ .

For Row 21, there are no outbound transitions on  $c$  so the resulting state is empty.

This gives us the following table:

	meta-state	NFA states	input	resulting states
1	A	1, 2	a	B = 3, 5, 6
2	A	1, 2	b	-
3	A	1, 2	c	-
4	B	3, 5, 6	a	C = 1, 2, 4
5	B	3, 5, 6	b	D = 2, 4
6	B	3, 5, 6	c	E = 6
7	C	1, 2, 4	a	B
8	C	1, 2, 4	b	-
9	C	1, 2, 4	c	F = 7
10	D	2, 4	a	G = 3, 6
11	D	2, 4	b	-
12	D	2, 4	c	F
13	E	6	a	C
14	E	6	b	-
15	E	6	c	-
16	F	7	a	-
17	F	7	b	-
18	F	7	c	-
19	G	3, 6	a	C
20	G	3, 6	b	C
21	G	3, 6	c	-

All rows are filled in, so we are done.

**Important note:** The procedure is to follow the input out of the NFA states and then follow the  $\Lambda$ s. A common mistake is to follow the  $\Lambda$ s out of the NFA states. For example, when filling out the last row, even though there is a  $\Lambda$  from state 3, we don't follow it because we are only looking for transitions on  $c$ .


The subset construction was supposed to turn an NFA into a DFA, but it appears to have just produced a table. We can take the information in our final table from the example we just completed and summarize it in Figure 4.7.

This is known as a transition table. It is fairly straight forward to convert this table into a DFA (and a DFA into a transition table). Create states for each state in the table (the union of the From and To columns). The start state is always  $A$ , and any meta-state that included a final state in the

From	transition on	To
A	a	B
B	a	C
B	b	D
B	c	E
C	a	B
C	c	F
D	a	G
D	c	F
E	a	C
G	a	C
G	b	C

Figure 4.7: A summary of the table derived in this section. Each row contains the start state, and input character, and the resulting state if that character is found while in the start state.

original NFA is a final state in the DFA (in this case State  $F$ ). The resulting DFA is as follows:



Does the subset construction always result in a DFA, or might it result in another NFA? The answer is that it always results in a DFA for the following two reasons:

1. The *input* column never has  $\Lambda$ s, so the resulting FA will not have any  $\Lambda$  transitions.

2. When generating rows, each meta-state has exactly one row for each input character. As a result, there will never be multiple outbound transitions for the same character.

The consequence is that the resulting FA has no non-determinism and is therefore a DFA.

# Chapter 5

## Theory

What we have done so far:

We have shown that Thompson's Construction can turn any regular expression into an NFA. This implies that:

$$L(\text{regular expressions}) \subseteq L(\text{NFA})$$

This statement means that the set of all languages that can be constructed with regular expressions is a subset (or equal) of the languages that can be constructed with an NFA. In other words, anything that can be done with a regular expression can also be done with an NFA.

The Subset Construction showed that any NFA can be turned into a DFA. This implies that:

$$L(\text{NFA}) \subseteq L(\text{DFA})$$

So we now have:

$$L(\text{regular expressions}) \subseteq L(\text{NFA}) \subseteq L(\text{DFA})$$

There are proofs both by induction and construction that show that any DFA can be turned into a regular expression. The proofs aren't particularly illuminating, so they won't be presented here. The statement will simply be taken on faith. So we now have:

$$L(\text{regular expressions}) \subseteq L(\text{NFA}) \subseteq L(\text{DFA}) \subseteq L(\text{regular expressions})$$

The only way that this can be true is if:

$$L(\text{regular expressions}) = L(\text{NFA}) = L(\text{DFA})$$

In other words, regular expressions, NFAs and DFAs are all equally powerful. They can be used to define exactly the same set of languages. This relation is known as Kleene's Theorem. It can be used to prove interesting properties of regular languages. Some properties are easier to prove using DFA's, some are easier to prove using regular expressions, but since these mechanisms are equivalent (can be used to define the same set of languages), then proving a property using one mechanism means the property applies to all languages in the family.

**Theorem 3** *The union of two regular languages is regular.*

This can be proved by construction. Consider two languages  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  both of which are regular. Since they are regular, there is a DFA that corresponds to each of them. If we construct a new NFA by creating a new start state that is connected to the start states of both  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ , we would have an NFA that accepts any word in  $L_1$  or any word in  $L_2$ . Since we have an NFA for this language, the language must be regular. Figure 5.1 illustrates this in picture form.




Figure 5.1: This FA accepts the strings accepted by  $FA_1 \cup FA_2$

This could also be proved using regular expressions. If  $RE_1$  is a regular expression that defines  $L_1$ , and  $RE_2$  is a regular expression that defines  $L_2$ , then  $RE_1 + RE_2$  defines the language  $FA_1 \cup FA_2$ .



**Theorem 4** *The complement of any regular language is regular.*

First, what do we mean by the complement of a language. If a regular language  $L$  is defined over the alphabet  $\Sigma$ , then the complement of  $L$ , which we will call  $L'$ , is the set of all strings that are in  $\Sigma^*$ , but not in  $L$ .

We can again prove this by construction. If  $L$  is regular, then there is a complete DFA that generates the language. By “complete”, we mean that every state has an outbound transition for every letter in  $\Sigma$ . If we take that DFA and reverse the “plusness” of each state (that is, every state that was a final state in the original becomes a non-final state in the result, and any state that was non-final in the original becomes final in the result) then any string accepted by the original will be rejected in the final and any string rejected by the original will be accepted in the final. Since the DFA is complete, it will never “crash” - that is, for each input letter, it will always have a transition it can follow. Since it is a deterministic FA, a given input can only wind up in a single state. That one and only state has opposite implications in the two FAs. If it accepts the string in one, it rejects the string in the other. As a result, the two FAs represent languages that are complements of each other.




Figure 5.2: A complete DFA can be modified to generate the complement of the original language by changing the “plusness” of each node: Final nodes in the original become non-final in the converted diagram and non-final nodes in the original become final nodes in the converted diagram.

**Theorem 5** *The intersection of two regular languages is regular.*

DeMorgan’s Law for sets states that  $L_1 \cap L_2 = (L_1' \cup L_2')'$ . In other words, the intersection of two sets is equal to the complement of the union of the

complement of the two sets. If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular then so are their complements ( $L'_1$  and  $L'_2$ ). Since these are regular, then so is their union ( $L'_1 \cup L'_2$ ). And finally, so is the complement of that language  $((L'_1 \cup L'_2)')$ . Since this is equivalent of the intersection of the two languages, then the intersection must also be regular.

**Theorem 6** *There is an algorithm to determine if two regular expressions are equivalent.*

Consider  $L_1 = L(RE_1)$  and  $L_2 = L(RE_2)$ . If  $RE_1$  and  $RE_2$  define different languages, then either  $L_1$  contains words not in  $L_2$  or  $L_2$  contains words not in  $L_1$  (or both). Since  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular, we can compute  $L_3 = (L_1 \cap L'_2) \cup (L'_1 \cap L_2)$ . The first term in  $L_3$  is all strings that are in  $L_1$  but not in  $L_2$ . The second term is all strings that are in  $L_2$  but not in  $L_1$ . If the union of those two terms is empty, then the two languages  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  must be equivalent.

But now we need a decision procedure for “Is the language empty?”. If we have a regular expression for a language, then the following procedure will give one word in the language:

1. Delete all stars
2. If a  $\Lambda$  is part of an alternation, remove that part of the alternation.
3. Delete all remaining  $\Lambda$ 's
4. For every alternation, keep only the left-most option
5. Remove parenthesis

What is left must be a word in the language.

If we have an FA for the language, then the following procedure will determine if the FA accepts at least one word:

1. Add the start state to a work list
2. Remove a state from the work list and mark it as visited. Add all unmarked states reachable from this state to the work list.

3. Repeat Step 2 until the work list is empty.
4. If a final state was marked, then the language includes at least one word.

**Theorem 7** *Let  $F$  be an FA with  $N$  states. If  $F$  accepts any words at all, then it must accept a word of length less than  $N$ .*

The shortest path from the start state to an accept state must visit each node at most once. As a result, if there is any path from the start state to an accept state, there must be a path with length less than  $N$ .

Theorem 7 leads to another decision process for “Is the language empty?”: Enumerate all words of length less than  $N$  (the number of states in the FA), and try them all. If the FA accepts any words, it must accept one of these words.

**Theorem 8** *Any infinite regular language must have a loop in the FA.*

By “loop in the FA”, what we mean is that there is some set of states which can be repeated an arbitrary number of times. For example, the states 2,3,4 in Figure 5.3 form a loop that can be repeated any number of times. Consider




Figure 5.3: This FA represents an infinite language, and it contains a loop composed of states 2,3,4.

any infinite regular language  $L$ . The language  $L$  can be generated by some DFA. The DFA is finite, so let’s say it has  $N$  states, where  $N$  is some finite number. The longest string that can be generated by this DFA without visiting the same state more than once is  $\leq (N - 1)$ . Clearly the length can’t be  $\geq N$  because if you make  $N$  transitions between  $N$  states, then at least one of those states must be repeated. The maximum length might be  $< (N - 1)$  because there might not be any path that touches each state exactly once.

Since the maximum length without repeating states is  $\leq (N - 1)$ , then any string longer than this must visit the same state at least twice. In other words, there must be a path from State  $S_i$  back to State  $S_i$  and from there to a final state. This path constitutes a loop. As a result, the FA for any infinite regular language must contain a loop.

**Lemma 9** *Let  $L$  be any infinite regular language, then there exist strings  $x, y, z$ , where  $y$  is not the empty string, such that all strings  $xy^n z$  with  $n > 0$  are in  $L$ .*

Since there are an infinite number of words in  $L$ , any FA that generates  $L$  must have a loop. The string  $x$  represents the path from the start state to the beginning of the loop. The string  $y$  represents the path around the loop. The string  $z$  represents the path from the end of the loop to a final state. Since  $y$  represents a loop, then each circuit around the loop generates another  $y$ . Since the loop can be traversed an arbitrary number of times, strings with an arbitrary number of  $y$ 's can be generated. This is shown in Figure 5.4.




Figure 5.4: This FA illustrates the proof of the pumping lemma. The strings  $x, y, z$  are labeled. Clearly each circuit of the loop generates another  $y$ .

Lemma 9 is known as the Pumping Lemma for Regular Languages. It can be used to prove that a language is NOT regular. Before giving some examples, it is important to make several clarifications:

1. The Lemma states that all strings  $xy^n z$  are in  $L$ . It does NOT say that all strings in  $L$  are in the form  $xy^n z$ .
2. The Lemma can be used to prove that a language is NOT regular. It cannot be used to prove that a language IS regular. In other words, there are some non-regular languages that fit the form of the pumping lemma, but any language that is infinite that does NOT fit the pumping lemma must not be regular.

Consider the language  $ab^*c$ . This is an infinite language and it is regular, so it must conform to the pumping lemma. To show this, take  $x = a$ ,  $y = b$ ,  $z = c$ . With this assignment, it should be clear that all strings  $xy^n z$  are in the language.

Now let's consider the language of all strings that consist of any number of  $a$ 's followed by any number of  $b$ 's. This language can be represented as  $a^n b^m$ . Is this language regular? Let's see if we can prove it is NOT regular using the pumping lemma. Let's take  $x = a$ ,  $y = ab$ ,  $z = b$ . The string  $xyz$  is  $aabb$  which is in the language. However, the string  $xy^2 z$  is  $aababb$  which is NOT in the language. Can we conclude from this that the language is not regular? No.

The previous paragraph gave a single example of a choice for  $x, y, z$ , and a single example is not a proof. To use the pumping lemma to prove a language is not regular, you must show that there is no possible choice of  $x, y, z$  where the pumping lemma applies. Let's consider another choice. Let's choose  $x = a$ ,  $y = a$ ,  $z = b$ . With this choice, any  $xy^n z$  can be written  $a^{n+1}b$ , all of which are in the language. Note that this does not represent ALL words in the language, but all words of this form ARE in the language.

Since we found strings  $x, y, z$  for which all  $xy^n z$  are in the language, we failed to prove that this language is not regular. This should come as no surprise since the regular expression  $a^*b^*$  generates this language. Since there is a regular expression that generates the language, the language must be regular.

Now let's make a minor modification to our language. Instead of any number of  $a$ 's followed by any number of  $b$ 's, let's require the  $a$ 's to be followed by the same number of  $b$ 's. This language can be expressed  $a^n b^n$ . Note that this time both letters have the same superscript meaning there must be the same number of each. Can we find an  $x, y, z$  such that all strings  $xy^n z$  are in the language.

Possibility 1:  $y$  consists only of  $a$ 's. In this case, increasing  $n$  in  $xy^n z$  would increase the number of  $a$ 's without increasing the number of  $b$ 's thus generating words not in the language.

Possibility 2:  $y$  consists only of  $b$ 's. In this case, increasing  $n$  in  $xy^n z$  would increase the number of  $b$ 's without increasing the number of  $a$ 's thus generating words not in the language.

Possibility 3:  $y$  consists of both  $a$ 's and  $b$ 's. In this case, increasing  $n$  in  $xy^nz$  would increase the number of  $a$ - $b$  transitions. Since the language only allows one  $a - b$  transition, this would generate words not in the language.

Since  $y$  cannot be the empty string, we've enumerated all possible choices for  $y$  and none of them meet the requirements of the pumping lemma. We can therefore conclude that  $a^n b^n$  is not regular.

This language is of more than passing concern. Consider the substitution where instead of  $a$  we have an open parenthesis and instead of  $b$  we have a closing parenthesis. The language is now  $(^n)^n$ , which is the set of nested parenthesis. The ability to have an arbitrary number of nested parenthesis (or curly braces) is an artifact of many programming languages. The fact that you cannot generate this language with a regular expression means that the syntax of most programming languages is not regular. It also means that the syntax for regular expressions is not itself regular.

If we assume that the syntax for programming languages is formal (and it would be difficult to write a compiler if it was not: how could you decide if a source file was a valid program if the language was not formal?), then we need another class of languages to express the syntax of programming languages. This other set of languages is the subject of the next part of this book.

**Add practice problems here.**

## Part III

# Context Free Grammars

The previous chapter showed that there are languages that have features common in computer programming languages that cannot be represented as regular expressions. One such example is nested parenthesis (or curly braces). Since it's reasonable to assume that programming languages are formal languages, there must be another category of language that includes programming languages. This part of the text explores this category of language.



# Chapter 6

## Context Free Grammars

Recall that nested parenthesis cannot be represented as a regular expression. They can be represented using a recursive definition:

1.  $()$  is in BAL
2. if  $x$  is in BAL, then so is  $(x)$

This suggests that languages defined recursively are more powerful (in the sense that they can define more languages) than regular expressions. We want to formalize the structure of recursive definitions so that we can prove properties of these languages much as we did for regular languages in Chapter 5. Context Free Grammars are one such formalization.

A Context Free Grammar (CFG) is made up a a list of productions of the general form:

$X$  can be replaced by  $A B C$

The potential for recursion comes about because the variable being replaced can appear in the replacement:

$X$  can be replaced by  $A X C$

More formally, a production in a CFG consists of a left hand side and a right hand side. The left hand side gives the symbol that can be replaced. The right hand side gives the list of symbols that can replace the symbol on the left. The two sides are typically separated either by an arrow (  $\rightarrow$  ) or sometimes a colon-colon-equals (  $::=$  ). A sample production that indicates that the symbol  $A$  can be replaced by  $X Y Z$  is given below:

$$A \rightarrow X Y Z$$

Symbols in CFGs are of two flavors: non-terminals are those that appear on the left hand side of a production. They are non-terminals because they can be replaced by other symbols. Terminals are those symbols that never appear on the left hand side. They are “terminal” because they can never be replaced. For ease of reading, non-terminals are usually given in UPPER-CASE, and terminals are given in lowercase. CFGs also need a start symbol - the symbol that is the starting point for derivations. The start symbol is often either  $S$  or **START**, but if neither is specified, the left hand side of the first production is considered the start symbol.

1 $S \rightarrow a S b$ 2 $S \rightarrow \Lambda$
--

CFG 6.1: A CFG that defines the language of any number of  $a$ ’s followed by the same number of  $b$ ’s.

Figure 6.1 shows a complete CFG. The productions have been numbered for easy reference. There are only two productions. The first one says that the start symbol ( $S$ ) can be replaced with “ $a S b$ ”. Note that this is a recursive rule because the  $S$  appears on both sides. The second production says that  $S$  can be replaced with nothing.

What can we do with this CFG? Let’s do some derivations. Starting with the start symbol and Production 1, we can get the string  $aSb$ . If we then use Production 2, we are left with the string  $ab$ . Since there are no more non-terminals, we are done.

What if we invoked Production 1 more than once? The first invocation produces  $aSb$ . The next invocation produces  $aaSbb$ . Each invocation adds

another **a** and **b**. When we finally invoke Production 2, we are left with a string of **a**'s followed by the same number of **b**'s.

While not the most complex illustration, this CFG illustrates that CFGs are more powerful than regular expressions. Regular expressions are not able to generate balanced parenthesis. A regular expression such as  $(^*)^*$  allows any number of opening parenthesis and any number of closing parenthesis, but there is no way to guarantee that the number of closing parenthesis match the number of opening parenthesis. If we substituted parenthesis for the **a** and **b** in Figure 6.1, we would have a solution to the balanced parenthesis problem.

Figure 6.2 presents a more complete, and more interesting CFG. This language defines a program as zero or more statements. An individual statement can be an assignment statement (in this language, an assignment statement is a terminal, so the assumption is that they are defined elsewhere), an **if** statement, or a compound statement (curly braces surrounding any number of statements).

```

1 PROGRAM → STMTS
2 STMTS → STMT STMTS
3 STMTS → Λ
4 STMT → IF_STMT
5 STMT → COMPOUND_STMT
6 STMT → assignment_stmt
7 IF_STMT → if ( expr ) STMT
8 COMPOUND_STMT → { STMTS }
9 COMPOUND_STMT → STMT

```

CFG 6.2: This CFG defines a program as being zero or more statements, where each statement is either an **if** statement, an assignment statement or a compound statement.

```

1 assignment_statement
  if (expr)
    assignment_statement
  if (expr)
5    if (expr)
      assignment_statement
  if (expr)

```

```
10 {  
    assignment_statement  
    assignment_statement  
    {  
    }  
}
```

Listing 6.3: Sample program in the language defined by the CFG in Figure 6.2

The program in Listing 6.3 illustrates the features of the language defined by the CFG in Figure 6.2. Line 1 is a simple assignment statement. The `if` statement that begins in Line 2 is a simple `if` statement. The `if` statement that begins in Line 4 shows a nested `if` statement. The compound statement that begins in Line 8 shows that compound statements can be nested and that they can be empty (in Line 11).

## 6.1 Derivations

Listing 6.3 claims to be a program in the language defined in Figure 6.2. How can we substantiate this claim? This is normally done by showing a derivation of the program given the CFG. Each line of a derivation substitutes a single non-terminal for the right-hand-side of a production for that non-terminal.

Derivations start with the start symbol and continue until there are only terminals. Each step other than the first should list the production number that was invoked to make the substitution. Rather than starting with the longer program in Listing 6.3, let's start with the shorter program in Listing 6.4.

```
1 if (expr)  
  {  
    assignment_statement  
    assignment_statement  
5 }
```

Listing 6.4: Short program program in the language defined by the CFG in Figure 6.2. The derivation of this program is given in Derivation 6.5

This derivation is what's known as a left-most derivation because each time there were multiple non-terminals that could be replaced, the left-most one

	PROGRAM
1	STMTS
4	IF_STMT
7	if ( expr ) STMT
8	if ( expr ) { STMTS }
2	if ( expr ) { STMT STMTS }
6	if ( expr ) { assignment_stmt STMTS }
2	if ( expr ) { assignment_stmt STMT STMTS }
6	if ( expr ) { assignment_stmt assignment_stmt STMTS }
3	if ( expr ) { assignment_stmt assignment_stmt }

Derivation 6.5: Derivation of the program in Listing 6.4

was replaced. It is also possible to do right-most derivations, and you can also do neither: sometimes pick the left-most non-terminal, sometimes the right-most, and sometimes one in the middle.

Derivations can also be represented as syntax trees. In a syntax tree, the children of each non-terminal are the items from the right hand side of the production that was used to replace the non-terminal. Figure 6.1 shows the syntax tree for the derivation in Figure 6.5.

Note that if the derivation is given in tree form, there is no sense of left-most and right-most because the tree gives no indication of what order the productions were invoked. For the derivation represented in Figure 6.5, it would not matter what order the productions were invoked in. All derivations would produce an identical tree. This is because the grammar in Figure 6.2 is non-ambiguous. An ambiguous grammar is one in which it is possible to produce different trees for the same input.

## 6.2 Ambiguous Grammars

A grammar is ambiguous when a single input can produce multiple different trees. The grammar in Figure 6.6 illustrates this. The expression  $3 + 4 * 5$  can be derived two different ways. One has the multiplication happening first and the other with the addition happening first. These two derivations are illustrated by the trees in Figure 6.2.




Figure 6.1: A syntax tree representing the derivation in Figure 6.5.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | $\text{EXPR} \rightarrow \text{EXPR} + \text{num}$ |
| 2 | $\text{EXPR} \rightarrow \text{EXPR} * \text{num}$ |
| 3 | $\text{EXPR} \rightarrow \text{num}$               |

CFG 6.6: An ambiguous expression grammar.




Figure 6.2: Two syntax trees showing derivations of  $3 + 4 * 5$  using the ambiguous grammar in Figure 6.6

For programming languages, ambiguous grammars are clearly bad. The expression  $3 + 4 * 5$  should not evaluate to a different value simply because the compiler did a left-most derivation versus a right-most derivation. There are expression grammars that resolve the ambiguity of the grammar in Figure 6.6, but since this is a theory book, we will leave that topic for a compiler book.

# Chapter 7

## Pushdown Automata

When talking about regular languages, we found that an existing concept - state machines (aka finite automata) proved very useful for processing regular languages. In this chapter, rather than showing that an existing machine is useful for processing context free languages (those that can be defined by a CFG), we will instead invent such a machine.

Finite automata have no way of “remembering” what path they took. This is why they were unable to solve the balanced parenthesis problem. They had no way to remember how many opening parenthesis they encountered, so they couldn’t enforce that there be the same number of closing parenthesis. To solve this problem, we propose that a push-down stack be added to finite automata thus making a new machine called a pushdown automata.

To illustrate how this could allow us to solve the balanced parenthesis problem, suppose each time we encountered an opening parenthesis in the input, we pushed it onto the stack. Each time we encountered a closing parenthesis, we popped an open from the stack. If we never attempted to pop an empty stack, and if at the end of the input, the stack was empty, then we must have only encountered balanced parenthesis.

zzz

**This section needs work.**



## Part IV

# Beyond Context Free Languages

**This section needs work.**

# Appendix A

## The First Appendix

The `\appendix` command should be used only once. Subsequent appendices can be created using the `Chapter` command.

# Appendix B

## The Second Appendix

Some text for the second Appendix.

This text is a sample for a short bibliography. You can cite a book by making use of the command `\cite{KarelRektorys}`: [1]. Papers can be cited similarly: [2]. If you want multiple citations to appear in a single set of square brackets you must type all of the citation keys inside a single citation, separating each with a comma. Here is an example: [2, 3, 4].

# Bibliography

- [1] Rektorys, K., *Variational methods in Mathematics, Science and Engineering*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht-Holland/Boston-U.S.A., 2th edition, 1975
- [2] BERTÓTI, E.: *On mixed variational formulation of linear elasticity using nonsymmetric stresses and displacements*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering., **42**, (1997), 561-578.
- [3] SZEIDL, G.: *Boundary integral equations for plane problems in terms of stress functions of order one*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mechanics, **2**(2), (2001), 237-261.
- [4] CARLSON D. E.: *On Günther's stress functions for couple stresses*, Quart. Appl. Math., **25**, (1967), 139-146.

# Afterword

The back matter often includes one or more of an index, an afterword, acknowledgments, a bibliography, a colophon, or any other similar item. In the back matter, chapters do not produce a chapter number, but they are entered in the table of contents. If you are not using anything in the back matter, you can delete the back matter TeX field and everything that follows it.