

CFL closure Proofs

Context-Free Languages - Closure Properties (Complete Proofs)

Overview of CFL Closure Properties

CFLs are CLOSED under:

- Union (\cup)
- Concatenation (\cdot)
- Kleene Star ($*$)

CFLs are NOT CLOSED under:

- Intersection (\cap)
- Complement ($\bar{}$)

Key Insight: The closure properties that work are those that can be implemented by "choosing" or "sequencing" derivations from component grammars. Operations requiring "coordination" between different parts fail.

Theorem 1: CFL Closure Under Union

Statement: If L_1 and L_2 are context-free, then $L_1 \cup L_2$ is context-free.

Proof Idea:

Create a new grammar that can generate strings from either original grammar by adding a new start symbol with productions that "choose" between the two languages.

Proof:

Step 1: Let $G_1 = (V_1, \Sigma_1, R_1, S_1)$ generate L_1 and $G_2 = (V_2, \Sigma_2, R_2, S_2)$ generate L_2 .

Step 2: WLOG, assume $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$ (rename variables if necessary).

Step 3: Construct $G = (V, \Sigma, R, S)$ where:

- $V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \{S\}$ (S is new start symbol)
- $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$
- $R = R_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{S \rightarrow S_1, S \rightarrow S_2\}$

Step 4: Prove $L(G) = L_1 \cup L_2$:

\subseteq : If $w \in L(G)$, then $S \Rightarrow^* w$. The derivation starts $S \rightarrow S_1$ or $S \rightarrow S_2$.

- If $S \rightarrow S_1$, then $S_1 \Rightarrow^* w$ using only R_1 , so $w \in L_1$
- If $S \rightarrow S_2$, then $S_2 \Rightarrow^* w$ using only R_2 , so $w \in L_2$
- Therefore $w \in L_1 \cup L_2$

\supseteq : If $w \in L_1 \cup L_2$:

- If $w \in L_1$, then $S_1 \Rightarrow^* w$, so $S \rightarrow S_1 \Rightarrow^* w$
 - If $w \in L_2$, then $S_2 \Rightarrow^* w$, so $S \rightarrow S_2 \Rightarrow^* w$
 - Therefore $w \in L(G)$
-

Theorem 2: CFL Closure Under Concatenation

Statement: If L_1 and L_2 are context-free, then $L_1 \cdot L_2$ is context-free.

Proof Idea:

Force every string to be decomposed into two parts: first part generated by G_1 , second part by G_2 . The new start symbol coordinates this sequencing.

Proof:

Step 1: Let $G_1 = (V_1, \Sigma_1, R_1, S_1)$ generate L_1 and $G_2 = (V_2, \Sigma_2, R_2, S_2)$ generate L_2 .

Step 2: WLOG, assume $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$.

Step 3: Construct $G = (V, \Sigma, R, S)$ where:

- $V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \{S\}$ (S is new start symbol)
- $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$
- $R = R_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{S \rightarrow S_1 S_2\}$

Step 4: Prove $L(G) = L_1 \cdot L_2$:

\subseteq : If $w \in L(G)$, then $S \Rightarrow^* w$.

- The derivation starts $S \rightarrow S_1 S_2$
- So $S_1 S_2 \Rightarrow^* w$
- This means $w = uv$ where $S_1 \Rightarrow^* u$ and $S_2 \Rightarrow^* v$
- Therefore $u \in L_1$, $v \in L_2$, so $w \in L_1 \cdot L_2$

\supseteq : If $w \in L_1 \cdot L_2$, then $w = uv$ where $u \in L_1$, $v \in L_2$.

- $S_1 \Rightarrow^* u$ and $S_2 \Rightarrow^* v$

- So $S \rightarrow S_1 S_2 \Rightarrow^* uv = w$
- Therefore $w \in L(G)$

Example:

$L_1 = \{a^n b^n \mid n \geq 0\}, L_2 = \{c^m d^m \mid m \geq 0\}$

$G_1: S_1 \rightarrow \epsilon \mid a S_1 b$

$G_2: S_2 \rightarrow \epsilon \mid c S_2 d$

$L_1 \cdot L_2: S \rightarrow S_1 S_2$

Result: $\{a^n b^n c^m d^m \mid n, m \geq 0\}$

Theorem 3: CFL Closure Under Kleene Star

Statement: If L is a context-free language, then L^* is context-free.

💡 Proof Idea:

L^* means "zero or more concatenations of strings from L ." We need a grammar that can generate ϵ (zero strings) or recursively build longer concatenations.

Proof:

Step 1: Let $G = (V, \Sigma, R, S_1)$ generate L .

Step 2: Construct $G' = (V', \Sigma, R', S)$ where:

- $V' = V \cup \{S\}$ (S is new start symbol)
- $R' = R \cup \{S \rightarrow \epsilon, S \rightarrow SS_1\}$

Step 3: Prove $L(G') = L^*$:

\subseteq : If $w \in L(G')$, then $S \Rightarrow^* w$.

- If derivation uses $S \rightarrow \epsilon$, then $w = \epsilon \in L^*$
- If derivation uses $S \rightarrow SS_1$, then $w = uv$ where $S \Rightarrow^* u$ and $S_1 \Rightarrow^* v$
- By induction: $u \in L^*$ and $v \in L$, so $w = uv \in L^*$

\supseteq : If $w \in L^*$, then either:

- $w = \epsilon$: Use $S \rightarrow \epsilon$
- $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_k$ where each $w_i \in L$: Use $S \rightarrow SS_1 \Rightarrow^* SS_1 w_1 \rightarrow SS_1 w_1 \Rightarrow^* SS_1 w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k-1} \rightarrow S_1 w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k-1} \Rightarrow^* w_1 w_2 \dots w_k = w$

Alternative Construction (often cleaner):

- $R' = R \cup \{S \rightarrow \epsilon \mid S_1 S\}$

This generates strings by: $S \rightarrow S_1S \rightarrow S_1S_1S \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow S_1S_1\dots S_1\epsilon$

Example:

```
L = {a^n b^n | n ≥ 1}: S_1 → ab | aS_1b
L*: S → ε | S_1S
Result: L* = {(a^n b^n)^k | n ≥ 1, k ≥ 0}
```

Theorem 4: CFLs are NOT Closed Under Intersection

Statement: There exist context-free languages L_1 and L_2 such that $L_1 \cap L_2$ is not context-free.

💡 Proof Idea:

Find two CFLs whose intersection forces a coordination that CFGs cannot handle - typically requiring equal counts of three or more different symbols.

Proof (Classic Counterexample):

Step 1: Define the languages:

- $L_1 = \{a^i b^j c^i \mid i, j \geq 1\}$
- $L_2 = \{a^i b^j c^i \mid i, j \geq 1\}$

Step 2: Show L_1 and L_2 are context-free:

For L_1 :

```
S_1 → AC
A → aA | a
C → bCc | bc
```

For L_2 :

```
S_2 → AB
A → aAb | ab
B → cB | c
```

Step 3: Find the intersection: $L_1 \cap L_2 = \{a^i b^j c^i \mid i, j \geq 1\} \cap \{a^i b^j c^i \mid i, j \geq 1\} = \{a^i b^i c^i \mid i \geq 1\}$

Step 4: Prove $L_1 \cap L_2$ is not context-free using the CFL Pumping Lemma:

Let p be the pumping length. Consider $s = a^p b^p c^p \in L_1 \cap L_2$.

By the pumping lemma, $s = uvwxy$ where $|vwx| \leq p$, $|vx| \geq 1$, and $uv^iwx^iy \in L_1 \cap L_2$ for all $i \geq 0$.

Case Analysis:

- **Case 1:** vwx spans only one type of symbol (all a's, all b's, or all c's) Then pumping changes count of only one symbol type, breaking the equality requirement.
- **Case 2:** vwx spans two types of symbols Since $|vwx| \leq p$, it cannot span all three types. Pumping changes at most two symbol counts, but we need all three to remain equal.

In all cases, pumping fails to maintain $a^i b^i c^i$ pattern. Therefore $L_1 \cap L_2$ is not context-free.

Theorem 5: CFLs are NOT Closed Under Complement

Statement: There exists a context-free language L such that \bar{L} is not context-free.

Proof Idea:

Use the non-closure under intersection and De Morgan's laws. If CFLs were closed under complement, they would also be closed under intersection.

Proof (Reduction from Intersection):

Step 1: Assume, for contradiction, that CFLs are closed under complement.

Step 2: Let L_1 and L_2 be any context-free languages.

Step 3: By De Morgan's law: $L_1 \cap L_2 = \bar{\bar{L}_1 \cup \bar{L}_2}$

Step 4: If CFLs are closed under complement:

- \bar{L}_1 would be context-free
- \bar{L}_2 would be context-free

Step 5: Since CFLs are closed under union:

- $\bar{L}_1 \cup \bar{L}_2$ would be context-free
- Therefore $L_1 \cap L_2$ would be context-free

Step 6: This contradicts Theorem 4 (CFLs not closed under intersection).

Therefore, CFLs are not closed under complement.

Direct Counterexample:

Alternative Proof: Consider $L = \{a^i b^j c^k \mid i \neq j \text{ or } j \neq k\}$

Step 1: Show L is context-free: $L = \{a^i b^j c^k \mid i \neq j\} \cup \{a^i b^j c^k \mid j \neq k\}$

Each component is CFL (can be shown with appropriate grammars), and CFLs are closed under union.

Step 2: Find the complement: $\bar{L} = \{a^i b^j c^k \mid i = j \text{ and } j = k\} = \{a^i b^i c^i \mid i \geq 0\}$

Step 3: We already proved $\{a^ibici \mid i \geq 1\}$ is not CFL in Theorem 4. Similarly, $\{a^ibici \mid i \geq 0\}$ is not CFL.

Therefore \bar{L} is not context-free, proving CFLs are not closed under complement.

Summary Table

Operation	Regular Languages	Context-Free Languages	Decidable Languages
Union (\cup)	✓ Closed	✓ Closed	✓ Closed
Intersection (\cap)	✓ Closed	✗ Not Closed	✓ Closed
Complement ($\bar{}$)	✓ Closed	✗ Not Closed	✓ Closed
Concatenation (\cdot)	✓ Closed	✓ Closed	✓ Closed
Kleene Star ($*$)	✓ Closed	✓ Closed	✓ Closed

Key Insight: As we move up the Chomsky hierarchy, we gain expressive power but lose closure properties. This reflects the fundamental trade-off between computational power and structural constraints in formal language theory.