

# NORMAL FORMS

---

(PART II)

---

Recall: Any context-free grammar can be converted into either  
Chomsky Normal Form and/or Greibach Normal Form.

Each rule is of the form  $A \rightarrow c$  or  $A \rightarrow BC$

Each rule is of the form  $A \rightarrow cB_1 \dots B_k$ .

Neither form allows the generation of the empty string  $\epsilon$ .

We showed that to convert a given CFG into either normal form,  
we start by eliminating  $\epsilon$ -productions and unit-productions.

$A \rightarrow \epsilon$

$A \rightarrow B$

Consider a context-free language  $L$ .

We showed that there is a CFG  $G$  which generates  $L$  s.t.  $G$  does not contain any  $\epsilon$ - or unit-productions.

So every rule is of the form  $A \rightarrow \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n$ , where  $A \in NT$  and  $\gamma_i \in NT \cup T$ , for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

For Chomsky Normal Form, we said that every rule must be of the form  $A \rightarrow c$ , or  $A \rightarrow BC$ , where  $c \in T$ , and  $A, B, C \in NT$ .

Can we obtain a  $G'$  s.t.  $L(G) = L(G') = L$ , where  $G'$  is in Chomsky Normal Form?

$G' = (NT', T, R', S)$ , where

$$NT_1 = NT \cup \{A_c \mid c \in T\}$$

add a new non-terminal symbol for each letter in the alphabet

$$R_1 = \{A_c \rightarrow c \mid c \in T\}$$

$$R_2 = R \setminus \left\{ A \rightarrow \gamma_1 \dots \gamma_{i-1} c \gamma_{i+1} \dots \gamma_n \mid \begin{array}{l} c \in T, \text{ and} \\ \text{for some } j \neq i, \gamma_j \neq \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\cup \left\{ A \rightarrow \gamma_1 \dots \gamma_{i-1} A_c \gamma_{i+1} \dots \gamma_n \mid \begin{array}{l} c \in T, \text{ and} \\ \text{for some } j \neq i, \gamma_j \neq \varepsilon \end{array} \right\} \cup R_1$$

All rules in  $R_2$  are of the form  $A \rightarrow c$  ( $A \in NT, c \in T$ ), or  $A \rightarrow B_1 \dots B_k$  ( $A, B_1, \dots, B_k \in NT, k \geq 2$ ).

Consider a rule of the form  $A \rightarrow B_1 \cdots B_k$ , where  $A, B_1, \dots, B_k \in NT$  and  $k > 2$ .

Need to convert this into a rule with only two non-terminal symbols on the right.

For every rule of the above form in  $R_2$ , choose a new non-terminal symbol  $C \notin NT_1$ , and replace this rule by the following two rules.

$$\{A \rightarrow B_1 C, C \rightarrow B_2 \cdots B_k\}.$$

Do this repeatedly till all such rules have exactly two non-terminal symbols on the right.

$NT'$  is the final set of non-terminals, and  $R'$  the final set of rules.

Example:  $G = (\{S\}, \{a, b\}, R, S)$ , where

$$R = \{S \rightarrow \epsilon, S \rightarrow aSb, S \rightarrow bSa, S \rightarrow SS\}.$$

Convert  $G$  into  $G'$ , where  $G'$  does not contain  $\epsilon$ - or unit-productions.

$$\textcircled{1} \{S \rightarrow \epsilon, S \rightarrow aSb\} \subseteq R \Rightarrow S \rightarrow ab \in R'$$

$$\textcircled{2} \{S \rightarrow \epsilon, S \rightarrow bSa\} \subseteq R \Rightarrow S \rightarrow ba \in R'$$

$$\text{So } R' = R \setminus \{S \rightarrow \epsilon\} \cup \{S \rightarrow ab, S \rightarrow ba\}$$

$$= \{S \rightarrow aSb, S \rightarrow bSa, S \rightarrow SS, S \rightarrow ab, S \rightarrow ba\}$$

We now convert  $G'$  into Chomsky Normal Form.

$G_{conf} = (NT', T, R', S)$ , where

$$NT' = \{S, A, B, C_1, C_2\}$$

$$T = \{a, b\}$$

$$R' = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} S \rightarrow AC_1, S \rightarrow BC_2, \\ S \rightarrow SS, S \rightarrow AB, S \rightarrow BA, \\ A \rightarrow a, B \rightarrow b, \\ C_1 \rightarrow SB, C_2 \rightarrow SA, \\ S \rightarrow \varepsilon \end{array} \right\}$$

So now we can convert a given CFG into Chomsky Normal Form.

What about Greibach Normal Form?

Here, every rule needs to be of the form  $A \rightarrow c B_1 \dots B_k$ ,  
where  $k \geq 0$ ,  $A, B_1, \dots, B_k \in NT$ , and  $c \in T$ .

So the  $A \rightarrow c$  kind of rules in the Chomsky Normal Form is fine

But how do we handle the  $A \rightarrow BC$  kind of rules?

Suppose we have a grammar in Chomsky Normal Form.

Enumerate the non-terminals as  $N_1, \dots, N_k$  s.t.  $|NT| = k$ .

Modify the rules in  $R$  such that if  $N_i \rightarrow N_j \delta$ , then  $i < j$ .



What if we end up with something of the form  $N_i \rightarrow N_i \gamma$ ?

Suppose we have a bunch of left recursive rules of the form

$$A \rightarrow A\gamma_1 \mid A\gamma_2 \mid \dots \mid A\gamma_k$$

and some other rules of the form  $A \rightarrow \alpha_1 \mid \alpha_2 \mid \dots \mid \alpha_l$ .

Then, we add new rules of the form

$$A \rightarrow \alpha_j \mid \alpha_j B \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq l, \text{ and}$$

$$B \rightarrow \gamma_i \mid \gamma_i B \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k. \quad \text{Then turn each of these into } A \rightarrow \alpha B_1 \dots B_k \text{ form.}$$

Claim: This transformation preserves the language generated by the grammar.

Exercise!

Example:

$$S \rightarrow rA | BB$$

$$B \rightarrow r | SB$$

$$A \rightarrow t$$

$$A_1 = S, A_2 = A, A_3 = B$$

$$A_1 \rightarrow rA_2 | A_3A_3$$

$$A_3 \rightarrow r | A_1A_3 \rightarrow \text{problem: } i > j$$

$$A_2 \rightarrow t$$

$$R \rightarrow r \quad T \rightarrow t$$

$$S \rightarrow RA | BB$$

$$B \rightarrow r | SB$$

$$A \rightarrow t$$

$$A_3 \rightarrow r | rA_2A_3 | A_3A_3A_3 \quad \text{left recursive}$$

$$A_3 \rightarrow r | rB | rA_2A_3 | rA_2A_3B$$

$$B \rightarrow A_3A_3 | A_3A_3B$$

$$A_1 \rightarrow rA_2 | \underline{A_3A_3}, \quad A_2 \rightarrow t,$$

$$A_3 \rightarrow r | rB | rA_2A_3 | rA_2A_3B$$

not in the form  
 $A \rightarrow cB_1 \dots B_k$

$$B \rightarrow \underline{A_3A_3} | \underline{A_3A_3B}$$

$$A_1 \rightarrow rA_2 \mid rA_3 \mid rBA_3 \mid rA_2A_3A_3 \mid rA_2A_3BA_3$$

$$A_2 \rightarrow t$$

$$A_3 \rightarrow r \mid rB \mid rA_2A_3 \mid rA_2A_3B$$

$$B \rightarrow rA_3 \mid rBA_3 \mid rA_2A_3A_3 \mid rA_2A_3BA_3 \mid \\ rA_3B \mid rBA_3B \mid rA_2A_3A_3B \mid rA_2A_3BA_3B$$