

1 General Grammars

Definition 1.1 (General Grammar) A (general) grammar is a quadruple (V, Σ, R, S) where

V is an alphabet
 $\Sigma \subseteq V$ is the set of terminal symbols
 $V - \Sigma$ is the set of nonterminals
 $S \in V - \Sigma$ is the start symbol
 R is the set of rules, a subset of

$V^*(V - \Sigma)V^*$	×	V^*
<i>left-hand side</i>		<i>right-hand side</i>
<i>at least one</i>		<i>may have anything</i>
<i>nonterminal</i>		

Note that context-free grammars are also (general) grammars. As for derivations, $w_1uw_2 \Rightarrow_G w_1vw_2$ for $w_1, w_2 \in V^*$ if $(u, v) \in R$. Then \Rightarrow_G^* is defined as a sequence of zero or more \Rightarrow_G . Also, $w \in \Sigma^*$ is *generated by G* iff $S \Rightarrow^* w$ and $L(G) = \{w \in \Sigma^* : w \text{ is generated by } G\}$. A *derivation* in G is a sequence

$$w_0 \Rightarrow_G w_1 \Rightarrow_G w_2 \Rightarrow_G \dots \Rightarrow_G w_n.$$

General grammars can be seen as having *context-dependence* which means that a replacement can only be applied in a specified context. A production of the form

$$uAv \rightarrow uvw$$

can be seen as applying the replacement $A \rightarrow w$ only when u is to the left and v is to the right. Any general grammar can be simulated using only productions of this form, it turns out. This helps to motivate the term “context-free.”

General grammars are more powerful than context-free grammars. Here is a grammar whose language is $\{a^n b^n c^n : n \geq 0\}$, which we know is not context-free:

$$\begin{aligned}
G &= (V, \Sigma, R, S) \\
V &= \{S, a, b, c, A, B, C, T_a, T_b, T_c\} \\
\Sigma &= \{a, b, c\} \\
\\
&\{S \rightarrow ABCS \quad \text{Generate } (ABC)^n T_c \\
&S \rightarrow T_c \\
\\
&CA \rightarrow AC \quad \text{Sort} \\
&BA \rightarrow AB \\
&CB \rightarrow BC \\
R = & \\
&CT_c \rightarrow T_c c \quad \text{change } C \text{ to } c \\
&CT_c \rightarrow T_b c \\
\\
&BT_b \rightarrow T_b b \quad \text{change } B \text{ to } b \\
&BT_b \rightarrow T_a b \\
\\
&AT_a \rightarrow T_a a \quad \text{change } A \text{ to } a \\
&T_a \rightarrow \epsilon \}
\end{aligned}$$

Here is a derivation of $aabbcc$ in this grammar:

$$\begin{aligned}
S &\Rightarrow ABCS \Rightarrow ABCABCS \Rightarrow ABCABCT_c \\
&\Rightarrow ABACBCT_c \Rightarrow AABCBCT_c \Rightarrow AABBCCT_c \\
&\Rightarrow AABBCT_c c \Rightarrow AABBT_b cc \Rightarrow AABT_b bcc \\
&\Rightarrow AAT_a bcc \Rightarrow AT_a abcc \Rightarrow T_a aabbcc \Rightarrow aabbcc
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.1 *A language is generated by a grammar iff it is recursively enumerable.*

This shows that grammars are equivalent in power to Turing machines, in some sense. The proof simulates a grammar by a Turing machine and a Turing machine by a grammar. It is straightforward, if cumbersome, to design a Turing machine to simulate a grammar. It also fairly easy to simulate a Turing machine by a grammar.