

Induction Proofs and Context-Free Grammars

Let G be a (context-free) grammar, and let E be a language defined "in prose", i.e. extensionally. We want to ascertain whether $L(G) = E$.

Defⁿ: G is sound for E if $L(G) \subseteq E$, i.e. every terminal string derivable in the grammar belongs to the language.
 G is comprehensive* if $E \subseteq L(G)$, i.e. if G can generate every string in the language.

*The actual term in logic is "complete" but this would cause confusion with a later different use of the term "complete".

(namely, as in "NP-complete" in our order of topics.)

These terms arose in logic where G is a system of logic with axioms and deduction rules, $L(G)$ equals the theorems in this system, and E is the set of true statements in the system. Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem states that in this case, whenever G contains all the rules of elementary arithmetic (such as the commutative, associative, and distributive laws of $+$ and $\cdot$), $L(G)$ must be a proper subset of E , i.e. not all true statements are provable. The cases we will work on are ones where $L(G)$ does equal E , and we need to prove $L(G) \subseteq E$ and $E \subseteq L(G)$.

For soundness, i.e. $L(G) \subseteq E$, we want to induct on the grammar. There is a neat technique for doing so called Structural Induction (SI). For context-free grammars, the SI technique can be described simply:

- I. Assign to each variable A in the grammar a property P_A of terminal strings x it may derive. You can phrase each such meaning P_A in the form " P_A = I derive strings x such that..."
- II. For the start symbol, you want P_S to imply $x \in E$. Often you can take P_S to be "I derive strings x such that $x \in E$ ", but sometimes you need to make P_S a stronger property, to make part III work.
- III. For each production $A \rightarrow \text{RHS}$, not just those involving P_S , show that if every variable B in RHS derives a substring that satisfies P_B , then the resulting string satisfies P_A "on LHS".