2.2 PUSHDOWN AUTOMATA

In this section we introduce a new type of computational model called pushdown automata. These automata are like nondeterministic finite automata but have an extra component called a stack. The stack provides additional memory beyond the finite amount available in the control. The stack allows pushdown automata to recognize some nonregular languages.

Pushdown automata are equivalent in power to context-free grammars. This equivalence is useful because it gives us two options for proving that a language is context free. We can give either a context-free grammar generating it or a pushdown automaton recognizing it. Certain languages are more easily described in terms of generators, whereas others are more easily described in terms of recognizers.

The following figure is a schematic representation of a finite automaton. The control represents the states and transition function, the tape contains the input string, and the arrow represents the input head, pointing at the next input symbol to be read.

![Schematic of a finite automaton](image)

**FIGURE 2.4**
Schematic of a finite automaton

With the addition of a stack component we obtain a schematic representation of a pushdown automaton, as shown in the following figure.
A pushdown automaton (PDA), can write symbols on the stack and read them back later. Writing a symbol “pushes down” all the other symbols on the stack. At any time the symbol on the top of the stack can be read and removed. The remaining symbols then move back up. Writing a symbol on the stack is often referred to as pushing the symbol, and removing a symbol is referred to as popping it. Note that all access to the stack, for both reading and writing, may be done only at the top. In other words a stack is a “last in, first out” storage device. If certain information is written on the stack and additional information is written afterward, the earlier information becomes inaccessible until the later information is removed.

Plates on a cafeteria serving counter illustrate a stack. The stack of plates rests on a spring so that when a new plate is placed on top of the stack, the plates below it move down. The stack on a pushdown automaton is like a stack of plates, with each plate having a symbol written on it.

A stack is valuable because it can hold an unlimited amount of information. Recall that a finite automaton is unable to recognize the language \( \{0^n1^n \mid n \geq 0 \} \) because it cannot store very large numbers in its finite memory. A PDA is able to recognize this language because it can use its stack to store the number of 0s it has seen. Thus the unlimited nature of a stack allows the PDA to store numbers of unbounded size. The following informal description shows how the automaton for this language works.

Read symbols from the input. As each 0 is read, push it onto the stack. As soon as 1s are seen, pop a 0 off the stack for each 1 read. If reading the input is finished exactly when the stack becomes empty of 0s, accept the input. If the stack becomes empty while 1s remain or if the 1s are finished while the stack still contains 0s or if any 0s appear in the input following 1s, reject the input.

As mentioned earlier, pushdown automata may be nondeterministic. This feature is crucial because, in contrast with the finite automata situation, nondeterminism adds power to the capability that pushdown automata would have if they were allowed only to be deterministic. Some languages, such as \( \{0^n1^n \mid n \geq 0 \} \), do not require nondeterminism, but others do. We give a language requiring nondeterminism in Example 2.11.
FORMAL DEFINITION OF A PUSHDOWN AUTOMATON

The formal definition of a pushdown automaton is similar to that of a finite automaton, except for the stack. The stack is a device containing symbols drawn from some alphabet. The machine may use different alphabets for its input and its stack, so now we specify both an input alphabet \( \Sigma \) and a stack alphabet \( \Gamma \).

At the heart of any formal definition of an automaton is the transition function, for that describes its behavior. Recall that \( \Sigma_\varepsilon = \Sigma \cup \{ \varepsilon \} \) and \( \Gamma_\varepsilon = \Gamma \cup \{ \varepsilon \} \). The domain of the transition function is \( Q \times \Sigma_\varepsilon \times \Gamma_\varepsilon \). Thus the current state, next input symbol read, and top symbol of the stack determine the next move of a pushdown automaton. Either symbol may be \( \varepsilon \) causing the machine to move without reading a symbol from the input or without reading a symbol from the stack.

For the range of the transition function we need to consider what to allow the automaton to do when it is in a particular situation. It may enter some new state and possibly write a symbol on the top of the stack. The function \( \delta \) can indicate this action by returning a member of \( Q \) together with a member of \( \Gamma_\varepsilon \), that is, a member of \( Q \times \Gamma_\varepsilon \). Because we allow nondeterminism in this model, a situation may have several legal next moves. The transition function incorporates nondeterminism in the usual way, by returning a set of members of \( Q \times \Gamma_\varepsilon \), that is, a member of \( \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma_\varepsilon) \). Putting it all together, our transition function \( \delta \) takes the form \( \delta : Q \times \Sigma_\varepsilon \times \Gamma_\varepsilon \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma_\varepsilon) \).

DEFINITION 2.8

A pushdown automaton is a 6-tuple \((Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)\), where \( Q \), \( \Sigma \), \( \Gamma \), and \( F \) are all finite sets, and

1. \( Q \) is the set of states,
2. \( \Sigma \) is the input alphabet,
3. \( \Gamma \) is the stack alphabet,
4. \( \delta : Q \times \Sigma_\varepsilon \times \Gamma_\varepsilon \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma_\varepsilon) \) is the transition function,
5. \( q_0 \in Q \) is the start state, and
6. \( F \subseteq Q \) is the set of accept states.

A pushdown automaton \( M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F) \) computes as follows. It accepts input \( w \) if \( w \) can be written as \( w = w_1w_2 \cdots w_m \), where each \( w_i \in \Sigma_\varepsilon \) and sequences of states \( r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_m \in Q \) and strings \( s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_m \in \Gamma^* \) exist that satisfy the next three conditions. The strings \( s_i \) represent the sequence of stack contents that \( M \) has on the accepting branch of the computation.

1. \( r_0 = q_0 \) and \( s_0 = \varepsilon \). This condition signifies that \( M \) starts out properly, in the start state and with an empty stack.
2. For \( i = 0, \ldots, m - 1 \), we have \( (r_{i+1}, b) \in \delta(r_i, w_{i+1}, a) \), where \( s_i = at \) and \( s_{i+1} = bt \) for some \( a, b \in \Gamma_\varepsilon \) and \( t \in \Gamma^* \). This condition states that \( M \) moves properly according to the state, stack, and next input symbol.
3. \( r_m \in F \). This condition states that an accept state occurs at the input end.
EXAMPLE 2.9

The following is the formal description of the PDA from page 102 that recognizes the language \( \{0^n1^n \mid n \geq 0\} \). Let \( M_1 \) be \( (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_1, F) \), where

\[
Q = \{q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4\},
\]

\[
\Sigma = \{0, 1\},
\]

\[
\Gamma = \{\$, \\}\},
\]

\[
F = \{q_1, q_4\}, \text{ and}
\]

\( \delta \) is given by the following table, wherein blank entries signify \( \emptyset \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>( \epsilon )</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>( \epsilon )</th>
<th>( \epsilon )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stack:</td>
<td>( $ )</td>
<td>( \epsilon )</td>
<td>( $ )</td>
<td>( \epsilon )</td>
<td>( $ )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( q_1 \) \[ ((q_2, 0)) \]

\( q_2 \) \[ ((q_3, \epsilon)) \]

\( q_3 \) \[ ((q_3, \epsilon)) \]

\( q_4 \) \[ ((q_4, \epsilon)) \]

We can also use a state diagram to describe a PDA, as shown in the following three figures. Such diagrams are similar to the state diagrams used to describe finite automata, modified to show how the PDA uses its stack when going from state to state. We write “\( a, b \to c \)” to signify that when the machine is reading an \( a \) from the input it may replace the symbol \( b \) on the top of the stack with a \( c \). Any of \( a \), \( b \), and \( c \) may be \( \epsilon \). If \( a \) is \( \epsilon \), the machine may make this transition without reading any symbol from the input. If \( b \) is \( \epsilon \), the machine may make this transition without reading and popping any symbol from the stack. If \( c \) is \( \epsilon \), the machine does not write any symbol on the stack when going along this transition.

![State diagram for the PDA \( M_1 \) that recognizes \( \{0^n1^n \mid n \geq 0\} \)]
The formal definition of a PDA contains no explicit mechanism to allow the PDA to test for an empty stack. This PDA is able to get the same effect by initially placing a special symbol $ on the stack. Then if it ever sees the $ again, it knows that the stack effectively is empty. Subsequently, when we refer to testing for an empty stack in an informal description of a PDA, we implement the procedure in the same way.

Similarly, PDAs cannot test explicitly for having reached the end of the input string. This PDA is able to achieve that effect because the accept state takes effect only when the machine is at the end of the input. Thus from now on, we assume that PDAs can test for the end of the input, and we know that we can implement it in the same manner.

**Example 2.10**

This example illustrates a pushdown automaton that recognizes the language

\[ \{a^i b^j c^k \mid i, j, k \geq 0 \text{ and } i = j \text{ or } i = k \} \]

Informally the PDA for this language works by first reading and pushing the a's. When the a's are done the machine has all of them on the stack so that it can match them with either the b's or the c's. This maneuver is a bit tricky because the machine doesn't know in advance whether to match the a's with the b's or the c's. Nondeterminism comes in handy here.

Using its nondeterminism, the PDA can guess whether to match the a's with the b's or with the c's, as shown in the following figure. Think of the machine as having two branches of its nondeterminism, one for each possible guess. If either of them match, that branch accepts and the entire machine accepts. In fact we could show, though we do not do so, that nondeterminism is essential for recognizing this language with a PDA.

**Figure 2.7**

State diagram for PDA \( M_2 \) that recognizes

\[ \{a^i b^j c^k \mid i, j, k \geq 0 \text{ and } i = j \text{ or } i = k \} \]
EXAMPLE 2.11

In this example we give a PDA $M_3$ recognizing the language $\{ww^R \mid w \in \{0,1\}^*\}$. Recall that $w^R$ means $w$ written backwards. The informal description of the PDA follows.

Begin by pushing the symbols that are read onto the stack. At each point nondeterministically guess that the middle of the string has been reached and then change into popping off the stack for each symbol read, checking to see that they are the same. If they were always the same symbol and the stack empties at the same time as the input is finished, accept; otherwise reject.

The following is the diagram of this machine.

![State diagram for the PDA $M_3$ that recognizes $\{ww^R \mid w \in \{0,1\}^*\}$](image)

FIGURE 2.8

EQUIVALENCE WITH CONTEXT-FREE GRAMMARS

In this section we show that context-free grammars and pushdown automata are equivalent in power. Both are capable of describing the class of context-free languages. We show how to convert any context-free grammar into a pushdown automaton that recognizes the same language and vice versa. Recalling that we defined a context-free language to be any language that can be described with a context-free grammar, our objective is the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.12

A language is context free if and only if some pushdown automaton recognizes it.

As usual for "if and only if" theorems, we have two directions to prove. In this theorem, both directions are interesting. First, we do the easier forward direction.
LEMMA 2.13

If a language is context free, then some pushdown automaton recognizes it.

PROOF IDEA  Let \( A \) be a CFL. From the definition we know that \( A \) has a CFG, \( G \), generating it. We show how to convert \( G \) into an equivalent PDA, which we call \( P \).

The PDA \( P \) that we now describe will work by accepting its input \( w \), if \( G \) generates that input, by determining whether there is a derivation for \( w \). Recall that a derivation is simply the sequence of substitutions made as a grammar generates a string. Each step of the derivation yields an intermediate string of variables and terminals. We design \( P \) to determine whether some series of substitutions using the rules of \( G \) can lead from the start variable to \( w \).

One of the difficulties in testing whether there is a derivation for \( w \) is in figuring out which substitutions to make. The PDA's nondeterminism allows it to guess the sequence of correct substitutions. At each step of the derivation one of the rules for a particular variable is selected nondeterministically and used to substitute for that variable.

The PDA \( P \) begins by writing the start variable on its stack. It goes through a series of intermediate strings, making one substitution after another. Eventually it may arrive at a string that contains only terminal symbols, meaning that it has derived a string using the grammar. Then \( P \) accepts if this string is identical to the string it has received as input.

Implementing this strategy on a PDA requires one additional idea. We need to see how the PDA stores the intermediate strings as it goes from one to another. Simply using the stack for storing each intermediate string is tempting. However, that doesn't quite work because the PDA needs to find the variables in the intermediate string and make substitutions. The PDA can access only the top symbol on the stack and that may be a terminal symbol instead of a variable. The way around this problem is to keep only part of the intermediate string on the stack: the symbols starting with the first variable in the intermediate string. Any terminal symbols appearing before the first variable are matched immediately with symbols in the input string. The following figure shows the PDA \( P \).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{control} \\
011001 \\ A1A0 \\
01A1A0 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{A} \\
1A \\
0 \$
\end{array}
\]

FIGURE 2.9

\( P \) representing the intermediate string 01A1A0
The following is an informal description of $P$.

1. Place the marker symbol $\$$ and the start variable on the stack.
2. Repeat the following steps forever.
   a. If the top of stack is a variable symbol $A$, nondeterministically select
      one of the rules for $A$ and substitute $A$ by the string on the right-hand
      side of the rule.
   b. If the top of stack is a terminal symbol $a$, read the next symbol from
      the input and compare it to $a$. If they match, repeat. If they do not
      match, reject on this branch of the nondeterminism.
   c. If the top of stack is the symbol $\$$, enter the accept state. Doing so
      accepts the input if it has all been read.

**Proof** We now give the formal details of the construction of the pushdown
automaton $P = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_1, F)$. To make the construction clearer we use
shorthand notation for the transition function. This notation provides a way to
write an entire string on the stack in one step of the machine. We can simulate
this action by introducing additional states to write the string one symbol at a
time, as implemented in the following formal construction.

Let $q$ and $r$ be states of the PDA, and let $a$ be in $\Sigma_e$ and $s$ be in $\Gamma_e$. Say that
we want the PDA to go from $q$ to $r$ when it reads $a$ and pops $s$. Furthermore we
want it to push the entire string $u = u_1 \cdots u_t$ on the stack at the same time. We
can implement this action by introducing new states $q_1, \ldots, q_{t-1}$ and setting the
transition function

$$
\delta(q, a, s) \text{ to contain } (q_1, u_1), \\
\delta(q_1, \varepsilon, \varepsilon) = \{(q_2, u_{t-1})\}, \\
\delta(q_2, \varepsilon, \varepsilon) = \{(q_3, u_{t-2})\}, \\
\vdots \\
\delta(q_{t-1}, \varepsilon, \varepsilon) = \{(r, u_1)\}.
$$

We use the notation $(r, u) \in \delta(q, a, s)$ to mean that when $q$ is the state of the
automaton, $a$ is the next input symbol, and $s$ is the symbol on the top of the stack,
the PDA may read the $a$ and pop the $s$, then push the string $u$ onto the stack and
go on to the state $r$. The following figure shows this implementation pictorially.
The states of $P$ are $Q = \{q_{\text{start}}, q_{\text{loop}}, q_{\text{accept}}\} \cup E$, where $E$ is the set of states we need for implementing the shorthand just described. The start state is $q_{\text{start}}$. The only accept state is $q_{\text{accept}}$.

The transition function is defined as follows. We begin by initializing the stack to contain the symbols $S$ and $S$, implementing step 1 in the informal description: $\delta(q_{\text{start}}, e, e) = \{(q_{\text{loop}}, SS)\}$. Then we put in transitions for the main loop of step 2.

First, we handle case (a) wherein the top of the stack contains a variable. Let $\delta(q_{\text{loop}}, e, A) = \{(q_{\text{loop}}, w)\}$ where $A \rightarrow w$ is a rule in $R$.

Second, we handle case (b) wherein the top of the stack contains a terminal. Let $\delta(q_{\text{loop}}, a, a) = \{(q_{\text{loop}}, e)\}$.

Finally, we handle case (c) wherein the empty stack marker $S$ is on the top of the stack. Let $\delta(q_{\text{loop}}, e, S) = \{(q_{\text{accept}}, e)\}$.

The state diagram is shown in the following figure.
EXAMPLE 2.14

We use the procedure developed in Lemma 2.13 to construct a PDA $P_1$ from the following CFG $G$.

\[
S \rightarrow aTb \mid b \\
T \rightarrow Ta \mid \varepsilon
\]

The transition function is shown in the following diagram.

![Diagram of PDA $P_1$]

FIGURE 2.12
State diagram of $P_1$

Now we prove the reverse direction of Theorem 2.12. For the forward direction we gave a procedure for converting a CFG into a PDA. The main idea was to design the automaton so that it simulates the grammar. Now we want to give a procedure for going the other way: converting a PDA into a CFG. We design the grammar to simulate the automaton. This task is a bit tricky because "programming" an automaton is easier than "programming" a grammar.

LEMMA 2.15

If a pushdown automaton recognizes some language, then it is context free.

PROOF IDEA  We have a PDA $P$, and we want to make a CFG $G$ that generates all the strings that $P$ accepts. In other words, $G$ should generate a string if that string causes the PDA to go from its start state to an accept state.
To achieve this outcome we design a grammar that does somewhat more. For each pair of states $p$ and $q$ in $P$ the grammar will have a variable $A_{pq}$. This variable generates all the strings that can take $P$ from $p$ with an empty stack to $q$ with an empty stack. Observe that such strings can also take $P$ from $p$ to $q$, regardless of the stack contents at $p$, leaving the stack at $q$ in the same condition as it was at $p$.

First, we simplify our task by modifying $P$ slightly to give it the following three features.

1. It has a single accept state, $q_{\text{accept}}$.
2. It empties its stack before accepting.
3. Each transition either pushes a symbol onto the stack (a *push* move) or pops one off the stack (a *pop* move), but does not do both at the same time.

Giving $P$ features 1 and 2 is easy. To give it feature 3, we replace each transition that simultaneously pops and pushes with a two transition sequence that goes through a new state, and we replace each transition that neither pops nor pushes with a two transition sequence that pushes then pops an arbitrary stack symbol.

To design $G$ so that $A_{pq}$ generates all strings that take $P$ from $p$ to $q$, starting and ending with an empty stack, we must understand how $P$ operates on these strings. For any such string $x$, $P$'s first move on $x$ must be a push, because every move is either a push or a pop and $P$ can't pop an empty stack. Similarly the last move on $x$ must be a pop, because the stack ends up empty.

Two possibilities occur during $P$'s computation on $x$. Either the symbol popped at the end is the symbol that was pushed at the beginning, or not. If so, the stack is empty only at the beginning and end of $P$'s computation on $x$. If not, the initially pushed symbol must get popped at some point before the end of $x$ and thus the stack becomes empty at this point. We simulate the former possibility with the rule $A_{pq} \rightarrow aA_{rs}b$ where $a$ is the input symbol read at the first move, $b$ is the symbol read at the last move, $r$ is the state following $p$, and $s$ the state preceding $q$. We simulate the latter possibility with the rule $A_{pq} \rightarrow A_{pr}A_{rq}$, where $r$ is the state when the stack becomes empty.

**Proof** Say that $P = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, \{q_{\text{accept}}\})$ and construct $G$. The variables of $G$ are $\{A_{pq} | p, q \in Q\}$. The start variable is $A_{q_0 \text{ } q_{\text{accept}}}$. Now we describe $G$'s rules.

- For each $p, q, r, s \in Q$, $t \in \Gamma$, and $a, b \in \Sigma$, if $\delta(p, a, \epsilon)$ contains $(r, t)$ and $\delta(s, b, t)$ contains $(q, \epsilon)$ put the rule $A_{pq} \rightarrow aA_{rs}b$ in $G$.
- For each $p, q, r \in Q$ put the rule $A_{pq} \rightarrow A_{pr}A_{rq}$ in $G$.
- Finally, for each $p \in Q$ put the rule $A_{pp} \rightarrow \epsilon$ in $G$.

You may gain some intuition for this construction from the following figures.
FIGURE 2.13
PDA computation corresponding to the rule $A_{pq} \rightarrow A_{pr}A_{rq}$

FIGURE 2.14
PDA computation corresponding to the rule $A_{pq} \rightarrow aA_{rs}b$

Now we prove that this construction works by demonstrating that $A_{pq}$ generates $x$ if and only if (iff) $x$ can bring $P$ from $p$ with empty stack to $q$ with empty stack. We consider each direction of the iff as a separate claim.

CLAIM 2.16
If $A_{pq}$ generates $x$, then $x$ can bring $P$ from $p$ with empty stack to $q$ with empty stack.

We prove this claim by induction on the number of steps in the derivation of $x$ from $A_{pq}$. 
2.2 Pushdown Automata

Basis: The derivation has 1 step. A derivation with a single step must use a rule whose right-hand side contains no variables. The only rules in \( G \) where no variables occur on the right-hand side are \( A_{pp} \rightarrow \varepsilon \). Clearly, input \( \varepsilon \) takes \( P \) from \( p \) with empty stack to \( p \) with empty stack so the basis is proved.

Induction step: Assume true for derivations of length at most \( k \), where \( k \geq 1 \), and prove true for derivations of length \( k + 1 \).

Suppose that \( A_{pq} \Rightarrow x \) with \( k + 1 \) steps. The first step in this derivation is either \( A_{pq} \Rightarrow aA_{rs}b \) or \( A_{pq} \Rightarrow A_{pr}A_{rq} \). We handle these two cases separately.

In the first case, consider the portion \( y \) of \( x \) that \( A_{rs} \) generates, so \( x = ayb \). Because \( A_{rs} \Rightarrow y \) with \( k \) steps, the induction hypothesis tells us that \( P \) can go from \( r \) on empty stack to \( s \) on empty stack. Because \( A_{pq} \rightarrow aA_{rs}b \) is a rule of \( G \), \( \delta(p, a, \varepsilon) \) contains \((r, t)\) and \( \delta(a, b, t) \) contains \((q, \varepsilon)\). Hence, if \( P \) starts at \( p \) with an empty stack, after reading \( a \) it can go to state \( r \) and push \( t \) on the stack. Then reading string \( y \) can bring it to \( s \) and leave \( t \) on the stack. Then after reading \( b \) it can go to state \( q \) and pop \( t \) off the stack. Therefore \( x \) can bring it from \( p \) with empty stack to \( q \) with empty stack.

In the second case, consider the portions \( y \) and \( z \) of \( x \) that \( A_{pr} \) and \( A_{rq} \) respectively generate, so \( x = yz \). Because \( A_{pr} \Rightarrow y \) in at most \( k \) steps and \( A_{rq} \Rightarrow z \) in at most \( k \) steps, the induction hypothesis tells us that \( y \) can bring \( P \) from \( p \) to \( r \), and \( z \) can bring \( P \) from \( r \) to \( q \), with empty stacks at the beginning and end. Hence \( x \) can bring it from \( p \) with empty stack to \( q \) with empty stack. This completes the induction step.

Claim 2.17

If \( x \) can bring \( P \) from \( p \) with empty stack to \( q \) with empty stack, \( A_{pq} \) generates \( x \).

We prove this claim by induction on the number of steps in the computation of \( P \) that goes from \( p \) to \( q \) with empty stacks on input \( x \).

Basis: The computation has 0 steps.

If a computation has 0 steps, it starts and ends at the same state, say, \( p \). So we must show that \( A_{pp} \Rightarrow x \). In 0 steps, \( P \) only has time to read the empty string, so \( x = \varepsilon \). By construction, \( G \) has the rule \( A_{pp} \rightarrow \varepsilon \), so the basis is proved.

Induction step: Assume true for computations of length at most \( k \), where \( k \geq 0 \), and prove true for computations of length \( k + 1 \).

Suppose that \( P \) has a computation wherein \( x \) brings \( p \) to \( q \) with empty stacks in \( k + 1 \) steps. Either the stack is empty only at the beginning and end of this computation, or it becomes empty elsewhere, too.

In the first case, the symbol that is pushed at the first move must be the same as the symbol that is popped at the last move. Call this symbol \( t \). Let \( a \) be the input read in the first move, \( b \) be the input read in the last move, \( r \) be the state after the first move, and \( s \) be the state before the last move. Then \( \delta(p, a, \varepsilon) \) contains \((r, t)\) and \( \delta(s, b, t) \) contains \((q, \varepsilon)\), and so rule \( A_{pq} \rightarrow aA_{rs}b \) is in \( G \).
Let $y$ be the portion of $x$ without $a$ and $b$, so $x = ayb$. Input $y$ can bring $P$ from $r$ to $s$ without touching the symbol $t$ that is on the stack and so $P$ can go from $r$ with an empty stack to $s$ with an empty stack on input $y$. We have removed the first and last steps of the $k + 1$ steps in the original computation on $x$ so the computation on $y$ has $(k + 1) - 2 = k - 1$ steps. Thus the induction hypothesis tells us that $A_{rs} \Rightarrow y$. Hence $A_{pq} \Rightarrow x$.

In the second case, let $r$ be a state where the stack becomes empty other than at the beginning or end of the computation on $x$. Then the portions of the computation from $p$ to $r$ and from $r$ to $q$ each contain at most $k$ steps. Say that $y$ is the input read during the first portion and $z$ is the input read during the second portion. The induction hypothesis tells us that $A_{pr} \Rightarrow y$ and $A_{rq} \Rightarrow z$. Because rule $A_{pq} \rightarrow A_{pr}A_{rq}$ is in $G$, $A_{pq} \Rightarrow x$, and the proof is complete.

That completes the proof of Lemma 2.15 and of Theorem 2.12.

We have just proved that pushdown automata recognize the class of context-free languages. This proof allows us to establish a relationship between the regular languages and the context-free languages. Because every regular language is recognized by a finite automaton and every finite automaton is automatically a pushdown automaton that simply ignores its stack, we now know that every regular language is also a context-free language.

**Corollary 2.18**

Every regular language is context free.

**Figure 2.15**

Relationship of the regular and context-free languages