Constructive Formalization of Regular Languages

Base revision 8276ebe, Thu Oct 4 11:09:07 2012 +0200, Jan-Oliver Kaiser.

Jan-Oliver Kaiser

October 4, 2012

Abstract

Existing formalizations of regular languages in constructive settings are mostly limited to regular expressions and finite automata. Furthermore, these usually require in the order of 10,000 lines of code. The goal of this thesis is to show that an extensive, yet elegant formalization of regular languages can be achieved in constructive type theory. In addition to regular expressions and finite automata, our formalization includes the Myhill-Nerode theorem. The entire development weighs in at approximately 3,300 lines of code.

Citations?

Reduce & update

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

Our goal is to give a concise formalization of the equivalence between regular expressions, finite automata and the Myhill-Nerode characterization. We give procedures to convert between these characterizations and prove their correctness. Our development is done in the proof assistant Coq. We make use of the SSReflect plugin which provides support for finite types and other useful infrastructure for our purpose.

Regular languages are a well-studied class of formal languages. In their current form, they were first studied by Kleene [22], who introduced regular expressions. The concept of deterministic finite automata was introduced before Kleene's invention of regular expressions by Huffman [19] and Moore [27]. Rabin and Scott later introduced the concept non-deterministic finite automata [30], for which they were given the Turing award [4].

1.1 Related work

There have been many publications on regular languages in recent years. Most of them investigate decidability of equivalence of regular expressions, often with a focus on automatically deciding Kleene algebras.

Coquand and Siles develop a decision procedure for equivalence of regular expressions [13] on the basis of Brzozowski derivatives [12] in Coq (with SSReflect) with the goal of providing a tactic on top of the decision procedure. Their development weighs in at 7,500 lines of code, 700 of which serve as the basis of our formalization.

Krauss and Nipkow give a decision procedure for equivalence of regular expressions in Isabelle/HOL [24]. Their development is very concise with

just over 1,000 lines of code. Being interested only in a correct (and efficient) tactic for deciding equivalences, they did not prove completeness and termination.

Another decision procedure for equivalence of regular expressions is developed by Braibant and Pous [10], with the goal of deciding Kleene algebras in Coq. Their formalization is based on matrices and weighs in at 19,000 lines of code. It encompasses finite automata, regular expressions and the Myhill-Nerode theorem.

Moreira, Pereira and Sousa give a decision procedure for equivalence of regular expressions in Coq[28]. Their development is based on Antimirov's partial derivatives of regular expressions [2] and contains a refutation step to speed up inequality checking. It consists of 19,000 lines of code.

Asperti formalize a decision procedure for equivalence of regular expressions [5] based on the notion of pointed regular expressions [6]. This development was done in the Matita proof assistant [7]. It weighs in at 3,400 lines of code.

There is also been a paper by Wu, Zhang and Urban on formalizing the Myhill-Nerode theorem using only regular expressions and not, as is commonly done, finite automata [32]. The authors state that this unusual choice stems, at least partly, from the restrictions of Isabelle/HOL (and similar HOL-based theorem provers). In particular, the fact that Isabelle/HOL does not allow for quantification over types prevents straight-forward formalizations of finite automata. Their development consists of roughly 2,000 lines of code.

1.2 Contributions

Unlike recent publications in this area, we do not focus on executable decision procedures. Instead, our formalization is very close to the mathematical definitions given in [23]. Our development shows that Coq (particularly with SSReflect) is well suited for this kind of formalization. Furthermore, we have also developed a new characterization derived from the Nerode relation and proven it equivalent to all other characterizations. Our development weighs in at about 3,500 lines of code.

1.3 Outline

In Chapter 2 we introduce the Coq framework and the SSReflect extension. We give a brief introduction of the SSReflect-specific syntax and

concepts that are relevant to our formalization.

In Chapter 3 we give basic definitions (words, languages, etc.). We also introduce decidable languages, regular languages and regular expressions. Furthermore, we prove the decidability of regular languages.

In Chapter 4 we introduce finite automata. We prove the equivalence of deterministic and non-deterministic finite automata. We also give a procedure to remove unreachable states from deterministic finite automata. Furthermore, we prove decidability of emptiness and equivalence of finite automata. Finally, we prove the equivalence of regular expressions and finite automata.

In Chapter 5 we introduce the Myhill-Nerode theorem. We give three different characterizations of regular languages based on the Myhill-Nerode theorem and prove them equivalent to finite automata. The formalization of these characterizations is interesting in itself due to the fact that we had to find a suitable representation of quotient types in Coq, which has no notion of quotient types.

Chapter 2

Coq and SSReflect

We decided to employ the Small Scale Reflection Extension (**SSReflect**[1]) for the **Coq**[2] proof assistant. The most important factors in this decision were SSReflect's excellent support for finite types, list operations and graphs. SSReflect also introduces an alternative scripting language that can often be used to shorten the bookkeeping overhead of proofs considerably.

2.1 Coq

Description, citation

2.2 SSReflect

SSReflect is a set of extensions to the proof scripting language of the Coq proof assistant. They were originally developed to support small-scale reflection. However, most of them are of quite general nature and improve the functionality of Coq in most basic areas such as script layout and structuring, proof context management and rewriting [16].

2.2.1 Finite Types and Ordinals

The most important feature of SSReflect for our purpose are finite types. Finite types are based on lists. Every element of a finite type is contained in the associated (de-duplicated) list and vice versa. SSReflect's support for finite types is based on canonical structures, instances of which come predefined for basic finite types and type constructors. This allows us to easily combine basic finite types such as bool with type constructors such as option and sum. We can also create finite types directly from lists.

[1] http://www.msr-inria.inria.fr/Projects/math-components
[2] http://coq.inria.fr/

SSReflect provides boolean versions of the universal and existential quantifiers on finite types, **forallb** and **existsb**. We can compute the number of elements in a finite type F with #|F|. enum gives a list of all items of a finite type. Finite types also come with enumeration functions which provide a consistent ordering. The corresponding functions are enum_rank and enum_val. The input of enum_val and the result of enum_rank are ordinals, i.e. values in [0, \#|F|−1]. The corresponding type can be written as I_#|F|

2.2.2 Boolean Reflection

SSReflect offers boolean reflections for decidable propostions. This allows us to switch back and forth between equivalent boolean and propositional predicates.

2.2.3 Boolean Predicates

We make use of SSReflect's syntax to specify boolean predicates. This allows us to specify predicates in a way that resembles set-theoretic notation, e.g. [pred x | <boolean expression in x>]. Furthermore, we can use the functions pred1 and pred0 to specify the singleton predicate and the empty predicate, respectively. The complement of a predicate can be written as [predC p]. The syntax for combining predicates is [pred? p1 & p2], with ? being replaced with one of U (union), I (intersection) or D (difference). There is also syntax for the preimage of a predicate under a function which can be written as [preim f of p].

There are also applicative (functional) versions of of predC, predU, predI, predD which are functions that take predicates and return predicates.

Chapter 3

Decidable Languages

We give basic definitions for languages, operators on languages and, finally, regular languages. We provide the corresponding formalizations from our development and prove their correctness.

3.1 Definitions

We closely follow the definitions from [18]. An **alphabet** Σ is a finite set of symbols. A **word** w is a finite sequence of symbols chosen from some alphabet. We use $|w|$ to denote the **length** of a word w. ε denotes the empty word. Given two words $w_1 = a_1 \cdots a_n$ and $w_2 = b_1 \cdots b_m$, the **concatenation** of w_1 and w_2 is defined as $a_1 \cdots a_n b_1 \cdots b_m$ and denoted $w_1 \cdot w_2$ or just $w_1 w_2$. A **language** is a set of words. The **residual language** of a language L with respect to symbol a is the set of words u such that av is in L. The residual is denoted $res_a(L)$. We define Σ^k to be the **set of words of length k**. The **set of all words** over an alphabet Σ is denoted Σ^*, i.e.,$\Sigma^* = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma^k$. A language L is **decidable** if and only if there exists a boolean predicate that decides membership in L. We will only deal with decidable languages from here on. Throughout the remaining document, we will assume a fixed alphabet Σ.

We employ finite types to formalize alphabets. In most definitions, alphabets will not be made explicit. However, the same name and type will be used throughout the entire development. Words are formalized as sequences over the alphabet. Decidable languages are represented by functions from *word* to *bool*.

```
Variable char: finType.
Definition word := seq char.
Definition language := pred word.
Definition residual x L : language := [preim cons x of L].
```

3.1.1 Operations on Languages

We will later introduce a subset of the decidable language that is based on the following operations. For every operator, we will prove the decidabality of the resulting language.

The **concatenation** of two languages L_1 and L_2 is denoted $L_1 \cdot L_2$ and is defined as the set of words $w = w_1 w_2$ such that w_1 is in L_1 and w_2 is in L_2. The **Kleene closure** of a language L is denoted L^* and is defined as the set of words $w = w_1 \cdots w_k$ such that $w_1 \ldots w_k$ are in L. Note that $\varepsilon \in L^*$ $(k = 0)$. We define the **complement** of a language L as $L \backslash \Sigma^*$, which we write as $\neg L$. Furthermore, we make use of the standard set operations **union** and **intersection**.

For our Coq development, take Coquand and Siles's [13] implementation of these operators. plus and prod refer to union and intersection, respectively. Additionally, we also introduce the singleton languages (atom), the empty language (void) and the language containing only the empty word (eps).

```
Definition conc L1 L2 : language :=
  fun v => [ exists i : 'I_(size v).+1, L1 (take i v) && L2 (drop i v) ].
Definition star L : language :=
  fix star v := if v is x :: v' then conc (residual x L) star v' else true.
Definition compl L : language := predC L.
Definition plus L1 L2 : language := [predU L1 & L2].
Definition prod L1 L2 : language := [predI L1 & L2].
Definition atom x : language := pred1 [:: x].
Definition void : language := pred0.
Definition eps : language := pred1 [::].
```

The definition of conc is based on a characteristic property of the concatenation of two languages. The following lemma proves this property.

Lemma 3.1.1. *Let $L_1, L_2, w = a_1 \cdots a_k$ be given. We have that*

$$w \in L_1 \cdot L_2 \iff \exists n \in \mathbb{N}. 0 < n \leq k \wedge a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \in L_1 \wedge a_n \cdots a_k \in L_2.$$

Proof. "⇒" From $w \in L_1 \cdot L_2$ we have w_1, w_2 such that $w = w_1 w_2 \wedge w_1 \in L_1 \wedge w_2 \in L_2$. We choose $n := |w_1| + 1$. We then have that $a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} = a_1 \cdots a_{|w_1|} = w_1$ and $w_1 \in L_1$ by assumption. Similarly, $a_n \cdots a_k = a_{|w_1|+1} \cdots a_k = w_2$ and $w_2 \in L_2$ by assumption.
"⇐" We choose $w_1 := a_1 \cdots a_{n-1}$ and $w_2 := a_n \cdots a_k$. By assumption we have that $w = w_1 w_2$. We also have that $a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \in L_1$ and $a_n \cdots a_k \in L_2$. It follows that $w_1 \in L_1$ and $w_2 \in L_2$. □

Listing 3.1: Formalization of lemma 3.1.1

```
Lemma concP : forall {L1 L2 v},
  reflect  (exists2 v1, v1 \in L1 & exists2 v2, v2 \in L2 & v = v1 ++ v2)
           (v \in conc L1 L2).
```

The implementation of star makes use of a property of the Kleene closure, which is that any nonempty word in L^* can be seen as the concatenation of a nonempty word in L and a (possibly empty) word in L^*. This property allows us to implement star as a structurally recursive predicate. The following lemma proves the correctness of this property.

Lemma 3.1.2. *Let $L, w = a_1 \cdots a_k$ be given. We have that*

$$w \in L^* \iff \begin{cases} a_2 \cdots a_k \in res_{a_1}(L) \cdot L^*, & \text{if } |w| > 0; \\ w = \varepsilon, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. "⇒" We do a case distinction on $|w| = 0$.

1. $|w| = 0$. It follows that $w = \varepsilon$.
2. $|W| \neq 0$, i.e. $|w| > 0$. From $w \in L^*$ we have $w = w_1 \cdots w_l$ such that $w_1 \cdots w_l$ are in L. There exists a minimal n such that $|w_n| > 0$ and for all $m < n$, $|w_m| = 0$. Let $w_n = b_1 \cdots b_p$. We have that $b_2 \cdots a_p \in res_{b_1}(L)$. Furthermore, we have that $w_{n+1} \cdots w_l \in L^*$. We also have $a_1 = b_1$ and $w = a_1 \cdots a_k = w_n \cdots w_l$. Therefore, we have $a_2 \cdots a_k \in res_{a_1}(L) \cdot L^*$.

"⇐" We do a case distinction on the disjunction.

1. $w = \varepsilon$. Then $w \in L^*$ by definition.
2. $a_2 \cdots a_k \in res_{a_1}(L) \cdot L^*$. By lemma 3.1.1 we have n such that $a_2 \cdots a_{n-1} \in res_{a_1}(L)$ and $a_n \cdots a_k \in L^*$. By definition of res, we have $a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \in L$. Furthermore, we also have $a_n \cdots a_k = w_1 \cdots w_l$ such that $w_1 \ldots w_l$ are in L. We choose $w_0 := a_1 \cdots a_{n-1}$. It follows that $w = w_0 w_1 \cdots w_l$ with $w_0, w_1, \cdots w_l$ in L. Therefore, $w \in L^*$.

□

The formalization of lemma 3.1.2 connects the formalization of star to the mathematical definition. The propositional formula given here appears slightly more restrictive than our mathemitcal definition as it requires all words from L to be nonempty. Mathematically, however, this is no restriction.

Listing 3.2: Formalization of lemma 3.1.2

```
Lemma starP : forall {L v},
  reflect  (exists2 vv,  all  [predD L & eps] vv & v = flatten  vv)
           (v \in  star  L).
```

Theorem 3.1.3. *The decidable languages are closed under concatenation, Kleene star, union, intersection and complement.*

Proof. We have already give algorithms for all operators. It remains to show that they are correct. For concatenation and the Kleene star, we have shown in lemma 3.1.1 and lemma 3.1.2 that the formalizations are equivalent to the mathematical definitions. The remaining operators (union, intersection, complement) can be applied directly to the result of the languages' boolean decision functions. □

3.2 Regular Languages

Definition 3.2.1. *The set of regular languages REG is defined to be exactly those languages generated by the following inductive definition:*

$$\frac{}{\emptyset \in REG} \qquad \frac{}{\{\varepsilon\} \in REG} \qquad \frac{a \in \Sigma}{\{a\} \in REG} \qquad \frac{L \in REG}{L^* \in REG}$$

$$\frac{L_1 \in REG \qquad L_2 \in REG}{L_1 \cup L_2 \in REG} \qquad \frac{L_1 \in REG \qquad L_2 \in REG}{L_1 \cdot L_2 \in REG}$$

3.2.1 Regular Expressions

Regular expressions mirror the definition of regular languages very closely.

Definition 3.2.2. *We will consider* ***extended regular expressions*** *that include negation (*Not*), intersection (*And*) and a single-symbol wildcard (*Dot*). Therefore, we have the following syntax for regular expressions:*

$$r, s := \emptyset \mid \varepsilon \mid . \mid a \mid r^* \mid r + s \mid r\&s \mid rs \mid \neg r$$

The semantics of these constructors are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\emptyset) &= \emptyset & \mathcal{L}(r^*) &= \mathcal{L}(r)^* \\ \mathcal{L}(\varepsilon) &= \{\varepsilon\} & \mathcal{L}(r + s) &= \mathcal{L}(r) \cup \mathcal{L}(s) \\ \mathcal{L}(.) &= \Sigma & \mathcal{L}(r\&s) &= \mathcal{L}(r) \cap \mathcal{L}(s) \\ \mathcal{L}(a) &= \{a\} & \mathcal{L}(rs) &= \mathcal{L}(r) \cdot \mathcal{L}(s) \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.2.3. *We say that two regular expressions r and s are equivalent if and only if*

$$\mathcal{L}(r) = \mathcal{L}(s).$$

We will later show that equivalence of regular expressions is decidable.

We take the implementation of regular expressions from Coquand and Siles's development ([13]), which is also based on SSReflect and comes with helpful infrastructure for our proofs. The semantics defined in definition 3.2.2 can be given as a boolean function.

Listing 3.3: Regular Expressions

```
Inductive regular_expression :=
 | Void
 | Eps
 | Dot
 | Atom of symbol
 | Star of regular_expression
 | Plus of regular_expression & regular_expression
 | And of regular_expression & regular_expression
 | Conc of regular_expression & regular_expression
 | Not of regular_expression .
Fixpoint mem_reg e :=
  match e with
   | Void => void
   | Eps => eps
   | Dot => dot
   | Atom x => atom x
   | Star e1 => star (mem_reg e1)
   | Plus e1 e2 => plus (mem_reg e1) (mem_reg e2)
   | And e1 e2 => prod (mem_reg e1) (mem_reg e2)
   | Conc e1 e2 => conc (mem_reg e1) (mem_reg e2)
   | Not e1 => compl (mem_reg e1)
  end.
```

We will later prove that this definition is equivalent to the inductive definition of regular languages in 3.2.1. In order to do that, we introduce a predicate on regular expressions that distinguishes **standard regular expressions** from **extended regular expressions** (as introduced above). The grammar of standard regular expression is as follows:

$$r, s := \emptyset \mid \varepsilon \mid a \mid r^* \mid r + s \mid rs$$

Connect standard reg-exp to reg. languages

Chapter 4

Finite Automata

Another way of characterizing regular languages are finite automata (FA)[18]. We will show that the languages of finite automata are exactly the regular languages. Furthermore, we will also derive a decision procedure for equivalence of regular expressions.

4.1 Definition

A finite automaton consists of

1. finite set of states Q,
2. a starting state $s \in Q$,
3. a set of final states $F \subseteq Q$
4. and a state-transition relation δ.

We define a **run** of a word $w \in \Sigma^*$ on an automaton $A = (Q, s, F, \delta)$ as a sequence of states σ such that for every two consequetive positions $i, i+1$ in σ there is $(\sigma_i, w_i, \sigma_{i+1}) \in \delta$. A word w is **accepted** by A in state x if and only if there exists a run σ of w on A such that $\sigma_0 = x \wedge \sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \in F$. The resulting set of accepted words is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_x(A)$. The **language** of A is exactly $\mathcal{L}_s(A)$ and is denoted $\mathcal{L}(A)$.

4.1.1 Non-Deterministic Finite Automata

Finite automata can be **non-deterministic** (NFA) in the sense that there exist multiple distinct runs for a word. This is the case if and only if δ is not functional.

Listing 4.1: Non-Deterministic Finite Automata

```
Record nfa : Type :=
  { nfa_state :> finType;
```

```
    nfa_s : nfa_state ;
    nfa_fin : pred nfa_state ;
    nfa_step : nfa_state -> char -> pred nfa_state }.
Fixpoint nfa_accept (x: A) w :=
match w with
  | [::] => nfa_fin A x
  | a::w => [ exists y, (nfa_step A x a y) && nfa_accept y w ]
end.
Definition nfa_lang := [pred w | nfa_accept (nfa_s A) w].
```

The acceptance criterion given here avoids the matter of runs. In many cases, this will help us with proofs by in induction on the accepted word. However, we will need runs in some of the proofs. Due to the fact that runs are not unique on NFAs, we give a predicate that decides if a run on A is valid for a word w. We then show that the acceptance criterion given above corresponds to the mathematical definition in terms of runs.

```
Fixpoint nfa_run x (xs : seq A) (w: word) {struct xs} :=
match xs,w with
  | y :: xs', a::w' => nfa_step A x a y && nfa_run y xs' w'
  | [::]      , [::]  => true
  | _         , _     => false
end.
Lemma nfa_run_accept x w:
  reflect (exists2 xs, nfa_run x xs w & last x xs \in nfa_fin A)
          (nfa_accept x w).
```

4.1.2 Deterministic Finite Automata

For functional δ, we speak of **deterministic** finite automata (DFA). In this case, we write δ as a function in our Coq development.

Listing 4.2: Deterministic Finite Automata

```
Record dfa : Type :=
  { dfa_state :> finType;
    dfa_s : dfa_state ;
    dfa_fin : pred dfa_state ;
    dfa_step : dfa_state -> char -> dfa_state }.
Fixpoint dfa_accept x w :=
match w with
  | [::] => dfa_fin A x
  | a::w => dfa_accept (dfa_step A x a) w
end.
Definition dfa_lang := [pred w | dfa_accept (dfa_s A) w].
```

Again, we avoid runs in our formalization of the acceptance criterion in favor of a acceptance criterion that is easier to work with in proofs. In this case, however, we can give a function that computes the unique run of a word on A. This allows us to give an alternative acceptance criterion that is closer to the mathematical definition. We also prove that both criteria are equivalent.

```
Fixpoint dfa_run' (x: A) (w: word) : seq A :=
match w with
  | [::] => [::]
  | a::w => (dfa_step A x a) :: dfa_run' (dfa_step A x a) w
end.
Lemma dfa_run_accept x w: last x (dfa_run' x w) \in dfa_fin A = (w \in dfa_accept x).
```

Equivalence of Automata

Definition 4.1.1. *We say that two automata are* ***equivalent*** *if and only if their languages are equal.*

Equivalence between DFA and NFA

Deterministic and non-deterministic finite automata are equally expressive. One direction is trivial since every DFA can be seen as a NFA. We prove the other direction using the powerset construction. Given NFA A, we construct an equivalent DFA A_{det} in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{det} &:= 2^Q \\ s_{det} &:= \{s\} \\ F_{det} &:= \{P \mid P \in Q_{det} \wedge P \cap F \neq \emptyset\} \\ \delta_{det} &:= \{(P, a, \bigcup_{p \in P} \{q \mid q \in Q, (p, a, q) \in \delta\}) \mid P \in Q_{det}, a \in \Sigma\}. \\ A_{det} &:= (Q_{det}, s_{det}, F_{det}, \delta_{det}). \end{aligned}$$

The formalization of A_{det} is straight-forward. We leave the set of states {set A} implicit.

```
Definition nfa_to_dfa :=
  {| dfa_s := set1 (nfa_s A);
     dfa_fin := [ pred X: {set A} | [ exists x: A, (x \in X) && nfa_fin A x] ];
     dfa_step := [ fun X a => \bigcup_(x | x \in X) finset (nfa_step A x a) ] |}
.
```

Lemma 4.1.2. *For all powerset states X and for all states x with $x \in X$ we have that*

$$\mathcal{L}_x(A) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_X(A_{det}).$$

Proof. Let $w \in \mathcal{L}_x(A)$. We proof by induction on w that $w \in \mathcal{L}_X(A_{det})$.

- For $w = \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_x(A)$ we get $x \in F$ from $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_x(A)$. From $x \in X$ we get $X \cap F \neq \emptyset$ and therefore $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_X(A_{det})$.
- For $w = aw'$ and $aw' \in \mathcal{L}_x(A)$ we get y such that $w' \in \mathcal{L}_y(A)$ and $(x, a, y) \in \delta$. The latter gives us $y \in Y$ where Y is such that $(X, a, Y) \in \delta_{det}$. With $y \in Y$ and $w' \in \mathcal{L}_y(A)$ we get which gives us $w' \in \mathcal{L}_Y(A_{det})$ by induction hypothesis. With $(X, a, Y) \in \delta_{det}$ we get $aw' \in \mathcal{L}_X(A_{det})$.

□

Lemma 4.1.3. *For all powerset states X and all words $w \in \mathcal{L}_X(A_{det})$ there exists a state x such that*

$$x \in X \wedge w \in \mathcal{L}_x(A).$$

Proof. We do an induction on $w \in \Sigma^*$.

- For $w = \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_X(A_{det})$ we get $X \cap F \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, there exists x such that $x \in X$ and $x \in F$. Thus, we have $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_x(A)$.
- For $w = aw'$ and $aw' \in \mathcal{L}_X(A_{det})$ we get Y such that $w' \in \mathcal{L}_Y(A_{det})$ and $(X, a, Y) \in \delta_{det}$. From the induction hypothesis we get y such that $y \in Y$ and $w' \in \mathcal{L}_y(A)$. From $y \in Y$ and $(X, a, Y) \in \delta_{det}$ we get x such that $x \in X$ and $(x, a, y) \in \delta$. Thus, $aw' \in \mathcal{L}_x(A)$.

□

Theorem 4.1.4. *The powerset automaton A_{det} accepts the same language as A, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{L}(A_{det}).$$

Proof. "$\subseteq$" This follows directly from lemma 4.1.2 with $x = s$ and $X = s_{det}$.
"$\supseteq$" From lemma 4.1.3 with $X = s_{det}$ we get $\mathcal{L}_{s_{det}}(A_{det}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_s(A)$, which proves the claim. □

The formalization of this proof is straight-forward and follows the plan laid out above. The corresponding Lemmas are:

```
Lemma nfa_to_dfa_complete (x: A) w (X: nfa_to_dfa ):
  x \in X -> nfa_accept A x w -> dfa_accept nfa_to_dfa X w.
Lemma nfa_to_dfa_sound (X: nfa_to_dfa) w:
  dfa_accept  nfa_to_dfa  X w -> [ exists x, (x \in X) && nfa_accept A x w ].
Lemma nfa_to_dfa_correct :  nfa_lang  A =i dfa_lang  nfa_to_dfa .
```

4.2 Connected Components

Finite automata can have isolated subsets of states that are not reachable from the starting state. These states can not contribute to the language of the automaton since there are no runs from the starting state to any of those unreachable states. It will later be useful to have automata that only contain reachable states. Therefore, we define a procedure to extract the connected component containing the starting state from a given automaton.

Definition 4.2.1. *Let* $A = (Q, s, F, \delta)$ *be a DFA. We define* reachable1 *such that for all* x *and* y, $(x, y) \in$ reachable1 $\iff \exists a, (x, a, y) \in \delta$. *We define* reachable $:= \{y \mid (s, y) \in \text{reachable1}^*\}$, *where* reachable1* *denotes the transitive closure of* reachable1. *With this, we can define the connected automaton* A_c*:*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_c &:= Q \cap \mathit{reachable} \\ s_c &:= s \\ F_c &:= F \cap \mathit{reachable} \\ \delta_c &:= \{(x, a, y) \mid (x, a, y) \in \delta \wedge x, y \in Q_c\} \\ A_c &:= (Q_c, s_c, F_c, \delta_c). \end{aligned}$$

We make use of SSReflect's *connect* predicate to extract a sequence of all states reachable from s. From this, we construct a finite type and use that as the new set of states. These new states carry a proof of reachability. We also have to give a transition function that ensures transitions always end in reachable states.

```
Definition reachable1 := [ fun x y => [ exists a, dfa_step A1 x a == y ] ].
Definition reachable := enum (connect reachable1 (dfa_s A1)).
Lemma reachable0 : dfa_s A1 \in reachable.
Lemma reachable_step x a: x \in reachable -> dfa_step A1 x a \in reachable.
Definition dfa_connected :=
  {| dfa_s := SeqSub reachable0;
     dfa_fin := fun x => match x with SeqSub x _ => dfa_fin A1 x end;
     dfa_step := fun x a => match x with
       | SeqSub _ Hx => SeqSub (reachable_step _ a Hx)
       end |}.
```

Make this understandable

Lemma 4.2.2. *For every state* $x \in$ reachable *we have that*

$$\mathcal{L}_x(A_c) = \mathcal{L}_x(A).$$

Proof. "$\subseteq$" Trivial. "$\supseteq$" We do an induction on w.

- For $w = \varepsilon$ we have $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_x(A)$ and therefore $x \in F$. With $x \in \mathit{reachable}$ we get $x \in F_c$. Thus, $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_x(A_c)$.

- For $w = aw'$ we have have $y \in Q$ such that $(x, a, y) \in \delta$ and $w' \in \mathcal{L}_y(A)$. From $x \in$ reachable we get $y \in$ reachable by transitivity. Therefore, $(x, a, y) \in \delta_c$. The induction hypothesis gives us $w' \in \mathcal{L}_y(A_c)$. Thus, $aw' \in \mathcal{L}_x(A_c)$.

□

Theorem 4.2.3. *The language of the connected automaton A_c is identical to that of the original automaton A, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{L}(A_c).$$

Proof. By reflexivity, we have $s \in$ reachable. We use lemma 4.2.2 with $x = s$ to prove the claim. □

The formalization of lemma 4.2.2 and theorem 4.2.3 is straight-forward.

```
Lemma dfa_connected_correct' x (Hx: x \in reachable) :
  dfa_accept dfa_connected (SeqSub Hx) =i dfa_accept A1 x.
Lemma dfa_connected_correct: dfa_lang dfa_connected =i dfa_lang A1.
```

To make use of the fact that A_c is fully connected, we will proof a characteristic property of A_c.

Definition 4.2.4. *A **representative** of a state x is a word w such that the unique run of w on A_c ends in x.*

Lemma 4.2.5. *We can give a representative for every state $x \in Q_c$.*

Proof. x carries a proof of reachability. From this, we get a path through the graph of reachable1 that ends ind x. We build the representative by extracting the edges of the path and building a word from those. □ Choice?

The formalization of theorem 4.2.5 includes a more general version of the theorem, which facilitates the proof by induction over the path.

```
Lemma dfa_connected_repr' (x y: dfa_connected):
  connect reachable1_connected y x ->
  exists w, last y (dfa_run' dfa_connected y w) = x.
Lemma dfa_connected_repr x :
  exists w, last (dfa_s dfa_connected) (dfa_run dfa_connected w) = x.
```

4.3 Emptiness

Given an automaton A, we can check if $\mathcal{L}(A) = \emptyset$. We simply obtain the connected automaton of A and check if there are any final states left.

Theorem 4.3.1. *The language of the connected automaton A_c is empty if and only if its set of final states F_c is empty, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}(A) = \emptyset \iff F_c = \emptyset.$$

Proof. By theorem 4.2.3 we have $\mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{L}(A_c)$. Therefore, it suffices to show

$$\mathcal{L}(A_c) = \emptyset \iff F_c = \emptyset.$$

"$\Leftarrow$" We have $\mathcal{L}(A_c) = \emptyset$ and have to show that for all $x \in Q_c$, $x \notin F_c$. Let $x \in Q_c$. By lemma 4.2.5 we get w such that the unique run of w on A_c ends in x. We use $\mathcal{L}(A_c) = \emptyset$ to get $w \notin \mathcal{L}(A_c)$, which implies that the run of w on A_c ends in a non-final state. By substituting the last state of the run by x we get $x \notin F_c$. "$\Rightarrow$" We have $F_c = \emptyset$ and have to show that for all words w, $w \notin \mathcal{L}(A_c)$. We use $F_c = \emptyset$ to show that the last state of the run of w on A_c is non-final. Thus, $w \notin \mathcal{L}(A_c)$.

Thus, emptiness is decidable. □

The formalization of lemma 4.3.1 is split in two parts to facilitate its application.

```
Definition dfa_lang_empty := #|dfa_fin  dfa_connected| == 0.
Lemma dfa_lang_empty_complete: dfa_lang dfa_connected =i pred0 -> dfa_lang_empty.
Lemma dfa_lang_empty_sound: dfa_lang_empty -> dfa_lang dfa_connected =i pred0.
Lemma dfa_lang_empty_correct:
    reflect  (dfa_lang  A1 =i pred0)
             dfa_lang_empty.
```

4.4 Deciding Equivalence of Finite Automata

Given finite automata A_1 and A_2, we construct DFA A such that the language of A is the symmetric difference of the languages of A_1 and A_2, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}(A) := \mathcal{L}(A_1) \ominus \mathcal{L}(A_2) = \mathcal{L}(A_1) \cap \neg\mathcal{L}(A_2) \cup \mathcal{L}(A_2) \cap \neg\mathcal{L}(A_1).$$

Theorem 4.4.1. *The equivalence of A_1 and A_2 is decidable, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}(A_1) = \mathcal{L}(A_2) \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{L}(A) \text{ is empty.}$$

Proof. The correctness of this procedure follows from the properties of the symmetric difference operator, i.e.

$$\mathcal{L}(A_1) \ominus \mathcal{L}(A_2) = \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}(A_1) = \mathcal{L}(A_2).$$

Thus, equivalence is decidable. □

Listing 4.3: Formalization of theorem 4.4.1

```
Definition dfa_sym_diff :=
  dfa_disj (dfa_conj A1 (dfa_compl A2)) (dfa_conj A2 (dfa_compl A1)).
Lemma dfa_sym_diff_correct:
  dfa_lang_empty dfa_sym_diff <-> dfa_lang A1 =i dfa_lang A2.
```

4.5 Regular Expressions and Finite Automata

We prove that there is a finite automaton for every extended regular expression and vice versa. In fact, we can give a standard regular expression for every finite automaton. With this, we will prove that extended regular expressions are equivalent to standard regular expressions, thereby proving closure under intersection and negation.

4.5.1 Regular Expressions to Finite Automata

We prove that there exists an equivalent automaton for every extended regular expression. The structure of this proof is given by the inductive nature of regular expressions. For every constructor, we provide an equivalent automaton.

Depending on the constructor of the regular expression, we will construct an equivalent DFA or NFA. Void, Eps, Dot, Atom, Plus, And and Not are very easy to implement on DFAs, whereas Star and Conc lend themselves well to NFAs.

Void

Definition 4.5.1. *We define an empty DFA with a single, non-accepting state, i.e.*

$$A_\emptyset := (\{t\}, t, \emptyset, \{(t, a, t) \mid a \in \Sigma\}).$$

Lemma 4.5.2. *The language of the empty DFA is empty, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}(E) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. $A_\emptyset$ has no final states, i.e. no run can end in a final state. □

```
Definition dfa_void :=
  {| dfa_s := tt;
     dfa_fin := pred0;
     dfa_step := [fun x a => tt] |}.
Lemma dfa_void_correct x w: ~~ dfa_accept dfa_void x w.
```

Eps

Definition 4.5.3. *We define an automaton that accepts only the empty word, i.e.*

$$A_\varepsilon := (\{t, f\}, t, \{f\}, \{(x, a, f) \mid x \in \{t, f\}, a \in \Sigma\}).$$

Lemma 4.5.4. *A_ε accepts no word in state f, i.e. for all w,*

$$w \notin \mathcal{L}_f(A_\varepsilon).$$

Proof. Let $w \in \Sigma^*$. We do an induction on w. For $w = \varepsilon$ we get $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{L}_f(A_\varepsilon)$ by $f \notin F_\varepsilon$. For $w = aw'$ we have $w' \notin \mathcal{L}_f(A_\varepsilon)$. Furthermore, $(f, a, f) \in \delta_\varepsilon$. Therefore, $aw' \notin \mathcal{L}_f(A_\varepsilon)$. □

Lemma 4.5.5. *The language of A_ε is exactly the singleton set containing the empty word, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}(A_\varepsilon) = \{\varepsilon\}.$$

Proof. Let $w \in \Sigma^*$. We do an induction on w. For $w = \varepsilon$ we have $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}(A_\varepsilon)$ and $\varepsilon \in \{\varepsilon\}$. Therefore, both directions are trivial. For $w = aw'$ we consider both directions independently.
"⇒" We have $(t, a, f) \in \delta_\varepsilon$ and $w' \in \mathcal{L}_f(A_\varepsilon)$. By lemma 4.5.4, this is a contradiction.
"⇐" We get a straigt-forward contradiction from $aw' \in \{\varepsilon\}$. □

```
Definition dfa_eps :=
  {| dfa_s := true;
     dfa_fin := pred1 true;
     dfa_step := [fun x a => false] |}.
Lemma dfa_eps_correct: dfa_lang dfa_eps =i pred1 [::].
```

reflect?

Dot

Definition 4.5.6. *We define an automaton that accepts the set of all singleton words, i.e.*

$$A_{Dot} := (\{s, t, f\}, s, \{t\}, \{(s, a, t) \mid a \in \Sigma\} \cup \{(x, a, f) \mid x \in \{t, f\}, a \in \Sigma\}).$$

Lemma 4.5.7. *A_{Dot} does not accept any word in state f, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_f(A_{Dot}) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. We prove this by induction on $w \in \Sigma^*$. For $w = \varepsilon$ we have $\varepsilon \notin \mathcal{L}_f(A_{Dot})$ by $f \notin F_{Dot}$. For $w = aw'$ we have $(f, a, f) \in \delta_{Dot}$ and $w' \notin \mathcal{L}_f(A_{Dot})$ by induction hypothesis. Thus, $aw' \notin \mathcal{L}_f(A_{Dot})$. □

Lemma 4.5.8. *A_{Dot} accepts exactly the empty word in state t, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_t(A_{Dot}) = \{\varepsilon\}$.*

Proof. Let $w \in \Sigma^*$. We do a case distinction on w. For $w = \varepsilon$ we have $\varepsilon in \mathcal{L}_t(A_{Dot})$ by $t \in F_{Dot}$. We also have $\varepsilon \in \{\varepsilon\}$. For $w = aw'$ we get $(t, a, f) \in \delta_{Dot}$. Since $aw' \notin \{\varepsilon\}$ it suffices to show that $w' \notin \mathcal{L}_f(A_{Dot})$, which we have by lemma 4.5.7. □

```
Definition dfa_dot :=
  {| dfa_s := None;
     dfa_fin := pred1 (Some true);
     dfa_step := [fun x b => if x == None then Some true else Some false ] |}.
Lemma dfa_dot_correct'' w: ~~ dfa_accept dfa_dot (Some false) w.
Lemma dfa_dot_correct' w: dfa_accept dfa_dot (Some true) w = (w == [::]).
Lemma dfa_dot_correct w: dfa_lang dfa_dot w = (size w == 1).
```

reflect?

Not

Definition 4.5.9. *Given DFA $A = (Q, s, F, \delta)$, the complement automaton $A_\neg$ is constructed by switching accepting and non-accepting states, i.e.*

$$A_\neg := (Q, s, Q \backslash F, \delta).$$

Lemma 4.5.10. *For every state $x \in Q$, we have that $w \in \Sigma^*$ is accepted in x by $A_\neg$ if and only if it is not accepted in x by A, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_x(A_\neg) = \Sigma^* \backslash \mathcal{L}_x(A)$*

Proof. We do an induction on w. For $w = \varepsilon$ we have $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_x(A_\neg) \iff \varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_x(A)$ from $x \in F \iff x \notin Q \backslash F$. For $w = aw'$ we get $(y, a, x) \in \delta$. By induction hypothesis, $w' \in \mathcal{L}_x(A_\neg) \iff w' \notin \mathcal{L}_x(A)$ Thus, $aw' \in \mathcal{L}_y(A_\neg) \iff aw' \notin \mathcal{L}_y(A)$. □

Lemma 4.5.11. *$A_\neg$ accepts the complement language of A, i.e. $\mathcal{L}(A_\neg) = \Sigma^* \backslash \mathcal{L}(A)$.*

Proof. This follows directly from lemma 4.5.10 with $x = s$. □

Plus

Definition 4.5.12. *Given DFAs $A_1 = (Q_1, s_1, F_1, \delta_1)$ and $A_2 = (Q_2, s_2, F_2, \delta_2)$ we construct the disjunction automaton in the following way:*

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_\vee &:= Q_1 \times Q_2 \\
s_\vee &:= (s_1, s_2) \\
F_\vee &:= \{(x_1, x_2) \mid x_1 \in F_1 \vee x_2 \in F_2\} \\
\delta_\vee &:= \{((x_1, x_2), a, (y_1, y_2)) \mid a \in \Sigma, (x_1, a, y_1) \in \delta_1, (x_2, a, y_2) \in \delta_2\} \\
A_\vee &:= (Q_\vee, s_\vee, F_\vee, \delta_\vee).
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.5.13. *For every state* $(x_1, x_2) \in Q_\vee$*, we have that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{(x_1,x_2)}(A_\vee) = \mathcal{L}_{x_1}(A_1) \cup \mathcal{L}_{x_2}(A_2).$$

Proof. We do a proof by induction on $w \in \Sigma^*$. For $w = \varepsilon$ we have, by definition of $F_\vee$, $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_{(x_1,x_2)}(A_\vee) \iff \varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_{x_1}(A_1) \vee \varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_{x_2}(A_2)$.
For $w = aw'$ we get $(x_1, a, y_1) \in \delta_1$ and $(x_2, a, y_2) \in \delta_2$. By induction hypothesis, we also have $w' \in \mathcal{L}_{x_1}(A_1) \vee w' \in \mathcal{L}_{x_2}(A_2)$. Thus, we get $aw' \in \mathcal{L}_{y_1}(A_1) \vee aw' \in \mathcal{L}_{x_2}(A_2)$. □

Lemma 4.5.14. $\mathcal{L}(A_\vee) = \mathcal{L}(A_1) \cup \mathcal{L}(A_2)$.

Proof. This follows directly from lemma 4.5.13 with $x = (s_1, s_2)$. □

```
Definition dfa_disj :=
  {| dfa_s := (dfa_s A1, dfa_s A2);
     dfa_fin := (fun q => let (x1,x2) := q in dfa_fin A1 x1 || dfa_fin A2 x2);
     dfa_step := [fun x a => (dfa_step A1 x.1 a, dfa_step A2 x.2 a)] |}.
Lemma dfa_disj_correct' x:
  [ predU dfa_accept A1 x.1 & dfa_accept A2 x.2 ]
    =i dfa_accept dfa_disj x.
Lemma dfa_disj_correct:
  [ predU dfa_lang A1 & dfa_lang A2 ]
    =i dfa_lang dfa_disj .
```

And

Definition 4.5.15. *Given DFAs* $A_1 = (Q_1, s_1, F_1, \delta_1)$ *and* $A_2 = (Q_2, s_2, F_2, \delta_2)$ *we construct the conjunction automaton in the following way:*

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_\wedge &:= Q_1 \times Q_2 \\
s_\wedge &:= (s_1, s_2) \\
F_\wedge &:= \{(x_1, x_2) \mid x_1 \in F_1 \wedge x_2 \in F_2\} \\
\delta_\wedge &:= \{((x_1, x_2), a, (y_1, y_2)) \mid a \in \Sigma, (x_1, a, y_1) \in \delta_1, (x_2, a, y_2) \in \delta_2\} \\
A_\wedge &:= (Q_\wedge, s_\wedge, F_\wedge, \delta_\wedge).
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.5.16. *For every state* $(x_1, x_2) \in Q_\wedge$*, we have that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{(x_1,x_2)}(A_\wedge) = \mathcal{L}_{x_1}(A_1) \cup \mathcal{L}_{x_2}(A_2).$$

Proof. This proof is very similar to lemma 4.5.13. We do a proof by induction on $w \in \Sigma^*$. For $w = \varepsilon$ we have, by definition of $F_\wedge$, $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_{(x_1,x_2)}(A_\wedge) \iff \varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_{x_1}(A_1) \wedge \varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}_{x_2}(A_2)$.
For $w = aw'$ we get $(x_1, a, y_1) \in \delta_1$ and $(x_2, a, y_2) \in \delta_2$. By induction hypothesis, we also have $w' \in \mathcal{L}_{x_1}(A_1) \wedge w' \in \mathcal{L}_{x_2}(A_2)$. Thus, we get $aw' \in \mathcal{L}_{y_1}(A_1) \wedge aw' \in \mathcal{L}_{x_2}(A_2)$. □

Lemma 4.5.17. $\mathcal{L}(A_\wedge) = \mathcal{L}(A_1) \cap \mathcal{L}(A_2)$.

Proof. This follows directly from lemma 4.5.16 with $x = (s_1, s_2)$. □

```
Definition dfa_conj :=
 {| dfa_s := (dfa_s A1, dfa_s A2);
    dfa_fin := (fun x => dfa_fin A1 x.1 && dfa_fin A2 x.2);
    dfa_step := [fun x a => (dfa_step A1 x.1 a, dfa_step A2 x.2 a)] |}.
Lemma dfa_conj_correct' x1 x2 :
  [ predI dfa_accept A1 x1 & dfa_accept A2 x2 ]
  =i dfa_accept dfa_conj (x1, x2).
Lemma dfa_conj_correct:
  [ predI dfa_lang A1 & dfa_lang A2 ]
  =i dfa_lang dfa_conj .
```

Conc

Definition 4.5.18. *Given two NFAs $A_1 = (Q_1, s_1, F_1, \delta_1)$ and $A_2 = (Q_2, s_2, F_2, \delta_2)$ we construct the concatenation automaton in the following way:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_{Conc} &:= Q_1 \uplus Q_2 \\
s_{Conc} &:= s_1 \\
F_{Conc} &:= \textbf{TODO} \\
\delta_{Conc} &:= \delta_1 \cup \delta_2 \cup \{(x, a, y) \mid x \in Q_1, y \in Q_2, (s_2, a, y) \in \delta_2\} \\
A_{Conc} &:= (Q_{Conc}, s_{Conc}, F_{Conc}, \delta_{Conc}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Case dist. on $s_2 \in F_2$

Lemma 4.5.19. *Every run of A_2 can be mapped to a run in A_3.*

Proof. Let σ be a run starting in x for $w \in \Sigma^*$ on A_2. We do an induction on σ. For $|\sigma| = 0$we have $w = \varepsilon$. Therefore, we have that σ is also a run starting in x for ε on A_{Conc} For $\sigma = y\sigma'$ we have $w = aw'$, $(x, a, y) \in \delta_2$. By definition of δ_{Conc} we also have $(x, a, y) \in \delta_{Conc}$. By induction hypothesis, we have that σ' is a run for w' starting in y on A_{Conc}. Thus, $y\sigma'$ is a run for aw' starting in x on A_{Conc}. □

symbol for empty run

Include all proofs

4.5.2 Deciding Equivalence of Regular Expressions

Based on our procedure to construct an equivalent automaton from a regular expression, we can decide equivalence of regular expressions. Given r_1 and r_2, we construct equivalent DFA A_1 and A_2 as above.

4.5.3 Finite Automata to Regular Expressions

We prove that there is an equivalent standard regular expression for every finite automaton. There are three ways to prove this.

The first one is a method called "**state removal**" [11] (reformulated in [17]), which works by sequentially building up regular expressions on the edges between states. In every step, one state is removed and its adjacent states' edges are updated to incorporate the missing state into the regular expression. Finally, only two states remain. The resulting edges can be combined to form a regular expression that recognizes the language of the initial automaton.

The second method is known as "**Brzozowski's method**" [12] and builds upon Brzowoski derivates of regular expressions. This method is algebraic in nature and arrivates at a regular expression by solving a system of linear equations on regular expressions. Every state is assigned an unkown regular expression. The intuition of these unkown regular expressions is that they recognize the words accepted in their associated state. The system is solved by substituition and Arden's lemma [3]. The regular expressions associated with the starting state recognizes the language of the automaton.

The third method, which we chose for our development, is due to Kleene [22]. It is known as the "**transitive closure method**". This method recursively constructs a regular expression that is equivalent to the given automaton. For the remainder of the chapter, we assume that we are given a DFA $A = (Q, s, F, \delta)$.

The idea of the transitive closure method is that we can give a regular expression to describe the path between any two states x and y. This regular expression accepts all words whose run σ on A starting in x ends in y. In fact, we can even give such a regular expression if we limit the set of paths through which the run is allowed to pass. We will call this set X. Passing through, here, means that the restriction applies only to states that are traversed, i.e. not to the beginning or end of the run.

If we take X to be the empty set, we only consider two types of runs. First, if $x \neq y$, every transition from x to y constitutes one (singelton) word. Conversely, if there is a word which does not pass through a state and whose run on A starts in x and ends in y, it can only be a singleton word consisting of one of the transitions from x to y. Therefore, the corresponding regular expression is the disjunction of all transitions from x to y. These transitions constitutes all possible words that lead from x to y without passing through any state.

Otherwise, if $x = y$, we also have to consider the empty word, since its run on A starts in x and ends in y. Thus, the corresponding regular expression is the disjunction of all transitions from x to y **and** ε.

In the case of a non-empty X, we make the following observation. If we pick an element $z \in X$, then any run σ from x to y either passes through z, or does not pass through z. If it does, we can split it into three parts.

(i) The first part contains the prefix of σ which contains all states up to the first occurrence of z that is not the starting state.

(ii) The second part contains that part of the remainder of σ which contains all further occurences of z, though not the last state if that is z.

(iii) The third part contains the remainder.

Parts (i) and (iii) can easily be expressed in terms of $X\backslash\{z\}$. Part (ii) can be further decomposed into runs from z to z that do not pass through z. Thus, part (ii) can also be expressed in terms of $X\backslash\{z\}$ with the help of the * operator.

If σ does not pass through z, it is covered by the regular expression for pathes from x to y restricted to $X\backslash\{z\}$.

Definition 4.5.20. *Let $X \subseteq Q$. Let $x, y \in Q$. We define R recursively on $|X|$:* correct?

$$R^X_{x,y} := \begin{cases} \sum\limits_{\substack{a\in\Sigma \\ (x,a,y)\in\delta}} a & \text{if } X = \emptyset \wedge x! = y; \\ \sum\limits_{\substack{a\in\Sigma \\ (x,a,y)\in\delta}} a + \varepsilon & \text{if } X = \emptyset \wedge x = y; \\ R^{X\backslash\{z\}}_{x,z}(R^{X\backslash\{z\}}_{z,z})^* R^{X\backslash\{z\}}_{z,y} + R^{X\backslash\{z\}}_{x,y}. & \text{if } \exists z \in X. \end{cases}$$

Based on the intuition given above, we try to express $\mathcal{L}(A)$ by R^Q. Based on the observation that every accepted word has a run from s to some state $f \in F$, we only have to combine the corresponding regular expressions $R^Q_{s,f}$ to form a regular expression for $\mathcal{L}(A)$. The goal of this chapter is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.5.21. *$\mathcal{L}(A)$ is recognizable by a regular expression, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{L}(\sum_{f\in F} R^Q_{s,f}) = \mathcal{L}(A).$$

We will first give a

Chapter 5

Myhill-Nerode

In this chapter, we consider three additional characterizations of regular languages:

1. Myhill relations,
2. weak Nerode relations,
3. and Nerode relations.

We will show that these three concepts can be used to characterize regular languages by proving them equivalent to the existence of a (deterministic) finite automaton. Our proof of equivalence will have the following structure:



We will first give a proof of (c), which is the most challenging proof and formalization in this chapter. We will then show (a), (b), and (d).

5.1 Definition

The following definitions (roughly following [23]) will lead us to the statement of the Myhill-Nerode theorem.

Definition 5.1.1. *The* ***equivalence class*** *of $u \in \Sigma^*$ w.r.t. $\equiv$ is the set of all v such that $u \equiv v$. It is denoted by $[u]_\equiv$.*

Definition 5.1.2. *$\equiv$ is of* ***finite index*** *if and only if the set of $\{[u]_\equiv \mid u \in \Sigma^*\}$ is finite.*

Due to the lack of native support for quotient types in Coq, we formalize equivalence relations of finite index as surjective functions from Σ^* to a finite type X.

Definition 5.1.3. *Let $f : \Sigma^* \mapsto X$ be surjective. The relation $\equiv_f$ is defined such that for all $u, v \in \Sigma^*$*

$$u \equiv_f v \iff f(u) = f(v).$$

For all $w \in \Sigma^*$, $f(w)$ can be seen as an equivalence class of $\equiv_f$.

It is easy to see that $\equiv_f$ is an equivalence relation. Furthermore, from the finiteness of X, it follows that $\equiv_f$ is of finite index.

```
Record Fin_Eq_Cls :=
    { fin_type : finType;
      fin_func :> word -> fin_type;
      fin_surjective : surjective fin_func }.
```

Definition 5.1.4. *Let f be as above. Let $x \in X$. $w \in \Sigma^*$ is a **representative** of x if and only if $f(w) = x$. We write $cr(x)$ to denote the **canonical representative** of x, which we obtain by constructive choice.*

```
Definition cr (f: Fin_Eq_Cls) x :=
      xchoose ( fin_surjective f x).
```

5.1.1 Myhill Relations

Definition 5.1.5. *Let $\equiv$ be an equivalence relation. $\equiv$ is a **Myhill**[1] **relation** [23] on L if and only if*

*(i) $\equiv$ is **right congruent**, i.e. for all $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ and $a \in \Sigma$,*

$$u \equiv v \Rightarrow u \cdot a \equiv v \cdot a.$$

*(ii) $\equiv$ **refines** L, i.e. for all $u, v \in \Sigma^*$,*

$$u \equiv v \Rightarrow (u \in L \iff v \in L).$$

*(iii) $\equiv$ is of **finite index**.*

[1] Myhill relations are commonly referred to as "Myhill-Nerode relations". In this thesis, it makes sense to split the concept of a Myhill relation from that of the Nerode relation.

Building on our formalization of equivalence relations of finite index, we only need to give formalizations of (i) and (ii).

```
Definition right_congruent {X} (f: word -> X) :=
        forall u v a, f u = f v -> f (rcons u a) = f (rcons v a).
Definition refines {X} (f: word -> X) :=
        forall u v, f u = f v -> u \in L = (v \in L).
Record Myhill_Rel :=
        { myhill_func :> Fin_Eq_Cls;
          myhill_congruent: right_congruent myhill_func;
          myhill_refines : refines myhill_func }.
```

Myhill relations correspond to the equivalence relations defined as the pairs of words (u, v) whose runs on a DFA A end in the same state. These relations are right congruent, refine $\mathcal{L}(A)$ and are of finite index as A has finitely many states. We will later give a formal proof of this.

5.1.2 Nerode Relations

Definition 5.1.6. *Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$. Let L be a language. We define the* ***Nerode relation*** $\doteq_L$ *on L such that*

$$u \doteq_L v \iff \forall w \in \Sigma^*.\ uw \in L \Leftrightarrow vw \in L.$$

The Nerode relation given above is a propositional statement in Coq. To proof that the Nerode relation is of finite index, we require an equivalence relation, i.e. a function f from words to a finite type, such that $=_f$ is equivalent to $\doteq_L$.

```
Definition equiv_suffix {X} (f: word -> X) :=
      forall u v, f u = f v <-> equal_suffix u v.
Record Nerode_Rel :=
      { nerode_func :> Fin_Eq_Cls;
        nerode_equiv: equiv_suffix nerode_func }.
```

Definition 5.1.7. *Let $\equiv$ be an equivalence relation. Let L be a language. We say that $\equiv$ is a* ***weak Nerode relation*** *on L if and only if*

$$\forall u, v \in \Sigma^*.\ u \equiv v \implies u \doteq_L v.$$

```
Definition equal_suffix u v :=
      forall w, u++w \in L = (v++w \in L).
Definition imply_suffix {X} (f: word -> X) :=
        forall u v, f u = f v -> equal_suffix u v.
Record Weak_Nerode_Rel :=
        { weak_nerode_func :> Fin_Eq_Cls;
          weak_nerode_imply: imply_suffix weak_nerode_func }.
```

The notion of a weak Nerode relation is not found in the literature. We will later prove them weaker than Myhill relations, in the sense that every Myhill relation is also a weak Nerode relation.

5.1.3 Myhill-Nerode Theorem

We can now move on to the statement of the Myhill-Nerode theorem [23].

Theorem 5.1.8. *(Myhill-Nerode) Let L be a language. The following four statements are equivalent:*

1. *there exists a (deterministic) finite automaton that accepts L;*
2. *there exists a Myhill relation on L;*
3. *there exists a weak Nerode relation on L;*
4. *the Nerode relation on L is of finite index.*

5.2 Minimizing Equivalence Classes

We will prove that if there is a weak Nerode relation on a language L, the Nerode relation is of finite index. This proves step (3) $\implies$ (4) and thus step (c) of our plan. For this purpose, we employ a table-filling algorithm [18] to find indistinguishable states under the Myhill-Nerode relation. However, we do not rely on an automaton, as is usually done. In fact, we use the finite type X, i.e., the equivalence classes, instead of states.

For the remainder of this section, we assume we are given a language L and a weak Nerode relation f_0.

We employ a fixed-point construction to find equivalence classes that are equivalent in the sense of $\doteq_L$. In each step, we add those equivalences classes that are distinguishable based on previously distinguishable equivalence classes. The initial set of distinguishable equivalence classes are distinguishable by the inclusion of their canonical representative in L. We denote this initial set $dist_0$.

$$dist_0 := \{(x, y) \in F \times F \mid cr(x) \in L \Leftrightarrow cr(y) \notin L\}.$$

Definition distinguishable := [fun x y => (cr f_0 x) \in L != ((cr f_0 y) \in L)].
Definition distinct0 := [set x | distinguishable x.1 x.2].

To find more distinguishable equivalence classes, we have to identify equivalence classes that "lead" to distinguishable equivalence classes. In allusion to the minimization procedure on automata, we define successors of equivalence classes. The intuition is that two states are distinguishable if they are succeeded by distinguishable states. Conversely, if a pair of states is not distinguishable, then their predecessors can not be distinguished by those states. Thus, two states are undistinguishable, i.e. equivalent, if none of their succeeding pairs of states are distinguishable.

Definition 5.2.1. *Let $x, y \in X$ and $a \in \Sigma$. We define $succ_a$ and $psucc_a$. $succ_a(x) := cr(x) \cdot a$ and $psucc_a(x, y) := (succ_a(x), succ_a(y))$.*

The fixed-point algorithm tries to extend the set of distinguishable equivalence classes by looking for a pair of equivalence classes that transitions to a pair of distinguishable equivalence classes. Given a set of pairs of equivalence classes *dist*, we define the set of pairs of distinguishable equivalence classes that are succeeded by pairs in *dist* as

$$distinct_S(dist) := \{(x, y) \mid \exists a.\, psucc_a(x, y) \in dist\}.$$

Definition 5.2.2. *Let dist be a subset of $X \times X$. We define unnamed such that*

$$unnamed(dist) := dist_0 \cup dist \cup distinct_S(dist).$$

```
Definition succ := [ fun x a => f_0 ((cr f_0 x) ++ [::a]) ].
Definition psucc := [ fun x y => [ fun a => (succ x a, succ y a) ] ].
Definition distinctS ( distinct : {set X*X}) :=
    [set (x,y) | x in X, y in X & [ exists a, psucc x y a \in distinct ] ].
Definition unnamed distinct :=
      distinct0 :|: distinct :|: ( distinctS distinct ).
```

Lemma 5.2.3. *unnamed is monotone and has a fixed-point.*

Proof. Monotonicity follows directly from the monotonicity of $\cup$. The number of sets in $X \times X$ is finite. Therefore, *unnamed* has a fixed point. We iterate *unnamed* $|X * X| + 1 = |X|^2 + 1$ times on the empty set. Since there can only ever be $|X * X|$ items in the result of *unnamed*, we will find the fixed point in no more than $|X * X| + 1$ steps.

Let ***distinct*** be the fixed point of *unnamed* and let it be denoted by $\not\cong$. We write ***equiv*** for the complement of *distinct* and denote it $\cong$. □

We now show that $\cong$ is equivalent to the Nerode relation. Formally, this means constructing a function that fulfills our definition of an equivalence relation of finite index. Then, we prove that this equivalence relation is equivalent to the the Nerode relation. First, we will prove that $\cong$ is an equivalence relation. Then, we will prove it equivalent to the Nerode relation in two separate steps, since the two directions require different strategies.

Lemma 5.2.4. *$\cong$ is an equivalence relation.*

Proof. We first state transitivity of $\cong$ in terms of $\ncong$ and call this property of $\ncong$ **complementary transitivity**:

$$\forall x, y, z \in X.\ \neg(x \ncong y) \implies \neg(y \ncong z) \implies \neg(x \ncong z).$$

It suffices to show that *distinct* is anti-reflexive, symmetric and complementarily transitive. Note that complementary transitivity, anti-reflexivity and symmetry are closed under union. We proceed by fixed-point induction.

1. For $\mathit{unnamed}(\mathit{dist}) = \emptyset$ we have anti-reflexivity, symmetry and complementary transitivity by the properties of $\emptyset$.

2. For $\mathit{unnamed}(\mathit{dist}) = \mathit{dist}'$ we have *dist* anti-reflexive, symmetric and complementarily transitive. It remains to show that dist_0 and $\mathit{distinct}_S(\mathit{dist})$ are anti-reflexive, symmetric and complementarily transitive.

   dist_0 is anti-reflexive, symmetric and complementarily transitive by definition.

   $\mathit{distinct}_S(\mathit{dist})$ can be seen as an intersection of a symmetric subset of $X \times X$ defined by psucc_a and the anti-reflexive, symmetric and complementarily transitive *dist*. Thus, $\mathit{distinct}_S(\mathit{dist})$ is anti-reflexive, symmetric and complementarily transitive.

   Therefore, dist' is anti-reflexive, symmetric and complementarily transitive.

□

```
Lemma equiv_refl x: x ~= x.
Lemma equiv_sym x y:  x ~= y -> y ~= x.
Lemma equiv_trans x y z: x ~= y -> y ~= z -> x ~= z.
```

Lemma 5.2.5. *Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$. $u \cong_{f_0} v \implies u \doteq_L v$.*

Proof. Let $w \in \Sigma^*$. We then show the contraposition of the claim:

$$uw \in L \not\Leftrightarrow vw \in L \implies u \ncong_{f_0} v.$$

Induction on w and generalize over u and v.

1. For $w = \varepsilon$ we have $u \in L \not\Leftrightarrow v \in L$ which gives us $(f_0(u), f_0(v)) \in dist_0$. Thus, $u \not\cong_{f_0} v$.

2. For $w = aw'$ we have $uaw \in L \not\Leftrightarrow vaw \in L$. We have to show $u \not\cong_{f_0} v$, i.e. $(f_0(u), f_0(v)) \in distinct$. By definition of $distinct$, it suffices to show $(f_0(u), f_0(v)) \in unnamed(distinct)$.

   For this, we prove $(f_0(u), f_0(v)) \in distinct_S(distinct)$. By $uaw \in L \not\Leftrightarrow vaw \in L$ we have $(f_0(cr(u)a), f_0(cr(v)a)) \in dist_0$.

   It remains to show that $cr(u)a \not\cong_{f_0} cr(v)a$ which we get by inductive hypothesis. For this, we need to show that $cr(u)aw \in L \not\Leftrightarrow cr(v)aw \in L$.

   By the properties of f, we get $cr(u)aw \in L \Leftrightarrow uaw \in L$ and $cr(v)aw \in L \Leftrightarrow vaw \in L$. Thus, $cr(u)aw \in L \not\Leftrightarrow cr(v)aw$.

□

Lemma 5.2.6. *Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$. If $u \not\cong_{f_0} v$, then u and v are **not** equivalent wr.t. the Merode relation, i.e. $u \not\cong_{f_0} v \implies u \not\doteq_L v$.*

Proof. We do a fixed-point induction.

1. For $unnamed(dist) = \emptyset$ we have $(f_0(u), f_0(v)) \in \emptyset$ and thus a contradiction.

2. For $unnamed(dist) = dist'$ we have $(f_0(u), f_0(v)) \in dist'$. We do a case distinction on $dist'$.

   (a) $(f_0(u), f_0(v)) \in dist_0$. We have $u \in L \not\Leftrightarrow v \in L$. Thus, $u \not\doteq_L v$ as witnessed by $w = \varepsilon$.

   (b) $(f_0(u), f_0(v)) \in dist$. By inductive hypothesis, $u \not\doteq_L v$.

   (c) $(f_0(u), f_0(v)) \in distinct_S(dist)$. We have $a \in \Sigma$ with $psucc_a(f_0(u), f_0(v))) \in dist$. By inductive hypothesis, we get $cr(u)a \not\doteq_L cr(v)a$ as witnessed by $w \in \Sigma^*$ such that $cr(u)aw \in L \not\Leftrightarrow cr(v)aw \in L$.

   By the properties of f, we get $cr(u)aw \in L \Leftrightarrow uaw \in L$ and $cr(v)aw \in L \Leftrightarrow vaw \in L$. Thus, we have $u \not\doteq_L v$ as witnessed by aw.

□

Corollary 5.2.7. *Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$. We have that*

$$u \cong_{f_0} v \iff u \doteq_L v.$$

```
Lemma equiv_equal_suffix u v: u ~=_f_0 v -> equal_suffix L u v.
Lemma distinct_not_equal_suffix u v:
    u ~!=_f_0 v ->
    exists w, u ++ w \in L != (v ++ w \in L).
```

```
Lemma equivP u v:
      reflect  ( equal_suffix  L u v)
               (u ~=_f_0 v).
```

Definition 5.2.8. *Let $w \in \Sigma^*$. We define*

$$f_{min}(w) := \{x \mid x \in X,\ f_0(w) \cong x\}.$$

Note that the domain of f_{min} is finite (since X is finite) and contains no empty sets (due to reflexivity of $\cong$).

Lemma 5.2.9. *f_{min} is surjective.*

Proof. Let $s \in dom(f_{min})$. There exists $x \in X$ such that $x \in s$ since $s \neq \emptyset$. We have $f_0(x) = f_0(cr(x))$ and therefore $x \cong_{f_0} cr(x)$ by reflexivity of $\cong$. Thus, $cr(x)$ is a representative of s since $f_{min}(x) = f_{min}(cr(x)) = s$. □

Lemma 5.2.10. *For all $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ we we have*

$$f_{min}(u) = f_{min}(v) \iff u \cong_{f_0} v.$$

Proof. "⇒" We have $f_{min}(u) = f_{min}(v)$ and thus $u \cong_{f_0} v$.

"⇐" We have $u \cong_{f_0} v$. Let $x \in X$. It suffices to show that $f_0(u) \cong x$ if and only if $f_0(v) \cong x$. This follows from symmetry and transitivity of $\cong$. □

Lemma 5.2.11. *f_{min} is equivalent to the Nerode relation, i.e. f_{min} is surjective and for all $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ we have*

$$f_{min}(u) = f_{min}(v) \iff u \doteq_L v.$$

Proof. We have proven surjectivity in lemma 5.2.9. By lemma 5.2.10 we have $f_{min}(u) = f_{min}(v)$ if and only if $u \cong_{f_0} v$. By corollary 5.2.7 we have $u \cong_{f_0} v$ if and only if $u \doteq_L v$. Thus, $f_{min}(u) = f_{min}(v)$ if and only if $u \doteq_L v$. □

The formalization of f_{min} is slightly more involved than the mathematical construction. We first need to define the finite type of f_{min}'s domain, which we do by enumerating all possible values of f_{min}.

```
Definition  equiv_repr  x := [set  y  |  x ~= y].
Definition  X_min := map equiv_repr (enum (fin_type  f_0 )).
Definition  f_min  w := SeqSub _ (equiv_repr_mem (f_0 w)).
```

We then prove lemmas 5.2.9, 5.2.10 and theorem 5.2.11 which are consequential and straight-forward.

```
Lemma f_min_surjective: surjective f_min.
Lemma f_minP u v:
      reflect (f_min u = f_min v)
              (u ∼=_f_0 v).
Lemma f_min_correct: equiv_suffix L f_min.
Definition f_min_fin : Fin_Eq_Cls :=
      {| fin_surjective := f_min_surjective |}.
```

We can now state the result of this chapter.

Corollary 5.2.12. *The Nerode relation is of finite index.*

Proof. This follows directly from lemma 5.2.4 and lemma 5.2.11. □

```
Definition weak_nerode_to_nerode: Nerode_Rel L :=
      {| nerode_func := f_min_fin ;
        nerode_equiv := f_min_correct |}.
```

This concludes step (3) $\implies$ (4) of theorem 5.1.8 (step ⓒ).

5.3 Finite Automata, Myhill relations, and Nerode relations

First, we will show that, given a DFA A, we can construct a Myhill relation on $\mathcal{L}(A)$. We will then show that this also enables us to construct a weak Nerode relation $\mathcal{L}(A)$. As we have already covered the minimization of equivalence classes in the previous chapter, this proves that the Nerode relation is of finite index.

Conversely, knowing that the Nerode relation on language L is of finite index, we will show that we can construct a DFA that accepts L.

5.3.1 Finite Automata to Myhill relations

We assume we are given a DFA A. We will be using the states of A as equivalence classes. Our goal is to construct a Myhill relation, for which we will need an equivalence relation of finite index. Therefore, we first need to ensure that the mapping from words to equivalence classes is surjective. Thus, we consider the equivalent, connected automaton $A_c = (Q_c, s_c, F_c, \delta_c)$ (definition 4.2.1), which has only reachable states. This enables us to construct a surjective function from words to the states of A_c.

Definition 5.3.1. *Let $u \in \Sigma^*$. Let σ be the run of u on A_c. We define $f : \Sigma^* \mapsto Q_c$ such that $f_M(U)$ is the last state in σ, i.e.*

$$f_M(u) := \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}.$$

Note that f_M is surjective (follows directly from lemma 4.2.5) and, thus, an equivalence relation.

```
Definition f_M := fun w => last (dfa_s A_c) (dfa_run A_c w).
Lemma f_M_surjective: surjective f_M.
Definition f_fin : Fin_Eq_Cls :=
    {| fin_func := f_M;
       fin_surjective := f_M_surjective |}.
```

In order to show that f_M is a Myhill relation, we prove that it fulfills definition 5.1.5.

Lemma 5.3.2. *f_M is right congruent.*

Proof. Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ such that $u =_{f_M} v$. Let $a \in \Sigma$. Since A is deterministic, we get $ua =_{f_M} va$. □

Lemma 5.3.3. *f_M refines $\mathcal{L}(A_c)$.*

Proof. Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ such that $u =_{f_M} v$. By definition of f_M, the runs u and v on A end in the same stat. Thus, either u and v are both accepted, or both not accepted. □

Theorem 5.3.4. *f_M is a Myhill relation on $\mathcal{L}(A)$.*

Proof. By lemma 4.2.3, we have $\mathcal{L}(A_c) = \mathcal{L}(A)$. Thus, it suffices to show that f_M is a Myhill relation on $\mathcal{L}(A_c)$. This follows from lemma 5.3.2 and lemma 5.3.3. □

We only have extensional equality on $\mathcal{L}(A_c)$ and $\mathcal{L}(A)$ in Coq. Thus, we first show that f_M is a Myhill relation on $\mathcal{L}(A_c)$. Then, we show that we can get a Myhill relation on $\mathcal{L}(A)$ from a Myhill relation on $\mathcal{L}(A_c)$.

```
Definition dfa_to_myhill ' : Myhill_Rel (dfa_lang A_c) :=
    {| myhill_func := f_fin ;
       myhill_congruent := f_M_right_congruent ;
       myhill_refines := f_M_refines |}.
Lemma myhill_lang_eq L1 L2: L1 =i L2 -> Myhill_Rel L1 -> Myhill_Rel L2.
Definition dfa_to_myhill : Myhill_Rel (dfa_lang A) :=
    myhill_lang_eq (dfa_connected_correct A) dfa_to_myhill '.
```

This concludes the proof of step (1) $\implies$ (2) (ⓐ).

5.3.2 Myhill relations to weak Nerode relations

We show that, if there exists a Myhill relation, there also exists a weak Nerode relation. In fact, we will prove that any Myhill relation **is** a weak Nerode relation.

Theorem 5.3.5. *Let f be a Myhill relation on a language L. Then f is a weak Nerode relation on L.*

Proof. Let $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ such that $u =_f v$. We have to show that for all $w \in \Sigma^*$, $uw \in L \Leftrightarrow vw \in L$. Induction on w and generalize over u and v.

1. For $w = \varepsilon$, we get $u \in L \Leftrightarrow v \in L$ as f refines L.
2. For $w = aw'$, we get $ua =_f va$ by congruence of f and thus, by inductive hypothesis, $uaw' \in L \Leftrightarrow vaw' \in L$.

□

```
Lemma myhill_suffix: imply_suffix L f.
Definition myhill_to_weak_nerode: Weak_Nerode_Rel L :=
    {| weak_nerode_func := f;
       weak_nerode_imply := myhill_suffix |}.
```

This concludes step (2) $\implies$ (3) (ⓑ).

5.3.3 Nerode relations to Finite Automata

Finally, we will prove the last step of theorem 5.1.8. If the Nerode relation on a language L is of finite index, we can construct a DFA that accepts L. The construction is very straight-forward and uses the equivalence classes of the Nerode relation as the set of states for the automaton.

Definition 5.3.6. *Let L be a language. Let X be a finite type. Let $f : \Sigma^* \mapsto X$ be the equivalence relation which proves that the Nerode relation on L is of finite index. We construct DFA A such that*

$$\begin{aligned} s &:= f(\varepsilon) \\ F &:= \{x | x \in X \wedge cr(x) \in L\} \\ \delta &:= \{(x, a, f(cr(x)a)) \mid x \in X, a \in \Sigma\} \\ A &:= (X, s, F, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

```
Definition nerode_to_dfa :=
    {| dfa_s := f [::];
       dfa_fin := [pred x | cr f x \in L ];
       dfa_step := [fun x a => f (rcons (cr f x) a)] |}.
```

In order to show that A accepts the language L, we first need to connect runs on A to the equivalence classes, i.e. the domain of f. The following lemma gives a direct connection.

Lemma 5.3.7. *Let $w \in \Sigma^*$. Let σ be the run of w on A starting in s. We have that the last state of σ is the equivalence class of w, i.e.*

$$\sigma_{|\sigma|-1} = f(w).$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on w from right to left.

1. For $w = \varepsilon$ we have $s = f(\varepsilon)$.
2. For $w = w'a$ we know that the run of w' on A starting in s ends in $f(w')$. It remains to show that $(f(w'), a, f(w)) \in \delta$. We have $cr(f(w'))a =_f w$, i.e. $f(cr(f(w'))a) = f(w)$ by definition of f. Thus, it suffices to show $(f(w'), a, f(cr(f(w'))a)) \in \delta$, which holds by definition of δ.

□

Theorem 5.3.8. *A accepts L, i.e. $\mathcal{L}(A) = L$.*

Proof. Let $w \in \Sigma^*$. Let σ be the run of w on A starting in s. w is accepted if and only if $\sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \in F$, i.e. if and only if $cr(\sigma_{|\sigma|-1}) \in L$. We have $w =_f cr(\sigma_{|\sigma|-1})$ and therefore $w \in L \Leftrightarrow cr(\sigma_{|\sigma|-1}) \in L$. Thus w is accepted if and only if $w \in L$. □

This concludes the last step of theorem 5.1.8, namely (4) $\implies$ (1) ((d)), and, consequently, this chapter.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Bibliography

[1] *2nd Annual Symposium on Switching Circuit Theory and Logical Design, Detroit, Michigan, USA, October 17-20, 1961*. IEEE Computer Society, 1961.

[2] Valentin M. Antimirov. Partial derivatives of regular expressions and finite automaton constructions. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 155(2):291–319, 1996.

[3] Dean N. Arden. Delayed-logic and finite-state machines. In *SWCT (FOCS)* [1], pages 133–151.

[4] Robert L. Ashenhurst and Susan Graham, editors. *ACM Turing award lectures: the first twenty years: 1966-1985*. ACM Press/Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., New York, NY, USA, 1987.

[5] Andrea Asperti. A compact proof of decidability for regular expression equivalence. In Beringer and Felty [8], pages 283–298.

[6] Andrea Asperti, Claudio Sacerdoti Coen, and Enrico Tassi. Regular expressions, au point. *CoRR*, abs/1010.2604, 2010.

[7] Andrea Asperti, Wilmer Ricciotti, Claudio Sacerdoti Coen, and Enrico Tassi. The matita interactive theorem prover. In Bjørner and Sofronie-Stokkermans [9], pages 64–69.

[8] Lennart Beringer and Amy P. Felty, editors. *Interactive Theorem Proving - Third International Conference, ITP 2012, Princeton, NJ, USA, August 13-15, 2012. Proceedings*, volume 7406 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2012.

[9] Nikolaj Bjørner and Viorica Sofronie-Stokkermans, editors. *Automated Deduction - CADE-23 - 23rd International Conference on Automated Deduction, Wroclaw, Poland, July 31 - August 5, 2011. Proceedings*, volume 6803 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2011.

[10] Thomas Braibant and Damien Pous. Deciding kleene algebras in coq. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 8(1), 2012.

[11] J. A. Brzozowski and E. J. McCluskey. Signal Flow Graph Techniques for Sequential Circuit State Diagrams. *IEEE Transactions on Electronic Computers*, EC-12:67–76, 1963.

[12] Janusz A. Brzozowski. Derivatives of regular expressions. *J. ACM*, 11(4):481–494, 1964.

[13] Thierry Coquand and Vincent Siles. A decision procedure for regular expression equivalence in type theory. In *CPP*, pages 119–134, 2011.

[14] D.Z. Du and K.I. Ko. *Problem Solving in Automata, Languages, and Complexity.* Wiley, 2001.

[15] Georges Gonthier. The four colour theorem: Engineering of a formal proof. In Kapur [21], page 333.

[16] Georges Gonthier, Assia Mahboubi, and Enrico Tassi. A Small Scale Reflection Extension for the Coq system. Rapport de recherche RR-6455, INRIA, 2008.

[17] Yo-Sub Han and Derick Wood. The generalization of generalized automata: Expression automata. In Michael Domaratzki, Alexander Okhotin, Kai Salomaa, and Sheng Yu, editors, *Implementation and Application of Automata*, volume 3317 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 156–166. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2005. 10.1007/978-3-540-30500-2_15.

[18] John E. Hopcroft, Rajeev Motwani, and Jeffrey D. Ullman. *Introduction to automata theory, languages, and computation - international edition (2. ed).* Addison-Wesley, 2003.

[19] D.A. Huffman. The synthesis of sequential switching circuits. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 257(3):161 – 190, 1954.

[20] Wolfram Kahl and Timothy G. Griffin, editors. *Relational and Algebraic Methods in Computer Science - 13th International Conference, RAMiCS 2012, Cambridge, UK, September 17-20, 2012. Proceedings*, volume 7560 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2012.

[21] Deepak Kapur, editor. *Computer Mathematics, 8th Asian Symposium, ASCM 2007, Singapore, December 15-17, 2007. Revised and Invited Papers*, volume 5081 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2008.

[22] S. C. Kleene. Representation of events in nerve nets and finite automata. *Automata Studies*, 1965.

[23] Dexter Kozen. *Automata and computability.* Undergraduate texts in computer science. Springer, 1997.

[24] Alexander Krauss and Tobias Nipkow. Proof pearl: Regular expression equivalence and relation algebra. *J. Autom. Reasoning*, 49(1):95–106, 2012.

[25] Peter Linz. *An introduction to formal languages and automata (4. ed.)*. Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 2006.

[26] The Coq development team. *The Coq proof assistant reference manual*. LogiCal Project, 2004. Version 8.0.

[27] Edward F. Moore. Gedanken-experiments on sequential machines. In Claude Shannon and John McCarthy, editors, *Automata Studies*, pages 129–153. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1956.

[28] Nelma Moreira, David Pereira, and Simão Melo de Sousa. Deciding regular expressions (in-)equivalence in coq. In Kahl and Griffin [20], pages 98–113.

[29] Anil Nerode. Linear automaton transformations. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 9(4):541–544, ao 1958.

[30] M. O. Rabin and D. Scott. Finite automata and their decision problems. *IBM J. Res. Dev.*, 3(2):114–125, April 1959.

[31] Marko C. J. D. van Eekelen, Herman Geuvers, Julien Schmaltz, and Freek Wiedijk, editors. *Interactive Theorem Proving - Second International Conference, ITP 2011, Berg en Dal, The Netherlands, August 22-25, 2011. Proceedings*, volume 6898 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2011.

[32] Chunhan Wu, Xingyuan Zhang, and Christian Urban. A formalisation of the myhill-nerode theorem based on regular expressions (proof pearl). In van Eekelen et al. [31], pages 341–356.