

# Lemmas, Theorems and Definitions

## Pumping Lemma through page 52

Author: José Kuiper, Noud de Kroon

May 24, 2015

## 1 Lemmas and Theorems

### 1.1 Chapter 1

1 Basic Definitions	
1.1	<p>Definition of an alphabet:            Let <math>\Sigma</math> be an alphabet. The set <math>\Sigma^*</math> of strings or finite words of <math>\Sigma</math> is defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The empty string <math>\epsilon \in \Sigma^*</math>;</li> <li>• if <math>a \in \Sigma</math> and <math>w \in \Sigma^*</math> then <math>aw \in \Sigma^*</math></li> </ul>
1.2	<p>Definition of length of a string:            Given an alphabet <math>\Sigma</math>, the length <math> w </math> for a string <math>w \in \Sigma^*</math> is given by:            (i) <math> \epsilon  = 0</math>, (ii) <math> aw  =  w  + 1</math>.</p>
1.4	<p>Definition of concatenations:            Let <math>\Sigma</math> be an alphabet. The concatenation <math>wv \in \Sigma^*</math> of strings <math>w, v \in \Sigma^*</math> is given by:            (i) <math>\epsilon v = v</math>, and (ii) <math>(aw)v = a(wv)</math></p>
def	<p>A string <math>v</math> is called a prefix of a string <math>w</math> if <math>vu = w</math> for some string <math>u</math>, notation <math>v \preceq w</math>.            In the situation that <math>v \preceq w</math> we occasionally write <math>u = w/v</math>, so if <math>v \preceq w</math> then we have <math>v(w/v) = w</math>.</p>
1.5	<p>Let <math>\Sigma</math> be an alphabet and <math>c \in \Sigma</math>. The count <math>\#_c(w)</math> of a symbol <math>c \in \Sigma</math> in a string <math>w \in \Sigma^*</math> is given by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\#_c(\epsilon) = 0</math>;</li> <li>• <math>\#_c(cw) = \#_c(w) + 1</math>;</li> <li>• <math>\#_c(aw) = \#_c(w)</math> if <math>a \neq c</math></li> </ul>
1.6	<p>Definition of a language:            Let <math>\Sigma</math> be an alphabet. A subset <math>L \subseteq \Sigma^*</math> is called a language over <math>\Sigma</math>.</p>
1.8a	<p>Definition of language concatenation:            Let <math>L_1, L_2 \subseteq \Sigma^*</math> be two languages over an alphabet <math>\Sigma</math>. The concatenation <math>L_1 \cdot L_2</math> of <math>L_1</math> and <math>L_2</math> is given by:  <math>L_1 \cdot L_2 = \{w_1w_2   w_1 \in L_1, w_2 \in L_2\}</math></p>

1.8b	<p>Definition of Kleene-closure:</p> <p>Let <math>L \subseteq \Sigma</math> be a language over an alphabet <math>\Sigma</math>. The Kleene-closure <math>L^*</math> of <math>L</math> is given by:</p> $L^* = \{w_1 \cdots w_n \mid n \geq 0, w_1, \dots, w_n \in L\}$
------	--

## 1.2 Chapter 2

2.1 DFA's	
2.1	<p>Definition of a Deterministic Finite Automaton:</p> <p>A DFA is a tuple <math>D = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)</math> with <math>Q</math> a finite set of states, <math>\Sigma</math> a finite alphabet, <math>\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q</math> the transition <i>function</i>, <math>q_0 \in Q</math> the initial state, and <math>F \subseteq Q</math> the set of final states.</p>
Def	<p>Definition of <math>\vdash_D</math>:</p> <p><math>(q, w) \vdash_D (q', w')</math> iff <math>w = aw'</math> and <math>\delta(q, a) = q'</math> for some <math>a \in \Sigma</math></p>
2.3	<p>Lemma stating some basic properties of a DFA:</p> <p>Let <math>D</math> be a DFA, then:</p> <p>(a) For all states <math>q, q', q''</math> and words <math>w, w'</math> it holds that:  if <math>q, w \vdash_D^* (q', w')</math> and <math>(q, w) \vdash_D^* (q'', w')</math> then <math>q' = q''</math></p> <p>(b) For states <math>q, q'</math> and all words <math>w, w', v</math> it holds that:  <math>(q, w) \vdash_D^* (q', w')</math> iff <math>(q, wv) \vdash_D^* (q', w'v)</math></p>
2.4	<p>Definition of the language defined by a DFA:</p> <p>Let <math>D = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)</math> be a finite automaton. The language <math>L(D) \subseteq \Sigma^*</math> accepted by <math>D</math> is defined by:</p> $L(D) = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \exists q \in F : (q_0, w) \vdash_D^* (q, \epsilon)\}$
2.2 NFA's	
2.7	<p>Definition of an NFA:</p> <p>(Non deterministic finite automaton with silent steps). An NFA is a quintuple <math>N = (Q, \Sigma, \rightarrow_N, q_0, F)</math> with <math>Q</math> a finite set of states, <math>\Sigma</math> a finite alphabet, <math>\rightarrow_N \subseteq Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\tau\}) \times Q</math> the transition <i>relation</i>, <math>q_0 \in Q</math> the initial state, and <math>F \subseteq Q</math> the set of final states.</p> <p>Important to note that <math>\rightarrow_N</math> is a relation and not a function, meaning there may be several transitions possible from a certain state for a given letter, or none at all for a certain letter.</p>
def	<p>Basic definition of the <math>\vdash_N</math> yield relation:</p> $(q, w) \vdash_N (q', w') \text{ iff } \exists a \in \Sigma : q \xrightarrow{a}_N q' \wedge w = aw' \text{ or } q \xrightarrow{\tau}_N q' \wedge w = w'$
2.8	<p>Lemma stating a consistency property of NFA's for all words <math>w, w', v</math> and states <math>q, q'</math>:</p> $(q, w) \vdash_N^* (q', w') \text{ iff } (q, wv) \vdash_N^* (q', w'v)$

2.9	<p>Definiton of the language defined by an NFA:</p> <p>Let <math>N = (Q, \Sigma, \rightarrow_N, q_0, F)</math> be a finite automaton. The language <math>L(N)</math> accepted by <math>N</math> is defined by:</p> $L(N) = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \exists q \in F : (q_0, w) \vdash_N^* (q, \epsilon)\}$
2.12	<p>Theorem: If a language <math>L \subseteq \Sigma^*</math> is accepted by a DFA, then <math>L</math> is also accepted by some NFA.</p> <p>The proof of this is trivial, since any state or function rule of a DFA is also valid in an NFA.</p>
2.13	<p>Theorem: If a language <math>L \subseteq \Sigma^*</math> is accepted by an NFA, then <math>L</math> is also accepted by a DFA.</p> <p>We construct this DFA from the NFA as follows:</p>
2.27	<p>Pumping Lemma for regular languages:</p> <p>This theorem can be used to prove that a language is not regular.</p> <p>Details:</p> <p>Let <math>L</math> be a regular language over an alphabet <math>\Sigma</math>. There exists a constant <math>m &gt; 0</math> such that each <math>w \in L</math> with <math> w  &gt; m</math> can be written as <math>w = xyz</math> where <math>x, y, z \in \Sigma^*</math>, <math>y \neq \epsilon</math>, <math> xy  \leq m</math>, and for all <math>k &gt; 0</math>: <math>xy^kz \in L</math>.</p>
2.30	<p>Let <math>L</math> be a regular language over an alphabet <math>\Sigma</math> represented by an NFA <math>N</math> accepting <math>L</math>. Then it can be decided if <math>L = \emptyset</math> or not.</p>
2.31	<p>With this theorem you can decide whether a string is in a language or not.</p> <p>Details:</p> <p>Let <math>L \subseteq \Sigma^*</math> be a regular language over the alphabet <math>\Sigma</math>, represented by an NFA <math>N</math> accepting <math>L</math>, and let <math>w \in \Sigma^*</math> be a string over <math>\Sigma</math>. Then it can be decided if <math>w \in L</math> or not.</p> <p>How to prove this:</p> <p>Construct, using the algorithm given in the proof of Theorem 2.13, a DFA <math>D</math> such that <math>\mathcal{L}(D) = \mathcal{L}(N)</math>. Simulate <math>D</math> starting from its initial state on input <math>w</math>, say <math>(q_0, w) \vdash_D^* (q', \epsilon)</math> for some state <math>q'</math> of <math>D</math>. Decide <math>w \in L</math> if <math>q'</math> is a final state of <math>D</math>, decide <math>w \notin L</math> otherwise.</p>

### 1.3 Chapter 3

3.1 Push-down automata	
3.2	<p>Definition of a push-down automaton:</p> <p>A push-down automaton (PDA) is a septuple <math>P = (Q, \Sigma, \Delta, \emptyset, \rightarrow, q_0, F)</math> where</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <math>Q</math> is a finite set of states,</li> <li>2. <math>\Sigma</math> is a finite input alphabet with <math>\tau \neq \Sigma</math>,</li> <li>3. <math>\Delta</math> is a finite data alphabet or stack alphabet,</li> <li>4. <math>\emptyset \neq \Delta</math> a special symbol denoting an empty stack,</li> <li>5. <math>\rightarrow \subseteq Q \times \Sigma_\tau \times \Delta_\emptyset \times \Delta^* \times Q</math>, where <math>\Sigma_\tau = \Sigma \cup \tau</math> and <math>\Delta_\emptyset = \Delta \cup \emptyset</math>, is a finite set of transitions or steps,</li> </ol>

	6. $q_0 \in Q$ is the initial state, 7. $F \subseteq Q$ is the set of final states.
3.4	<p>Definition of configuration of a PDA:</p> <p>Let <math>P = (Q, \Sigma, \Delta, \emptyset, \rightarrow, q_0, F)</math> be a push-down automaton. A configuration or instantaneous description (ID) of <math>P</math> is a triple <math>(q, w, x) \in Q \times \Sigma^* \times \Delta^*</math>. The relation <math>\vdash_P \subseteq (Q \times \Sigma^* \times \Delta^*) \times (Q \times \Sigma^* \times \Delta^*)</math> is given as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) <math>(q, aw, dy) \vdash_P (p, w, xy)</math> if <math>q \xrightarrow{a[d/x]} p</math></li> <li>(ii) <math>(q, w, dy) \vdash_P (p, w, xy)</math> if <math>q \xrightarrow{\tau[d/x]} p</math></li> <li>(iii) <math>(q, aw, \varepsilon) \vdash_P (p, w, x)</math> if <math>q \xrightarrow{a[\emptyset/x]} p</math></li> <li>(iv) <math>(q, w, \varepsilon) \vdash_P (p, w, x)</math> if <math>q \xrightarrow{\tau[\emptyset/x]} p</math></li> </ul>
3.6	<p>Lemma for PDA properties, stating that suffixes for strings and stacks don't matter for configurations. Let <math>P = (Q, \Sigma, \Delta, \emptyset, \rightarrow, q_0, F)</math> be a push-down automaton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) For <math>w, w', v \in \Sigma^*</math>, <math>q, q' \in Q</math>, <math>x, x', y \in \Delta^*</math> with <math>x \neq \varepsilon</math>, it holds that           <math display="block">(q, wv, xy) \vdash_P (q', w'v, x'y) \Leftrightarrow (q, w, x) \vdash_P (q', w', x')</math> </li> <li>(b) For <math>n \geq 0</math>, <math>w_i \in \Sigma^*</math>, <math>q_i \in Q</math>, <math>x_i \in \Delta^*</math> with <math>x_i \neq \varepsilon</math>, for <math>1 \leq i &lt; n</math>, <math>v \in \Sigma^*</math> and <math>y \in \Delta^*</math>, it holds that           <math display="block">(q_0, w_0v, x_0y) \vdash_P (q_1, w_1v, x_1y) \vdash_P \dots \vdash_P (q_n, w_nv, x_ny)</math> <math display="block">\Leftrightarrow</math> <math display="block">(q_0, w_0, x_0) \vdash_P (q_1, w_1, x_1) \vdash_P \dots \vdash_P (q_n, w_n, x_n)</math> </li> </ul>
3.7	<p>Definition on when a language is accepted by a PDA:</p> <p>Let <math>P = (Q, \Sigma, \Delta, \emptyset, \rightarrow, q_0, F)</math> be a push-down automaton. The language <math>\mathcal{L}(P)</math>, called the language <i>accepted</i> by the push-down automaton <math>P</math>, is given by:</p> $\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \exists q \in F \exists x \in \Delta^*: (q_0, w, \varepsilon) \vdash_P^* (q, \varepsilon, x)\}$ <p>Note that we require <math>q</math> to be a final state of <math>P</math>, i.e. <math>q \in F</math>, but <math>x</math> can be any stack content.</p>

3.2 Context-free grammars	
3.10	<p>Definition of a context-free grammar:</p> <p>A context-free grammar (CFG) is a four-tuple <math>G = (V, T, R, S)</math> where</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <math>V</math> is a non-empty finite set of variables or non-terminals,</li> <li>2. <math>T</math> is a finite set of terminals,</li> <li>3. <math>R \subseteq V \times (V \cup T)^*</math> is a finite set of production rules, and</li> <li>4. <math>S \in V</math> is the start symbol.</li> </ol> <p>Example: <math>V = \{S\}</math>, <math>T = \{a, b\}</math> and <math>R</math> consists of <math>S \rightarrow ab</math> and <math>S \rightarrow aSb</math>.</p>
3.13	<p>Definition on production, production sequence and language of a CFG.</p> <p>Let <math>G = (V, T, R, S)</math> be a context-free grammar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Let <math>A \rightarrow \alpha \in R</math> be a production rule of <math>G</math>. Thus <math>A \in V</math> and <math>\alpha \in (V \cup T)^*</math>. Let <math>\gamma = \beta_1 A \beta_2</math> be a string in which <math>A</math> occurs. Put <math>\gamma' = \beta_1 \alpha \beta_2</math>. We say that from the string <math>\gamma</math> the production rule <math>A \rightarrow \alpha</math> produces the string <math>\gamma'</math>, notation <math>\gamma \Rightarrow_G \gamma'</math>.</li> <li>• A production sequence or derivation is a sequence <math>(\gamma_i)_{i=0}^n</math> such that <math>\gamma_{i-1} \Rightarrow_G \gamma_i</math>, for <math>1 \leq i \leq n</math>. Often we write <math display="block">\gamma_0 \Rightarrow_G \gamma_1 \Rightarrow_G \dots \Rightarrow_G \gamma_{n-1} \Rightarrow_G \gamma_n</math> <p>The length of this production sequence is <math>n</math>. In case <math>\gamma = \gamma_0</math> and <math>\gamma' = \gamma_n</math> we also write <math>\gamma \Rightarrow_G^* \gamma'</math>.</p> </li> <li>• Let <math>A \in V</math> be a variable of <math>G</math>. The language <math>\mathcal{L}_G(A)</math> generated by <math>G</math> from <math>A</math> is given by <math display="block">\mathcal{L}_G(A) = \{w \in T^* \mid A \Rightarrow_G^* w\}</math> </li> <li>• The language <math>\mathcal{L}(G)</math>, the language generated by the CFG <math>G</math>, consists of all strings of terminals that can be produced from the start symbol <math>S</math>, i.e. <math display="block">\mathcal{L}(G) = \mathcal{L}_G(S)</math> </li> <li>• A language <math>L</math> is called context-free, if there exists a context-free grammar <math>G</math> such that <math>L = \mathcal{L}(G)</math>.</li> </ul>
3.15	<p>Lemma on splitting and combining production sequences. This technical lemma summarizes the context independence of the machinery introduced and is used in many situations. Let <math>G = (V, T, R, S)</math> be a context-free grammar.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Let <math>x, x', y, y' \in (V \cup T)^*</math>. If <math>x \Rightarrow_G^n x'</math> and <math>y \Rightarrow_G^m y'</math> then <math>xy \Rightarrow_G^{n+m} x'y'</math>.</li> <li>(b) Let <math>k \geq 1</math>, <math>X_1, \dots, X_k \in V \cup T</math>, <math>n_1, \dots, n_k \geq 0</math>, and <math>x_1, \dots, x_k \in (V \cup T)^*</math>. If <math>X_1 \Rightarrow_G^{n_1} x_1, \dots, X_k \Rightarrow_G^{n_k} x_k</math>, then <math>X_1 \dots X_k \Rightarrow_G^n x_1 \dots x_k</math> where <math>n = n_1 + \dots + n_k</math>.</li> <li>(c) Let <math>X_1, \dots, X_k \in V \cup T</math>, and <math>x \in (V \cup T)^*</math>. If <math>X_1 \dots X_k \Rightarrow_G^n x</math> then exist <math>n_1, \dots, n_k \geq 0</math>, and <math>x_1, \dots, x_k \in (V \cup T)^*</math> such that <math>n = n_1 + \dots + n_k</math>, <math>X_1 \Rightarrow_G^{n_1} x_1, \dots, X_k \Rightarrow_G^{n_k} x_k</math>, and <math>x = x_1 \dots x_k</math>.</li> </ol>

3.17	<p>Definition on left- and rightmost production and sequence.</p> <p>Let <math>G = (V, T, R, S)</math> be a context-free grammar. A production <math>\gamma \Rightarrow_G \gamma'</math> is called a leftmost production if <math>\gamma'</math> is obtained from <math>\gamma</math> by application of a production rule of <math>G</math> on the leftmost variable occurring in <math>\gamma</math>, i.e., <math>\gamma = wA\beta</math>, <math>A \rightarrow \alpha</math> a rule of <math>G</math>, <math>\gamma' = w\alpha\beta</math> for some <math>w \in T^*</math>, <math>A \in V</math>, and <math>\alpha, \beta \in (V \cup T)^*</math>. Notation, <math>\gamma \xRightarrow{l}_G \gamma'</math>. A leftmost derivation of <math>G</math> is a production sequence <math>(\gamma_i)_{i=0}^n</math> of <math>G</math> for which every production is leftmost. Notation, <math>\gamma \xRightarrow{l}_G^* \gamma'</math>. Similarly, one can define the notion of a rightmost production and a rightmost derivation for a CFG <math>G</math>.</p>
3.18	<p>Theorem: If <math>L</math> is a regular language, then <math>L</math> is also context-free.</p> <p>How to prove:</p> <p>Let <math>D = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)</math> be a deterministic automaton that accepts <math>L</math>. Define the grammar <math>G = (Q, \Sigma, R, q_0)</math> where <math>R</math> is given by</p> $R = \{q \rightarrow aq' \mid \delta(q, a) = q'\} \cup \{q \rightarrow \varepsilon \mid q \in F\}$ <p>Then prove that <math>L \subseteq \mathcal{L}(G)</math> as well as the other way around, with the help of a string <math>w \in L</math>, from which you may conclude that: <math>L = \mathcal{L}(G)</math>.</p> <p>Note: the reverse of this theorem does <i>not</i> hold!</p>
<b>3.3 Parse trees</b>	
3.19	<p>Definition of parse trees:</p> <p>Let <math>G = (V, T, R, S)</math> be a context-free grammar. The collection <math>\mathcal{PT}_G</math> of parse trees of <math>G</math>, a set of rooted node-labeled trees, is given as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single root tree <math>[X]</math> with root labeled <math>X</math> is a parse tree for <math>G</math> if <math>X</math> is a variable or terminal of <math>G</math>.</li> <li>• A two-node tree <math>[A \rightarrow \varepsilon]</math>, with root labeled <math>A</math> and leaf labeled <math>\varepsilon</math> is a parse tree for <math>G</math> if <math>A \in V</math> and <math>A \rightarrow \varepsilon</math> is a production rule of <math>G</math>.</li> <li>• If <math>PT_1, PT_2, \dots, PT_k</math> are <math>k</math> parse trees for <math>G</math> with roots <math>X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k</math>, respectively, and <math>A \rightarrow X_1X_2\dots X_k</math> is a production rule of <math>G</math>, then the tree <math>[A \rightarrow PT_1, PT_2, \dots, PT_k]</math> with root labeled <math>A</math> and subtrees of the root <math>PT_1, PT_2, \dots, PT_k</math> is a parse tree for <math>G</math>.</li> </ul> <p>Definition of yield function:</p> <p>The yield function: <math>yield : \mathcal{PT}_G \rightarrow (V \cup T)^*</math> with respect to <math>G</math> is given by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>yield([X]) = X</math> for <math>X \in V \cup T</math>,</li> <li>• <math>yield([A \rightarrow \varepsilon]) = \varepsilon</math> for <math>A \in V</math>,</li> <li>• <math>yield([A \rightarrow PT_1, PT_2, \dots, PT_k]) = yield(PT_1) * yield(PT_2) * \dots * yield(PT_k)</math> for <math>A \in V, PT_1, \dots, PT_k \in \mathcal{PT}_G</math>.</li> </ul>