

Tutorial - 7

Name = P.V. Srimam

Roll = 1801CS37

1) Proof by contradiction:

We initially consider two context free languages and prove their intersection is not context free.

$$\text{Let } L_1 = \{a^m b^n c^n \mid n \geq 0 \text{ and } m \geq 0\}$$

$$L_2 = \{a^n b^n c^m \mid n \geq 0 \text{ and } m \geq 0\}$$

L_1 :

$$S \rightarrow aS$$

$$S \rightarrow bAc$$

$$A \rightarrow bAc \mid \lambda$$

L_2 :

$$S \rightarrow Sc$$

$$S \rightarrow aAb$$

$$A \rightarrow aAb \mid \lambda$$

Here both are context free grammars.

$$\text{although } L_1 \cap L_2 = \{a^n b^n c^n \mid n \geq 0\}$$

In PDA, we can compare only two characters at a time using the stack. But as we have to ensure equal number of 'a', 'b', 'c', we will not be able to do so using context free grammar

$\therefore L_1 \cap L_2$ is not context free

2) Given,

$$L_1 = \{a^n b^n c^m\} \text{ and } L_2 = \{a^m b^n c^n\}, \text{ two}$$

context free grammar.

$$\underline{L_1 \cap L_2}$$

L_1 requires equal number of 'a', 'b'. And L_2 requires equal number of 'b', 'c'. Now, ~~the~~ considering these conditions together, we need the intersection language to have both equal no. of 'a', 'b' and 'b', 'c'.

$$1. e) \quad n(a) = n(b) = k_1$$

$$n(b) = n(c) = k_2$$

$$k_1 = k_2 = n(b) \Rightarrow n(a) = n(b) = n(c)$$

$\therefore L_1 \cap L_2$ should have equal number of 'a', 'b', 'c'.

$$\Rightarrow L_1 \cap L_2 = \{a^n b^n c^n\}$$

Since in a PDA we cannot ensure that more than 2 characters to have same frequency this is a non context free grammar.

3) Proof by contradiction,

RTP: Context free languages are not closed under complement.

ie) If L_1 is a CFL then $\overline{L_1}$ may not be a CFL.

Let us consider that statement is true.

and L_1, L_2 are CFL

We know that $L_1 \cup L_2$ is CFL.

$$\text{Now } \overline{L_1 \cup L_2} = \overline{L_1} \cap \overline{L_2}.$$

Now from our initial assumption, we get that $\overline{L_1}, \overline{L_2}$ are also CFL.

But as intersection of two CFL may not be CFL, there is no guarantee that $\overline{L_1} \cap \overline{L_2}$ is CFL

\Rightarrow No guarantee that $\overline{L_1 \cup L_2}$ is CFL

$$\therefore L_1 \cup L_2 \not\stackrel{\text{CFL}}{\Rightarrow} \overline{L_1 \cup L_2} \text{ CFL}$$

$$\text{Hence } L_1 \text{ (CFL)} \not\Rightarrow \overline{L_1} \text{ (CFL)}$$

Hence proved.