

# Week One, Lecture Two

Proof - Combination of mathematical notation and human language that provides a convincing argument for the truth of a statement.

## Models of Computations

### Strings

To define strings, we need an alphabet where an **alphabet** is defined as any nonempty finite set of elements called **symbols**, which you - as a reader - must set aside from your conceptions of meaning. For example, the Greek letter pi which usually means the irrational number 3.1415... here is just another written symbol.

A **string** is a finite sequence of symbols.

Assume our alphabet is  $\{0, 1\}$ . What are all the possible strings you can create from this alphabet?

- 0, 1, 00, 01, 10, ...
- All the possible strings from an alphabet (denoted by  $\Sigma^+$  (reads "sigma plus")) form an *infinite* set of *finite* strings.

Note that the sigma plus of an alphabet is *not* the same as the power set because sigma plus is a *sequence* of all possible strings. If it were the power set, then "00" would be the same as "0" as they are comprised of the same elements.

**Concatenation** is represented by a dot  $\cdot$ .

A **language** is a set of strings over some alphabet. For example, a language over the binary alphabet earlier can be  $\{00, 01, 10, 11\}$ .

You can even concatenate languages! If we have two languages  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ , then:

$$L_1 \cdot L_2 = \{ x \cdot y \mid x \in L_1, y \in L_2 \}$$

If  $L_1 = \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$  and  $L_2 = \{0, 1\}$ , then  $L_1 \cdot L_2$  is  $\{000, 010, 100, 110, 001, 011, 101, 111\}$ . In this example,  $L_1 \cdot L_2 = L_2 \cdot L_1$  i.e. it is commutative, HOWEVER this is NOT usually the case and is definitely not strictly true. Despite the shared symbol, concatenation is not commutative like multiplication.

- The empty set is similar to zero in multiplication however, in that  $L_1 \cdot \emptyset = \emptyset$ .  $L_1 \cdot \emptyset$  is NOT  $L_1$ .
- If the empty set is like zero, then do we have an equivalent to 1? Such that  $\_ \cdot W = W$ ?
- Yes! It's called epsilon  $\epsilon$  or **the empty string**. It has *length* zero however.

How is epsilon different from the empty set? First, we define **sigma star** as sigma plus union with epsilon.

$$\Sigma^+ = \{\text{all possible strings over an alphabet}\}$$
$$\Sigma^* = \Sigma^+ \cup \{\epsilon\}$$

Epsilon is the *identity* operation for string concatenation; empty set is the *anihilator*.

Say we have a language  $L$  which comprises the set of all American currency strings. For this, we consider 1.99, 17.00, \$0.99, and \$0 to be valid and leading zeroes (except the special \$0 case) (e.g. 01.99), , 9, \$.99 to be INVALID.

Write an FSA which models this language.