

Week5 monday

Three different CFGs that each generate the language $\{abba\}$

$$(\{S, T, V, W\}, \{a, b\}, \{S \rightarrow aT, T \rightarrow bV, V \rightarrow bW, W \rightarrow a\}, S)$$

$$(\{Q\}, \{a, b\}, \{Q \rightarrow abba\}, Q)$$

$$(\{X, Y\}, \{a, b\}, \{X \rightarrow aYa, Y \rightarrow bb\}, X)$$

Design a CFG to generate the language $\{a^n b^n \mid n \geq 0\}$

Sample derivation:

Design a CFG to generate the language $\{a^i b^j \mid j \geq i \geq 0\}$

Sample derivation:

Theorem 2.20: A language is generated by some context-free grammar if and only if it is recognized by some push-down automaton.

Definition: a language is called **context-free** if it is the language generated by a context-free grammar. The class of all context-free language over a given alphabet Σ is called **CFL**.

Consequences:

- Quick proof that every regular language is context free
- To prove closure of the class of context-free languages under a given operation, we can choose either of two modes of proof (via CFGs or PDAs) depending on which is easier
- To fully specify a PDA we could give its 6-tuple formal definition or we could give its input alphabet, stack alphabet, and state diagram. An informal description of a PDA is a step-by-step description of how its computations would process input strings; the reader should be able to reconstruct the state diagram or formal definition precisely from such a description. The informal description of a PDA can refer to some common modules or subroutines that are computable by PDAs:
 - PDAs can “test for emptiness of stack” without providing details. *How?* We can always push a special end-of-stack symbol, $\$$, at the start, before processing any input, and then use this symbol as a flag.
 - PDAs can “test for end of input” without providing details. *How?* We can transform a PDA to one where accepting states are only those reachable when there are no more input symbols.

Over $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$, let $L = \{a^n b^m \mid n \neq m\}$. **Goal:** Prove L is context-free.

Suppose L_1 and L_2 are context-free languages over Σ . **Goal:** $L_1 \cup L_2$ is also context-free.

Approach 1: with PDAs

Let $M_1 = (Q_1, \Sigma, \Gamma_1, \delta_1, q_1, F_1)$ and $M_2 = (Q_2, \Sigma, \Gamma_2, \delta_2, q_2, F_2)$ be PDAs with $L(M_1) = L_1$ and $L(M_2) = L_2$.

Define $M =$

Approach 2: with CFGs

Let $G_1 = (V_1, \Sigma, R_1, S_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, \Sigma, R_2, S_2)$ be CFGs with $L(G_1) = L_1$ and $L(G_2) = L_2$.

Define $G =$

Suppose L_1 and L_2 are context-free languages over Σ . **Goal:** $L_1 \circ L_2$ is also context-free.

Approach 1: with PDAs

Let $M_1 = (Q_1, \Sigma, \Gamma_1, \delta_1, q_1, F_1)$ and $M_2 = (Q_2, \Sigma, \Gamma_2, \delta_2, q_2, F_2)$ be PDAs with $L(M_1) = L_1$ and $L(M_2) = L_2$.

Define $M =$

Approach 2: with CFGs

Let $G_1 = (V_1, \Sigma, R_1, S_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, \Sigma, R_2, S_2)$ be CFGs with $L(G_1) = L_1$ and $L(G_2) = L_2$.

Define $G =$

Summary

Over a fixed alphabet Σ , a language L is **regular**

iff it is described by some regular expression
iff it is recognized by some DFA
iff it is recognized by some NFA

Over a fixed alphabet Σ , a language L is **context-free**

iff it is generated by some CFG
iff it is recognized by some PDA

Fact: Every regular language is a context-free language.

Fact: There are context-free languages that are not nonregular.

Fact: There are countably many regular languages.

Fact: There are countably infinitely many context-free languages.

Consequence: Most languages are **not** context-free!

Examples of non-context-free languages

$$\begin{aligned} &\{a^n b^n c^n \mid 0 \leq n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\ &\{a^i b^j c^k \mid 0 \leq i \leq j \leq k, i \in \mathbb{Z}, j \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \\ &\{ww \mid w \in \{0, 1\}^*\} \end{aligned}$$

(Sipser Ex 2.36, Ex 2.37, 2.38)

There is a Pumping Lemma for CFL that can be used to prove a specific language is non-context-free: If A is a context-free language, there there is a number p where, if s is any string in A of length at least p , then s may be divided into five pieces $s = uvxyz$ where (1) for each $i \geq 0$, $uv^i xy^i z \in A$, (2) $|uv| > 0$, (3) $|vxy| \leq p$. *We will not go into the details of the proof or application of Pumping Lemma for CFLs this quarter.*

Week5 wednesday

A set X is said to be **closed** under an operation OP if, for any elements in X , applying OP to them gives an element in X .

True/False	Closure claim
True	The set of integers is closed under multiplication. $\forall x \forall y ((x \in \mathbb{Z} \wedge y \in \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow xy \in \mathbb{Z})$
True	For each set A , the power set of A is closed under intersection. $\forall A_1 \forall A_2 ((A_1 \in \mathcal{P}(A) \wedge A_2 \in \mathcal{P}(A)) \rightarrow A_1 \cap A_2 \in \mathcal{P}(A))$
	The class of regular languages over Σ is closed under complementation.
	The class of regular languages over Σ is closed under union.
	The class of regular languages over Σ is closed under intersection.
	The class of regular languages over Σ is closed under concatenation.
	The class of regular languages over Σ is closed under Kleene star.
	The class of context-free languages over Σ is closed under complementation.
	The class of context-free languages over Σ is closed under union.
	The class of context-free languages over Σ is closed under intersection.
	The class of context-free languages over Σ is closed under concatenation.
	The class of context-free languages over Σ is closed under Kleene star.

Assume $\Sigma = \{0, 1, \#\}$

Σ^*	Regular	/	nonregular and context-free	/	not context-free
$\{0^i \# 1^j \mid i \geq 0, j \geq 0\}$	Regular	/	nonregular and context-free	/	not context-free
$\{0^i 1^j \# 1^j 0^i \mid i \geq 0, j \geq 0\}$	Regular	/	nonregular and context-free	/	not context-free
$\{0^i 1^j \# 0^i 1^j \mid i \geq 0, j \geq 0\}$	Regular	/	nonregular and context-free	/	not context-free

Turing machines: unlimited read + write memory, unlimited time (computation can proceed without “consuming” input and can re-read symbols of input)

- Division between program (CPU, state diagram) and data
- Unbounded memory gives theoretical limit to what modern computation (including PCs, supercomputers, quantum computers) can achieve
- State diagram formulation is simple enough to reason about (and diagonalize against) while expressive enough to capture modern computation

For Turing machine $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{accept}, q_{reject})$ the **computation** of M on a string w over Σ is:

- Read/write head starts at leftmost position on tape.
- Input string is written on $|w|$ -many leftmost cells of tape, rest of the tape cells have the blank symbol. **Tape alphabet** is Γ with $\sqcup \in \Gamma$ and $\Sigma \subseteq \Gamma$. The blank symbol $\sqcup \notin \Sigma$.
- Given current state of machine and current symbol being read at the tape head, the machine transitions to next state, writes a symbol to the current position of the tape head (overwriting existing symbol), and moves the tape head L or R (if possible). Formally, **transition function** is

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\}$$

- Computation ends if and when machine enters either the accept or the reject state. This is called **halting**. Note: $q_{accept} \neq q_{reject}$.

The **language recognized by the Turing machine** M , is

$$\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \text{computation of } M \text{ on } w \text{ halts after entering the accept state}\} = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid w \text{ is accepted by } M\}$$

An example Turing machine: $\Sigma =$, $\Gamma =$
 $\delta((q0, 0)) =$




Formal definition:

Sample computation:

$q0 \downarrow$						
0	0	0	□	□	□	□

The language recognized by this machine is ...

Extra practice:



Formal definition:

Sample computation: