

## 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  $\Sigma$  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  $\Sigma$ . **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  $\Sigma$ . **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  $\Sigma$ , 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  $\Sigma$ , 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 $\Sigma$ is closed under complementation.
	The class of regular languages over $\Sigma$ is closed under union.
	The class of regular languages over $\Sigma$ is closed under intersection.
	The class of regular languages over $\Sigma$ is closed under concatenation.
	The class of regular languages over $\Sigma$ is closed under Kleene star.
	The class of context-free languages over $\Sigma$ is closed under complementation.
	The class of context-free languages over $\Sigma$ is closed under union.
	The class of context-free languages over $\Sigma$ is closed under intersection.
	The class of context-free languages over $\Sigma$ is closed under concatenation.
	The class of context-free languages over $\Sigma$ is closed under Kleene star.

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

$\Sigma^*$	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  $\Sigma$  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  $\Gamma$  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:



# Week4 wednesday

Regular sets are not the end of the story

- Many nice / simple / important sets are not regular
- Limitation of the finite-state automaton model: Can't "count", Can only remember finitely far into the past, Can't backtrack, Must make decisions in "real-time"
- We know actual computers are more powerful than this model...

The **next** model of computation. Idea: allow some memory of unbounded size. How?

- To generalize regular expressions: **context-free grammars**
- To generalize NFA: **Pushdown automata**, which is like an NFA with access to a stack: Number of states is fixed, number of entries in stack is unbounded. At each step (1) Transition to new state based on current state, letter read, and top letter of stack, then (2) (Possibly) push or pop a letter to (or from) top of stack. Accept a string iff there is some sequence of states and some sequence of stack contents which helps the PDA process the entire input string and ends in an accepting state.

Is there a PDA that recognizes the nonregular language  $\{0^n 1^n \mid n \geq 0\}$ ?



The PDA with state diagram above can be informally described as:

Read symbols from the input. As each 0 is read, push it onto the stack. As soon as 1s are seen, pop a 0 off the stack for each 1 read. If the stack becomes empty and we are at the end of the input string, accept the input. If the stack becomes empty and there are 1s left to read, or if 1s are finished while the stack still contains 0s, or if any 0s appear in the string following 1s, reject the input.

Trace the computation of this PDA on the input string 01.

Trace the computation of this PDA on the input string 011.

A PDA recognizing the set  $\{0^n 1^n \mid n \geq 1\}$  can be informally described as:

Read symbols from the input. As each 0 is read, push it onto the stack. As soon as 1s are seen, pop a 0 off the stack for each 1 read. If the stack becomes empty and there is exactly one 1 left to read, read that 1 and accept the input. If the stack becomes empty and there are either zero or more than one 1s left to read, or if the 1s are finished while the stack still contains 0s, or if any 0s appear in the input following 1s, reject the input.

Modify the state diagram below to get a PDA that implements this description:



**Definition** A **pushdown automaton** (PDA) is specified by a 6-tuple  $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)$  where  $Q$  is the finite set of states,  $\Sigma$  is the input alphabet,  $\Gamma$  is the stack alphabet,

$$\delta : Q \times \Sigma_\epsilon \times \Gamma_\epsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma_\epsilon)$$

is the transition function,  $q_0 \in Q$  is the start state,  $F \subseteq Q$  is the set of accept states.

Draw the state diagram and give the formal definition of a PDA with  $\Sigma = \Gamma$ .

Draw the state diagram and give the formal definition of a PDA with  $\Sigma \cap \Gamma = \emptyset$ .

*Extra practice:* Consider the state diagram of a PDA with input alphabet  $\Sigma$  and stack alphabet  $\Gamma$ .

Label	means
$a, b; c$ when $a \in \Sigma, b \in \Gamma, c \in \Gamma$	
$a, \varepsilon; c$ when $a \in \Sigma, c \in \Gamma$	
$a, b; \varepsilon$ when $a \in \Sigma, b \in \Gamma$	
$a, \varepsilon; \varepsilon$ when $a \in \Sigma$	

How does the meaning change if  $a$  is replaced by  $\varepsilon$ ?

*Note: alternate notation is to replace ; with  $\rightarrow$*

## Week4 friday

For the PDA state diagrams below,  $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ .

Mathematical description of language

State diagram of PDA recognizing language  
 $\Gamma = \{\$, \#\}$



$\Gamma = \{ @, 1 \}$



$$\{0^i 1^j 0^k \mid i, j, k \geq 0\}$$

*Big picture:* PDAs were motivated by wanting to add some memory of unbounded size to NFA. How do we accomplish a similar enhancement of regular expressions to get a syntactic model that is more expressive?

DFA, NFA, PDA: Machines process one input string at a time; the computation of a machine on its input string reads the input from left to right.

Regular expressions: Syntactic descriptions of all strings that match a particular pattern; the language described by a regular expression is built up recursively according to the expression's syntax

**Context-free grammars:** Rules to produce one string at a time, adding characters from the middle, beginning, or end of the final string as the derivation proceeds.

Term	Typical symbol	Definition
<b>Context-free grammar</b> (CFG)	$G$	$G = (V, \Sigma, R, S)$
<b>Variables</b>	$V$	Finite set of symbols that represent phases in production pattern
<b>Terminals</b>	$\Sigma$	Alphabet of symbols of strings generated by CFG $V \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$
<b>Rules</b>	$R$	Each rule is $A \rightarrow u$ with $A \in V$ and $u \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*$
Start variable	$S$	Usually on LHS of first / topmost rule
<b>Derivation</b>	$S \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow w$	Sequence of substitutions in a CFG Start with start variable, apply one rule to one occurrence of a variable at a time
<b>Language</b> generated by the CFG $G$	$L(G)$	$\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \text{there is derivation in } G \text{ that ends in } w\} = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid S \Rightarrow^* w\}$
<b>Context-free language</b>		A language that is the language generated by some CFG
Sipser pages 102-103		

**Examples of context-free grammars, derivations in those grammars, and the languages generated by those grammars**

$G_1 = (\{S\}, \{0\}, R, S)$  with rules

$$S \rightarrow 0S$$

$$S \rightarrow 0$$

In  $L(G_1)$  ...

Not in  $L(G_1)$  ...

$$G_2 = (\{S\}, \{0, 1\}, R, S)$$

$$S \rightarrow 0S \mid 1S \mid \varepsilon$$

In  $L(G_2) \dots$

Not in  $L(G_2) \dots$

$(\{S, T\}, \{0, 1\}, R, S)$  with rules

$$S \rightarrow T1T1T1T$$

$$T \rightarrow 0T \mid 1T \mid \varepsilon$$

In  $L(G_3) \dots$

Not in  $L(G_3) \dots$

$G_4 = (\{A, B\}, \{0, 1\}, R, A)$  with rules

$$A \rightarrow 0A0 \mid 0A1 \mid 1A0 \mid 1A1 \mid 1$$

In  $L(G_4)$  ...

Not in  $L(G_4)$  ...

*Extra practice:* Is there a CFG  $G$  with  $L(G) = \emptyset$ ?