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, Σ is the input alphabet, Γ is the stack alphabet,

$$\delta: Q \times \Sigma_{\varepsilon} \times \Gamma_{\varepsilon} \to \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma_{\varepsilon})$$


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

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

$$\Gamma = \{\$, \#\}$$




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



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

Note: alternate notation is to replace; with \rightarrow on arrow labels.



Proof idea: Declare stack alphabet to be $\Gamma = \Sigma$ and then don't use stack at all.

Big picture: PDAs are 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.

Definitions below are on pages 101-102.

Term	Typical symbol	Meaning
	or Notation	
Context-free grammar (CFG)	G	$G = (V, \Sigma, R, S)$
The set of variables	V	Finite set of symbols that represent phases in pro-
		duction pattern
The set of terminals	Σ	Alphabet of symbols of strings generated by CFG $V \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$
The set of rules	R	Each rule is $A \to u$ with $A \in V$ and $u \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*$
The start variable	S	Usually on left-hand-side of first/ topmost rule
Derivation	$S \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow w$	Sequence of substitutions in a CFG (also written $S \Rightarrow^* w$). At each step, we can apply one rule to one occurrence of a variable in the current string by substituting that occurrence of the variable with the right-hand-side of the rule. The derivation must end when the current string has only terminals (no variables) because then there are no instances of
Language generated by the context-free grammar G	L(G)	variables to apply a rule to. The set of strings for which there is a derivation in G . Symbolically: $\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid S \Rightarrow^* w\}$ i.e.
Context-free language		$\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \text{there is derivation in } G \text{ that ends in } w\}$ A language that is the language generated by some context-free grammar

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


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

$$S \to 0 S$$

$$S \to 0$$

In $L(G_1)$...

Not in $L(G_1)$...



In $L(G_3)$...

Not in $L(G_3)$...

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

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

In $L(G_4)$...

Not in $L(G_4)$...



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 descripton. 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.

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

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

(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 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 $i \ge 0$, $uv^ixy^iz \in A$, (2) |uv| > 0, (3) $|vxy| \le p$. We will not go into the details of the proof or application of Pumping Lemma for CFLs this quarter.

Recall: 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} \land y \in \mathbb{Z}) \to 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) \land A_2 \in \mathcal{P}(A) \in \mathbb{Z}) \to 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.				

Definition and Theorem: For an alphabet Σ , a language L over Σ is called **regular** exactly when L is recognized by some DFA, which happens exactly when L is recognized by some NFA, and happens exactly when L is described by some regular expression

We saw that: The class of regular languages is closed under complementation, union, intersection, set-wise concatenation, and Kleene star.

Extra practice:


Disprove: There is some alphabet Σ for which there is some language recognized by an NFA but not by any DFA.

Disprove: There is some alphabet Σ for which there is some finite language not described by any regular expression over Σ .

Disprove: If a language is recognized by an NFA then the complement of this language is not recognized by any DFA.

Fix alphabet Σ . Is every language L over Σ regular?

Set	Cardinality
$\{0,1\}$	
$\{0,1\}^*$	
$\mathcal{P}(\{0,1\})$	
The set of all languages over $\{0,1\}$	
The set of all regular expressions over $\{0,1\}$	
The set of all regular languages over $\{0,1\}$	



- for each $i \ge 0$, $xy^iz \in A$
- $|xy| \leq p$.

Proof idea: In DFA, the only memory available is in the states. Automata can only "remember" finitely far in the past and finitely much information, because they can have only finitely many states. If a computation path of a DFA visits the same state more than once, the machine can't tell the difference between the first time and future times it visits this state. Thus, if a DFA accepts one long string, then it must accept (infinitely) many similar strings.

Proof illustration

True or False: A pumping length for $A = \{0, 1\}^*$ is p = 5.

True or False: A pumping length for $A = \{0, 1\}^*$ is p = 2.

True or False: A pumping length for $A = \{0, 1\}^*$ is p = 105.

Restating **Pumping Lemma**: If L is a regular language, then it has a pumping length.

Contrapositive: If L has no pumping length, then it is nonregular.

The Pumping Lemma cannot be used to prove that a language is regular.

The Pumping Lemma can be used to prove that a language is not regular.

Extra practice: Exercise 1.49 in the book.

Proof strategy: To prove that a language L is **not** regular,

- ullet Consider an arbitrary positive integer p
- ullet Prove that p is not a pumping length for L
- \bullet Conclude that L does not have any pumping length, and therefore it is not regular.

Negation: A positive integer p is **not a pumping length** of a language L over Σ iff

$$\exists s \ \big(\ |s| \geq p \land s \in L \land \forall x \forall y \forall z \ \big(\ (s = xyz \land |y| > 0 \land |xy| \leq p \) \rightarrow \exists i (i \geq 0 \land xy^iz \not\in L) \big) \ \big)$$

Proof strategy: To prove that a language L is **not** regular,

- \bullet Consider an arbitrary positive integer p
- Prove that p is not a pumping length for L. A positive integer p is **not a pumping length** of a language L over Σ iff

$$\exists s \ \big(\ |s| \ge p \land s \in L \land \forall x \forall y \forall z \ \big(\ (s = xyz \land |y| > 0 \land |xy| \le p \) \rightarrow \exists i (i \ge 0 \land xy^iz \notin L) \big) \ \big)$$

Informally:

• Conclude that L does not have any pumping length, and therefore it is not regular.

Example: $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}, L = \{0^n 1^n \mid n \ge 0\}.$

Fix p an arbitrary positive integer. List strings that are in L and have length greater than or equal to p:

Pick s =

Suppose s = xyz with $|xy| \le p$ and |y| > 0.

Then when i =, $xy^iz =$

Example: $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$, $L = \{ww^{\mathcal{R}} \mid w \in \{0, 1\}^*\}$. Remember that the reverse of a string w is denoted $w^{\mathcal{R}}$ and means to write w in the opposite order, if $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$ then $w^{\mathcal{R}} = w_n \cdots w_1$. Note: $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{R}} = \varepsilon$. Fix p an arbitrary positive integer. List strings that are in L and have length greater than or equal to p: Pick s =Suppose s = xyz with $|xy| \le p$ and |y| > 0. $, xy^iz =$ Then when i =**Example**: $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}, L = \{0^j 1^k \mid j \ge k \ge 0\}.$ Fix p an arbitrary positive integer. List strings that are in L and have length greater than or equal to p: Pick s =Suppose s = xyz with $|xy| \le p$ and |y| > 0. $, xy^iz =$ Then when i =**Example**: $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}, L = \{0^n 1^m 0^n \mid m, n \ge 0\}.$ Fix p an arbitrary positive integer. List strings that are in L and have length greater than or equal to p: Pick s =Suppose s = xyz with $|xy| \le p$ and |y| > 0.

 $, xy^iz =$

Then when i =

Extra practice:

$s \in L$	$s \notin L$	Is the language regular or nonregular?
	$s \in L$	$s \in L \qquad s \notin L$

Day11

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 processes the entire input string and ends in an accepting state.

Is there a PDA that recognizes the nonregular language $\{0^n1^n \mid n \geq 0\}$?



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 a computation of this PDA on the input string 01.

Extra practice: Trace the computations of this PDA on the input string 011.

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:

