

Top Hat #
8479

Extra/FYI/ Solution to (h) problems mid-40s.
Consider $\Sigma = \{0,1\}$ and any language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$

For all x in Σ^* define: $row_L(x)$ to be the infinite vector

$$row_L(x) = (L(x), L(x0), L(x1), L(x00), L(x01), \dots, L(x^z), \dots)$$

(all $z \in \Sigma^*$)

Then $x \equiv_L y$ if and only if $row_L(x) = row_L(y)$. A PD set for L has all distinct rows.

Full Myhill Nerode Theorem: L is regular \Leftrightarrow there are only finitely many distinct $row_L(x)$ vectors \Leftrightarrow all PD sets for L are finite. We have seen the \Rightarrow direction in contrast.

Proof (\Leftarrow): Suppose there only finitely many distinct rows.

Define $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, s, F)$ as follows: $Q = \{ \text{distinct rows} \}$

$\delta(row_L(x), c) = row_L(xc)$

$S = row_L(\epsilon)$. both finite!

$F = \{ row_L(x) : x \in L \}$

Since $row_L(x)$ itself is the object, it doesn't matter which x .

Then $L(M) = L$, and since Q is finite, M is a DFA, so $L \in REG$

Corollary: The number K of distinct rows, which equals the max size of a PD for L, equals the min # of states needed by a DFA for L, and the M in the proof is the unique DFA achieving it.

More Non(?) regular Language Examples: Consider ⁽²⁾

$$L_1 = \{ x \cdot y : \#0(x) = \#1(y) \}$$

Intension (intent)
vs Extension (semantics)
actual behavior.

$$L_2 = \{ x0y : \#0(x) = \#1(y) \}$$

"Proof" that L_1 is non-regular: Take $S = 0^*$. Clearly infinite.

Let any $x, y \in S$, $x \neq y$, be given. Then we can write $x = 0^m$, $y = 0^n$, where wlog. $m < n$. Take $z = 1^n$.

Then $xz = 0^m 1^n \notin L_1$ ^{wrong why?} since $n \neq m$ but $yz = 0^n 1^n \in L_1$.
So $L(xz) \neq L(yz)$, and since S infinite, this proves the "theorem".

Let's try $m=3, n=5$ $x=000$ $z=11111$. Is $xz = 00011111 \in L_1$?
 $w = 00011 \cdot 111$

Re-define $L_1 = \{ w : w \text{ can be broken as } w = uv \text{ st. } \#0(u) = \#1(v) \}$
Thus the "proof" is wrong. In fact, L_1 is regular!

$L_1 = \Sigma^*$: Given any $w \in \Sigma^n$, $|w| = n$.
For each i , $0 \leq i \leq n$, define $f(i) = \#0(x_1 \dots x_i) - \#1(x_{i+1} \dots x_n)$
 $f(0) = -\#1(x)$ which is ≤ 0 . $f(i)$ steps up by +1 (or 0) or -1 from $f(i-1)$.
 $f(n) = \#0(x)$ which is ≥ 0 . \therefore there is an i st. $f(i) = 0$. Take $u = x_1 \dots x_i$, $v = x_{i+1} \dots x_n$.
So $w \in L_1$, and since $w \in \Sigma^n$ is arbitrary, $L = \Sigma^*$ which is regular = $(0+1)^*$.

This proof does not work for L_2 because the "step up to 0" could be when $x_i = 1$. Then we don't get the needed 0 in $x0y$.

Re-define $L_2 = \{w \in \{0,1\}^* : w \text{ can be broken as } w =: u \cdot 0 \cdot v \text{ st. } \#0(u) = \#1(v)\}$.

Proof that L_2 is non-regular: Take $S = 0^*$ (clearly infinite).

Let any $x, y \in S, x \neq y$, be given. Then we can write $x = 0^m, y = 0^n$ where wlog $m < n$. Take $z = 1^n$.

Then $xz = 0^m 1^{n-1} \notin L_2$ since any possible parse $xz =: u0v$ uses one of the 0s from the 0^m part, but then $\#0(u) \leq m-1$ while $\#1(v) = n-1$.

They can't be equal since $m-1 < n-1$. Whereas $yz = 0^{n-1} 1^{n-1} \in L_2$,

because it parses as $0^{n-1} \cdot 0 \cdot 1^{n-1}$ so $L(xz) \neq L(yz)$.

Since $x, y \in S$ are arbitrary and S is infinite, $L_2 \notin REG$.

Ch 2 Preview

What kind of formalism can describe languages like L_2 ?

Note: $w = 10$ OK $w = 01$? $\therefore S \rightarrow 0$
 $\epsilon \notin L_2$ $w = 00$ Not OK. $S \rightarrow 1S$
 $0 \in L_2$ OK? yes Must balance $S \rightarrow S0$
 acts as since it by sending the $S \rightarrow S0$
 a base parses as base 0 to $S \rightarrow 0S$
 case. $w = \epsilon \cdot 0 \cdot 0$ $w = 0 \cdot 0 \cdot 1$. Abbreviate as

$G: S \rightarrow 0 | 1S | S0 | 0S1$ Claim: $L(G) = L_2$.

$G': S \rightarrow 0S0 | 1S1 | \epsilon | 0 | 1$. $L(G') = PAL$ the set of palindromes