## Assignment # 7.1a Sample Key

1. For the following languges, either provide a grammar to show it is a CFL or employ the Pumping Lemma to show it is not

a.) L = { a<sup>i</sup> b<sup>j</sup> | j > 2\*I }

This language is a CFL. A grammar that works is  $S \rightarrow aSbb \mid Sb \mid b$ 

# Assignment # 7.1b Sample Key

1. b.) L = { a<sup>n</sup> b<sup>Fib(n)</sup> | n>0 }, where Fib(i) is the i<sup>th</sup> Fibonacci number

PL: Provides N>0

We: Choose  $a^N b^{N!} \in L$ 

PL: Splits  $a^N b^{N!}$  into uvwxy,  $|vwx| \le N$ , |vx| > 0, such that  $\forall i \ge 0 uv^i wx^i y \in L$ 

*We: Choose i=2* 

Case 1: vwx contains only b's, then we are increasing the number of b's while leaving the number of a's unchanged. In this case  $uv^2wx^2y$  is of form  $a^Nb^{N!+c}$ , c>0 and this is not in L.

Case 2: vwx contains some a's and maybe some b's. Under this circumstances  $uv^2wx^2y$  has at least N+1 a's and at most N!+N-1 b's. But (N+1)! = N!(N+1) = N!\*N+N  $\ge$  N!+N > N!+N-1 and so is not in L.

Cases 1 and 2 cover all possible situations, so L is not a CFL

### Assignment # 7.2 Sample Key

2. Consider the context-free grammar **G** = ( { S } , { a , b } , S , P ), where P is:

 $S \rightarrow SaSbS \mid SbSaS \mid SaSaS \mid a \mid \lambda$ 

Provide the first part of the proof that

L(G) = L = { w | w has at least as many a's as b's }

That is, show that  $L(G) \subseteq L$ 

To attack this problem we can first introduce the notation that, for a syntactic form  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha_a =$  the number of **a's** in  $\alpha$ , and  $\alpha_b =$  the number of **b's** in  $\alpha$ . Using this, we show that if **S**  $\Rightarrow * \alpha$ , then  $\alpha_b \leq \alpha_a$  and hence that **L**(**G**)  $\subseteq$  **L**:

A straightforward approach is to show, inductively on the number of steps, **i**, in a derivation, that, if  $\mathbf{S} \Rightarrow i \alpha$ , then  $\alpha_b \leq \alpha_a$ .

### Assignment # 7.2 Sample Key

Basis (i=1): Since  $S \Rightarrow \alpha$  iff  $S \Rightarrow \alpha$  and all rhs of S have  $\alpha_b \le \alpha_a$  then the base case holds

- IH: Assume if  $S \Rightarrow_m \alpha$  , then  $\alpha_b \le \alpha_a$  , whenever  $m \le n$
- IS: Show that if  $S \Rightarrow_{n+1} \alpha$  , then  $\alpha_b \leq \alpha_a$
- If S  $\alpha$  then S  $\Rightarrow_n \beta$  and  $\beta \Rightarrow \alpha$

Since G has only one non-terminal S, the rewriting of  $\beta$  to  $\alpha$  involves a single application of one of the S-rules. By the I.H.,  $\beta$  has the property that  $\beta_b \leq \beta_a$ . Since a single application of an S rule either adds no b's or a's, one a, one a and one b, or two b's, we have the three following cases:

#### Assignment # 7.2 Sample key

Case 0:	$\alpha_a = \beta_a$ , and $\alpha_b = \beta_b$
	In which case, using the IH, we have:
	$\beta_{\rm b} \leq \beta_{\rm a} \rightarrow \alpha_{\rm b} \leq \alpha_{\rm a}$
Case 1:	$\alpha_{\rm b} = \beta_{\rm b}$ , and $\alpha_{\rm a} = \beta_{\rm a} + 1$
	In which case, using the IH, we have:
	$\beta_{\rm b} \leq \beta_{\rm a} \rightarrow \alpha_{\rm b} \leq \alpha_{\rm a}$
Case 2:	$\alpha_{\rm b}$ = $\beta_{\rm b}$ +1, and $\alpha_{\rm a}$ = $\beta_{\rm a}$ +1
	In which case, using the IH, we have:
	$\beta_{\rm b} \leq \beta_{\rm a} \rightarrow \alpha_{\rm b} \leq \alpha_{\rm a}$
Case 3:	$\alpha_{\rm b} = \beta_{\rm b}$ , and $\alpha_{\rm a} = \beta_{\rm a} + 2$
	In which case, using the IH, we have:
	$\beta_{\rm b} \leq \beta_{\rm a} \rightarrow \alpha_{\rm b} \leq \alpha_{\rm a}$