

**Generally useful information.**

- When I say a set  $S$  is re, unless I explicitly say otherwise, you may assume any of the following equivalent characterizations:
  1.  $S$  is either empty or the range of a total recursive function  $f_S$ .
  2.  $S$  is the domain of a partial recursive function  $g_S$ .
- If I say a function  $g$  is partially computable, then there is an index  $g$  (I know that's overloading, but that's okay as long as we understand each other), such that  $\Phi_g(x) = \Phi(x, g) = g(x)$ . Here  $\Phi$  is a universal partially recursive function.  
 Moreover, there is a primitive recursive function **STP**, such that **STP**( $x, g, t$ ) is **1** (true), just in case  $g$ , started on  $x$ , halts in  $t$  or fewer steps.  
**STP**( $x, g, t$ ) is **0** (false), otherwise.  
 Finally, there is another primitive recursive function **VALUE**, such that **VALUE**( $x, g, t$ ) is  $g(x)$ , whenever **STP**( $x, g, t$ ).  
**VALUE**( $x, g, t$ ) is defined but meaningless if  $\sim$ **STP**( $x, g, t$ ).
- The notation  $f(x)\downarrow$  means that  $f$  converges when computing with input  $x$ , but we don't care about the value produced. In effect, this just means that  $x$  is in the domain of  $f$ .
- The notation  $f(x)\uparrow$  means  $f$  diverges when computing with input  $x$ . In effect, this just means that  $x$  is **not** in the domain of  $f$ .
- The Post Correspondence problem is known to be undecidable. This problem is characterized by instances that are described by two  $n$ -ary sequences of non-empty words  $\langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \rangle, \langle y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n \rangle$ . The question is whether or not there exists a sequence,  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k$ , such that  $x_{i_1}x_{i_2}\dots x_{i_k} = y_{i_1}y_{i_2}\dots y_{i_k}$
- The language  $\{ww \mid w \text{ is a word in some alphabet with more than one letter}\}$  is not a CFL.  
 The language  $\{a^n b^n c^n \mid n \geq 0\}$  is not a CFL. The language  $\{a^n b^n \mid n \geq 0\}$  is not **Regular**.
- When I ask for a reduction of one set of indices to another, the formal rule is that you must produce a function that takes an index of one function and produces the index of another having whatever property you require. However, I allow some laxness here. You can start with a function, given its index, and produce another function, knowing it will have a computable index. For example, given  $f$ , a unary function, I might define  $g_f$ , another unary function, by  $g_f(0) = f(0)$   
 $g_f(y+1) = g_f(y) + f(y+1)$   
 This would get  $g_f(x)$  as the sum of the values of  $f(0)+f(1)+\dots+f(x)$ , which could be useful.

1. Choosing from among **(D) decidable**, **(U) undecidable**, **(?) unknown**, categorize each of the following decision problems. No proofs are required.

| Problem / Language Class          | Regular | Context Free | Context Sensitive |
|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|
| $L = \Sigma^*$ ?                  |         |              |                   |
| $L = \phi$ ?                      |         |              |                   |
| $L = L^2$ ?                       |         |              |                   |
| $x \in L^2$ , for arbitrary $x$ ? |         |              |                   |

2. Choosing from among **(Y) yes**, **(N) No**, **(?) unknown**, categorize each of the following closure properties. No proofs are required.

| Problem / Language Class                      | Regular | Context Free |
|---|---------|--------------|
| Closed under intersection?                    |         |              |
| Closed under quotient?                        |         |              |
| Closed under quotient with Regular languages? |         |              |
| Closed under complement?                      |         |              |

3. Consider the two operations on languages **max** and **min**, where  
 $\text{max}(L) = \{ x \mid x \in L \text{ and, for no } y \text{ does } xy \in L \}$  and  
 $\text{min}(L) = \{ x \mid x \in L \text{ and, for no prefix of } x, y, \text{ does } y \in L \}$   
 Describe the languages produced by **max** and **min**. for each of the following:

$$L_1 = \{ a^i b^j c^k \mid k \leq i \text{ or } k \leq j \}$$

$$\text{max}(L_1) = \underline{\hspace{10em}}$$

$$\text{min}(L_1) = \underline{\hspace{10em}}$$

$$L_2 = \{ a^i b^j c^k \mid k > i \text{ or } k > j \}$$

$$\text{max}(L_2) = \underline{\hspace{10em}}$$

$$\text{min}(L_2) = \underline{\hspace{10em}}$$

4. Prove that any class of languages,  $C$ , closed under union, concatenation, intersection with regular languages, homomorphism and substitution (e.g., the Context-Free Languages) is closed under **MissingMiddle**, where, assuming  $L$  is over the alphabet  $\Sigma$ ,

$$\mathbf{MissingMiddle}(L) = \{ xz \mid \exists y \in \Sigma^* \text{ such that } xyz \in L \}$$

You must be very explicit, describing what is produced by each transformation you apply.

5. Use **PCP** to show the undecidability of the problem to determine if the intersection of two context free languages is non-empty. That is, show how to create two grammars  $G_A$  and  $G_B$  based on some instance  $P = \langle \langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \rangle, \langle y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n \rangle \rangle$  of **PCP**, such that  $L(G_A) \cap L(G_B) \neq \emptyset$  iff  $P$  has a solution. Assume that  $P$  is over the alphabet  $\Sigma$ . You should discuss what languages your grammars produce and why this is relevant, but no formal proof is required.

6. Consider the set of indices  $\mathbf{CONSTANT} = \{ f \mid \exists K \forall y [ \varphi_f(y) = K ] \}$ . Use Rice's Theorem to show that  $\mathbf{CONSTANT}$  is not recursive. Hint: There are two properties that must be demonstrated.

7. Show that  $\mathbf{CONSTANT} \equiv_m \mathbf{TOT}$ , where  $\mathbf{TOT} = \{ f \mid \forall y \varphi_f(y) \downarrow \}$ .

8. Why does Rice's Theorem have nothing to say about each of the following? Explain by showing some condition of Rice's Theorem that is not met by the stated property.

a.) **AT-LEAST-LINEAR** = {  $f \mid \forall y \ \varphi_f(y)$  converges in no fewer than  $y$  steps }.

b.) **HAS-IMPOSTER** = {  $f \mid \exists g \ [ g \neq f \text{ and } \forall y \ [ \varphi_g(y) = \varphi_f(y) ] ]$  }.

9. The trace language of a computational device like a Turing Machine is a language of the form

**Trace** = {  $C_1\#C_2\# \dots C_n\# \mid C_i \Rightarrow C_{i+1}, 1 \leq i < n$  }

**Trace** is Context Sensitive, non-Context Free. Actually, a trace language typically has every other configuration word reversed, but the concept is the same. Oddly, the complement of such a trace is Context Free. Explain what makes its complement a **CFL**. In other words, describe the characteristics of this complement and why these characteristics are amenable to a **CFG** description.

**Note:** Reversing the second word in a pair is important here if you're thinking about Turing Machines but is irrelevant for **FRS with Residue**. Thus, don't make reversal an issue in your discussion. Also, here's a start for you, assuming  $\Sigma$  is the alphabet of configuration words.

Let  $R = (\Sigma + \#)^*##(\Sigma + \#)^* + \Sigma^* + \#(\Sigma + \#)^* + (\Sigma + \#)^*\Sigma^+$

**R** is a regular expression that describes all words that do not look like sequences of configurations. Your job now is to describe **BadTrace**, the rest of the complement of **Trace** and discuss why it's a **CFL**.