

12 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
$L = \Sigma^* ?$	D	U	U
$L = \phi ?$	D	D	U
$L = L^2 ?$	D	U	U
$x \in L^2, \text{ for arbitrary } x ?$	D	D	D

8 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?	Y	N
Closed under quotient?	Y	N
Closed under quotient with Regular languages?	Y	Y
Closed under complement?	Y	N

8 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:

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

$$\text{max}(L_1) = \underline{\{ a^i b^j c^k \mid k = \max(i, j) \}}$$

$$\text{min}(L_1) = \underline{\{ \lambda \} \text{ (string of length 0)}}$$

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

$$\text{max}(L_2) = \underline{\{ \} \text{ (empty)}}$$

$$\text{min}(L_2) = \underline{\{ a^i b^j c^k \mid k = \min(i, j) + 1 \}}$$

- 12 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 Σ ,

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

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

Define the alphabet $\Sigma' = \{ a' \mid a \in \Sigma \}$, where, of course, a' is a “new” symbol, i.e., one not in Σ

Define homomorphisms g and h , and substitution f as follows:

$$g(a) = a' \quad \forall a \in \Sigma \quad h(a) = a \ ; \ h(a') = \lambda \quad \forall a \in \Sigma \quad f(a) = \{a, a'\} \quad \forall a \in \Sigma$$

Consider $R = \Sigma^* \bullet g(\Sigma^*) \bullet \Sigma^* = \{ x y' z \mid x, y, z \in \Sigma^* \text{ and } y' = g(y) \in \Sigma'^* \}$

Σ^* is regular since it is the Kleene star closure of a finite set.

$g(\Sigma^*)$ is regular since it is the homomorphic image of a regular language.

R is regular as it is the concatenation of regular languages.

Now, $f(L) = \{ f(w) \mid w \in L \}$ is in C since C is closed under substitution. This language is the set of strings in L with randomly selected letters primed. Any string $w \in L$ gives rise to $2^{|w|}$ strings in $f(L)$.

$f(L) \cap R = \{ x y' z \mid x y z \in L \text{ and } y' = g(y) \}$ is in C since C is closed under intersection with regular languages.

$\text{MissingMiddle}(L) = h(f(L) \cap R) = \{ x z \mid \exists y \in \Sigma^* \text{ such that } xyz \in L \}$ which is in C , since C is closed under homomorphism. *Q.E.D.*

- 10 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 Σ . You should discuss what languages your grammars produce and why this is relevant, but no formal proof is required.

$$G_A = (\{ A \}, \Sigma \cup \{ [i] \mid 1 \leq i \leq n \}, A, P_A) \quad G_B = (\{ B \}, \Sigma \cup \{ [i] \mid 1 \leq i \leq n \}, B, P_B)$$

$$P_A : A \rightarrow x_i A [i] \mid x_i [i]$$

$$P_B : A \rightarrow y_i B [i] \mid y_i [i]$$

$$L(G_A) = \{ x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_p} [i_p] \dots [i_2] [i_1] \mid p \geq 1, 1 \leq i_t \leq n, 1 \leq t \leq p \}$$

$$L(G_B) = \{ y_{j_1} y_{j_2} \dots y_{j_q} [j_q] \dots [j_2] [j_1] \mid q \geq 1, 1 \leq j_u \leq n, 1 \leq u \leq q \}$$

$$L(G_A) \cap L(G_B) = \{ w [k_r] \dots [k_2] [k_1] \mid r \geq 1, 1 \leq k_v \leq n, 1 \leq v \leq r \}, \text{ where}$$

$$w = x_{k_1} x_{k_2} \dots x_{k_r} = y_{k_1} y_{k_2} \dots y_{k_r}$$

If $L(G_A) \cap L(G_B) \neq \emptyset$ then such a w exists and thus k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r is a solution to this instance of **PCP**. This shows that a decision procedure for the non-emptiness of the intersection of CFLs implies a decision procedure for **PCP**, which we have already shown is undecidable. Hence, the non-emptiness of the intersection of CFLs is undecidable. *Q.E.D.*

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

First, show CONSTANT is non-trivial.

$C_0(x) = 0$, one of the base functions, is in CONSTANT

$S(x) = x+1$, one of the base functions, is not in CONSTANT

Thus, CONSTANT is non-trivial

Second, let f, g be two arbitrary partial recursive functions with the same I/O behavior.

That is, $\forall x$ if $f(x)$ is defined, then $f(x) = g(x)$; otherwise both diverge, i.e., $f(x) \uparrow$ and $g(x) \uparrow$

Now, $f \in \text{CONSTANT}$

$\Leftrightarrow \exists K \forall x [f(x) = K]$ by definition of CONSTANT

$\Leftrightarrow \forall x [g(x) = C]$ where C is the instance of K above, since $\forall x [f(x) = g(x)]$

$\Leftrightarrow \exists K \forall x [g(x) = K]$ from above

$\Leftrightarrow g \in \text{CONSTANT}$ by definition of CONSTANT

Since CONSTANT meets both conditions of Rice's Theorem, it is undecidable. Q.E.D.

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

$\text{CONSTANT} \leq_m \text{TOT}$

Let f be an arbitrary partial recursive function.

Define g_f using composition, primitive recursion and minimization by

$$g_f(0) = f(0)$$

$$g_f(y+1) = f(y+1) + \mu z [f(y+1) = f(y)]$$

Now, if $f \in \text{CONSTANT}$ then $\forall y [f(y) \downarrow]$ and $[f(y+1) = f(y)]$.

Under this circumstance, $\mu z [f(y+1) = f(y)]$ is 0 for all y and $g_f(y) = f(y)$ for all y .

Clearly, then $g_f \in \text{TOT}$

If, however, $f \notin \text{CONSTANT}$ then $\exists y [f(y) \uparrow]$ or $[f(y+1) \neq f(y)]$.

Choose the least y meeting this condition.

If $f(y) \uparrow$ then $g_f(y) \uparrow$ since $f(y)$ is in $g_f(y)$'s definition (the 1st term).

If $f(y) \downarrow$ but $[f(y+1) \neq f(y)]$ then $g_f(y) \uparrow$ since $\mu z [f(y+1) = f(y)] \uparrow$ (the 2nd term).

Clearly, then $g_f \notin \text{TOT}$

Combining these, $f \in \text{CONSTANT} \Leftrightarrow g_f \in \text{TOT}$ and thus $\text{CONSTANT} \leq_m \text{TOT}$

$\text{TOT} \leq_m \text{CONSTANT}$

Let f be an arbitrary partial recursive function.

Define g_f using composition by

$$g_f(y) = f(y) - f(y)$$

Now, if $f \in \text{TOT}$ then $\forall y [f(y) \downarrow]$ and thus $\forall y g_f(y) = 0$. Clearly, then $g_f \in \text{CONSTANT}$

If, however, $f \notin \text{TOT}$ then $\exists y [f(y) \uparrow]$ and thus, $\exists y [g_f(y) \uparrow]$. Clearly, then $g_f \notin \text{CONSTANT}$

Combining these, $f \in \text{TOT} \Leftrightarrow g_f \in \text{CONSTANT}$ and thus $\text{TOT} \leq_m \text{CONSTANT}$

Hence, $\text{CONSTANT} \equiv_m \text{TOT}$. Q.E.D.

- 8 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** = $\{ f \mid \forall y \ \phi_f(y) \text{ converges in no fewer than } y \text{ steps} \}$.

We can deny the 2nd condition of Rice's Theorem since

S , where $S(x) = x+1$, converges in one step and hence is not in AT-LEAST-LINEAR

S' , defined by primitive recursion, is in AT-LEAST-LINEAR, where

$$S'(x) = C_1$$

$$S'(y+1) = S(S'(y))$$

However, $\forall x [S(x) = S'(x)]$, so they have the same I/O behavior and yet one is in and the other is out of -LEAST-LINEAR, denying the 2nd condition of Rice's Theorem

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

We can deny the 1st condition of Rice's Theorem since all functions have an imposter. To see this, consider for any function f , the equivalent but distinct function $g(x) = f(x) + C_0(x)$. Thus, HAS-IMPOSTER is trivial since it is equal to \mathcal{N} , the set of all indices.

- 8 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 Σ is the alphabet of configuration words.

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

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.

It is possible to create a Context Free Grammar for the language $L = \{ C \# C' \# \mid \sim C \Rightarrow C' \}$

Here, $\sim C \Rightarrow C'$ means C' is not derived directly from C .

The reason this is Context Free is that it checks just one pair, meaning we can push the first onto a stack and then compare the second to be sure it is not a consequence of the first.

Assume that the grammar for L is $G_L = (V, N, T, P_L)$

We can then extend this grammar to another CFG, $G_{BAD} = (V \cup \{S, U, C\}, N, S, P_{BAD})$, where P_{BAD} contains all of P_L plus

$$S \rightarrow U T U$$

$$U \rightarrow C \# U \mid \lambda$$

And C is a non-terminal that generates an arbitrary configuration in our machine notation.

*The language **BadTrace** generated by G_{BAD} is then the strings that look like traces but have at least one error, i.e., one pair of configurations that does not reflect a correct step of computation. $R \cup \text{BadTrace}$ is the complement of **Trace** and is a CFL since it is the union of two CFLs (one is actually regular). Q.E.D.*