# Finite Automata Part Three

#### New Stuff!

- We know that any language for which there exists a DFA can also be recognized by an NFA.
- Why?
	- Every DFA essentially already *is* an NFA!

- We know that any language for which there exists a DFA can also be recognized by an NFA.
- $Why?$ 
	- Every DFA essentially already *is* an NFA!
- **Question**: Can any language recognized by an NFA also be recognized by a DFA?

- We know that any language for which there exists a DFA can also be recognized by an NFA.
- $Whv?$ 
	- Every DFA essentially already *is* an NFA!
- **Question**: Can any language recognized by an NFA also be recognized by a DFA?
- Surprisingly, the answer is *yes*!

- **Question**: Can any language recognized by an NFA also be recognized by a DFA?
- Surprisingly, the answer is *yes*!
	- To prove this, we need to:
		- Pick an arbitrary language for which an NFA exists
		- Describe how we would construct a DFA with the same language (in a generalizable way)
		- For the next few slides, we'll ponder how to approach that...

*Thought Experiment:* How would you simulate an NFA in software?

 $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ q_1 \end{pmatrix}$  b  $\begin{pmatrix} q_2 \\ q_3 \end{pmatrix}$  a  $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ start  $\frac{1}{2}$  ( $q_3$ ),  $q_0$ 

 $\frac{a}{q_1}$   $\left(\frac{a}{q_1}\right)$   $\frac{b}{q_2}$   $\left(\frac{a}{q_2} \right)$   $\frac{a}{q_1}$  $\frac{\text{start}}{\longrightarrow}$  $\cdot$  qo  $\overline{)}$  $\left(\right. q_3\right)$ 

 $\vert \mathbf{b} \vert$  $\frac{a}{\sqrt{a}}$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{b}$  $\mathbf a$ 

 $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}$ start  $\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$  $\left(\right. q_3\right)$ 

 $\frac{a}{\sqrt{a}}$  $\vert \hspace{.06cm} \vert$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{b}$  $\mathbf a$ 



 $\mathbf{a}$  $\mathsf{D}$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{b}$  $\mathbf a$ 



 $\mathbf{a}$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{D}$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{D}$ 



 $\mathbf{a}$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{b}$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{D}$ 

 $\begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{pmatrix}$ start  $q_0$  $\left(\right. q_3\right)$ 

 $\frac{a}{\sqrt{a}}$  $\vert \vert$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{b}$  $\mathbf a$ 

 $\begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{pmatrix}$ start  $q_0$  $q_3$ 



 $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ q_1 \end{pmatrix}$ start  $q_0$  $\sqrt{(}q_3)$ 













 $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{b}$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{b}$  $\mathbf a$ 



 $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{b}$  $\mathbf a$  $\mathsf{b}$  $\mathbf a$ 

 $\begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{pmatrix}$ start  $q_0$  $q_3$ 



 $\begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \end{pmatrix}$ start  $q_0$  $q_3$ 













































 $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ q_1 \end{pmatrix}$  b  $\begin{pmatrix} q_2 \\ q_3 \end{pmatrix}$  a  $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ start  $q_0$  $\left(\,q_3\right)$ 



 $\widehat{q_0}$  a  $\widehat{q_1}$  b  $\widehat{q_2}$  a  $\widehat{q}$  $\frac{1}{2}$ 









 $\frac{a}{q}$  (q)  $\frac{b}{q}$  (q)  $\frac{a}{q}$ start  $q_0$  $\left( q_3 \right)$ 



 $\frac{a}{q}$  (q)  $\frac{b}{q^2}$  (q)  $\frac{a}{q}$ start  $q_0$  $q_3$ 









 $\widehat{q_0}$  a  $\widehat{q_1}$  b  $\widehat{q_2}$  a  $\widehat{q}$  $\sqrt{(}q_3)$ 


$\widehat{q_0}$  a  $\widehat{q_1}$  b  $\widehat{q_2}$  a  $\widehat{q}$  $\frac{1}{2}$ 



 $\sum$  $\overrightarrow{q_1}$  b  $\left(\overrightarrow{q_2}\right)$  a start





 $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  $\sim 10^{-1}$  $\frac{a}{q_1}$ start  $q_0$  $q_3$  $\pm 1$ 























 $\overrightarrow{a}$   $\left(\overrightarrow{q_1}\right)$   $\overrightarrow{b}$   $\left(\overrightarrow{q_2}\right)$   $\overrightarrow{a}$ start  $q_0$  $q_3$ 









 $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  $\sim 10^{-1}$  $\frac{a}{q_1}$ start  $q_0$  $q_3$  $\pm 1$ 



 $\Sigma$ 

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 91 start  $\frac{a}{a}$  $\mathbf{b}$  $\mathsf{a}$  $q_2$  $q_0$  $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$  $q_3$ 









 $q_0$   $q_1$   $q_2$   $q_3$   $q_4$   $q_3$ start  $\begin{pmatrix} a & a \\ a & a \end{pmatrix}$  a  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  a



 $q_0$   $\rightarrow$   $q_1$   $\rightarrow$   $q_2$   $\rightarrow$   $q_3$ start  $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & a & b \end{array}\right)$  a



 $q_0$   $\rightarrow$   $q_1$   $\rightarrow$   $q_2$   $\rightarrow$   $q_3$ start  $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & a & b \end{array}\right)$  a



































Your turn: What are the contents of the next row?

 $q_0$   $q_1$   $q_2$   $q_3$   $q_4$ start  $\begin{pmatrix} a & a \end{pmatrix}$  a  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \end{pmatrix}$  a



 $q_0$   $\rightarrow$   $q_1$   $\rightarrow$   $q_2$   $\rightarrow$   $q_3$ start  $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & a & b \end{array}\right)$  a







 $\sim 10^{-1}$ start  $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & & a \\ a & & a \end{array}\right)$  b a  $q_0$   $q_1$   $q_2$   $q_3$   $q_4$   $q_3$  $\pm 1$ 







start  $\begin{pmatrix} a & a \\ a & a \end{pmatrix}$  a  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  a  $q_0$   $q_1$   $q_2$   $q_3$   $q_4$   $q_3$  $\pm 1$ 



 $q_0$   $q_1$   $q_2$   $q_3$   $q_4$   $q_3$ start  $\begin{pmatrix} a & a \\ a & a \end{pmatrix}$  a  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  a



 $q_0$   $q_1$   $q_2$   $q_3$   $q_4$   $q_3$ start  $\begin{pmatrix} a & a \\ a & a \end{pmatrix}$  a  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  a



 $q_0$   $\rightarrow$   $q_1$   $\rightarrow$   $q_2$   $\rightarrow$   $q_3$ start  $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & a & b \end{array}\right)$  a



 $q_0$   $\rightarrow$   $q_1$   $\rightarrow$   $q_2$   $\rightarrow$   $q_3$ start  $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & a & b \end{array}\right)$  a


























$q_0$   $q_1$   $q_2$   $q_3$   $q_4$   $q_3$ start  $\begin{pmatrix} a & a \end{pmatrix}$  a  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \end{pmatrix}$  a



 $q_0$   $\rightarrow$   $q_1$   $\rightarrow$   $q_2$   $\rightarrow$   $q_3$ start  $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & a & b \end{array}\right)$  a































 $q_0$   $\rightarrow$   $q_1$   $\rightarrow$   $q_2$   $\rightarrow$   $q_3$ start  $\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & a & b \end{array}\right)$  a









 $\{q_0\}$   $\left\{\right.$   $\left. \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{a} \end{array}\right\}$   $\{q_0, q_1\}$ {*q*₀, *q*₂} b a b a b b a start {*q*₀, *q*₁, *q*₃} a







 $\{q_0\}$   $\left\{\right.$   $\left. \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{a} \end{array}\right\}$   $\{q_0, q_1\}$ {*q*₀, *q*₂} b a b a b b a start {*q*₀, *q*₁, *q*₃} a















































































### The Subset Construction

- This procedure for turning an NFA for a language *L* into a DFA for a language *L* is called the *subset construction*.
	- It's sometimes called the *powerset construction*; it's different names for the same thing!
- Intuitively:
	- Each state in the DFA corresponds to a set of states from the NFA.
	- Each transition in the DFA corresponds to what transitions would be taken in the NFA when using the massive parallel intuition.
	- The accepting states in the DFA correspond to which sets of states would be considered accepting in the NFA when using the massive parallel intuition.
- There's an online *Guide to the Subset Construction* with a more elaborate example involving ε-transitions and cases where the NFA dies; check that for more details.

### The Subset Construction

- In converting an NFA to a DFA, the DFA's states correspond to sets of NFA states.
- *Useful fact:*  $|\wp(S)| = 2^{|S|}$  for any finite set *S*.
- In the worst-case, the construction can result in a DFA that is *exponentially larger* than the original NFA.
- **Question to ponder:** Can you find a family of languages that have NFAs of size *n*, but no DFAs of size less than 2*n*?

### Why This Matters

- We now have two perspectives on regular languages:
	- Regular languages are languages accepted by DFAs.
	- Regular languages are languages accepted by NFAs.
- We can now reason about the regular languages in two different ways.

#### Properties of Regular Languages

- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are languages over the alphabet  $\Sigma$ , the language  $L_1 \cup L_2$  is the language of all strings in at least one of the two languages.
- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 \cup L_2?$

- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are languages over the alphabet  $\Sigma$ , the language  $L_1 \cup L_2$  is the language of all strings in at least one of the two languages.
- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 \cup L_2?$



- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are languages over the alphabet  $\Sigma$ , the language  $L_1 \cup L_2$  is the language of all strings in at least one of the two languages.
- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 \cup L_2?$



- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are languages over the alphabet  $\Sigma$ , the language  $L_1 \cup L_2$  is the language of all strings in at least one of the two languages.
- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 \cup L_2?$



- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are languages over the alphabet  $\Sigma$ , the language  $L_1 \cup L_2$  is the language of all strings in at least one of the two languages.
- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 \cup L_2?$



- If  $L_{1}$  and  $L_{2}$  are languages over  $\Sigma$ , then  $L_{1} \cap L_{2}$  is the language of strings in both  $L_{_1}$  and  $L_{_2}.$
- Question: If  $L^{}_1$  and  $L^{}_2$  are regular, is  $L^{}_1 \cap L^{}_2$ regular as well?

- If  $L_{1}$  and  $L_{2}$  are languages over  $\Sigma$ , then  $L_{1} \cap L_{2}$  is the language of strings in both  $L_{_1}$  and  $L_{_2}.$
- Question: If  $L^{}_1$  and  $L^{}_2$  are regular, is  $L^{}_1 \cap L^{}_2$ regular as well?

 $L_{\overline{1}}$ 



 $L_{\overline{2}}$ 

- If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are languages over  $\Sigma$ , then  $L_1 \cap L_2$  is the language of strings in both  $L_{_1}$  and  $L_{_2}.$
- Question: If  $L^{}_1$  and  $L^{}_2$  are regular, is  $L^{}_1 \cap L^{}_2$ regular as well?



 $L_{1}$   $L_{2}$ 

- If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are languages over  $\Sigma$ , then  $L_1 \cap L_2$  is the language of strings in both  $L_{_1}$  and  $L_{_2}.$
- Question: If  $L^{}_1$  and  $L^{}_2$  are regular, is  $L^{}_1 \cap L^{}_2$ regular as well?




### The Intersection of Two Languages

- If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are languages over  $\Sigma$ , then  $L_1 \cap L_2$  is the language of strings in both  $L_{_1}$  and  $L_{_2}.$
- Question: If  $L^{}_1$  and  $L^{}_2$  are regular, is  $L^{}_1 \cap L^{}_2$ regular as well?



#### Concatenation

# String Concatenation

- If  $w \in \Sigma^*$  and  $x \in \Sigma^*$ , the *concatenation* of w and x, denoted *wx*, is the string formed by tacking all the characters of *x* onto the end of *w*.
- Example: if  $w =$  quo and  $x =$  kka, the concatenation *wx* = quokka*.*
- $\cdot$  This is analogous to the  $+$  operator for strings in many programming languages.
- Some facts about concatenation:
	- The empty string ε is the *identity element* for concatenation:

 $w\epsilon = \epsilon w = w$ 

● Concatenation is *associative*:

 $wxy = w(xy) = (wx)y$ 

# Concatenation

• The *concatenation* of two languages  $L_1$ and  $L_2$  over the alphabet  $\Sigma$  is the language

 $L_1L_2 = \{ wx \in \Sigma^* \mid w \in L_1 \land x \in L_2 \}$ 

# Concatenation Example

- Let  $\Sigma = \{ a, b, ..., z, A, B, ..., Z \}$  and consider these languages over  $\Sigma$ :
	- $Noun = \{ Puppy, Rainbow, What$
	- $\cdot$  *Verb* = { Hugs, Juggles, Loves, ... }
	- *The* =  $\{ The \}$
- The language *TheNounVerbTheNoun* is
	- { ThePuppyHugsTheWhale, TheWhaleLovesTheRainbow, TheRainbowJugglesTheRainbow, … }

# Concatenation

• The *concatenation* of two languages  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ over the alphabet  $\Sigma$  is the language

 $L_1L_2 = \{ wx \in \Sigma^* \mid w \in L_1 \land x \in L_2 \}$ 

- Two views of  $L_1L_2$ :
	- The set of all strings that can be made by concatenating a string in *L*₁ with a string in *L*₂.
	- The set of strings that can be split into two pieces: a piece from *L*₁ and a piece from *L*₂.

 $T$  and  $T$  is closely related to, but different than, the Cartesian product. This is closely related to, but different than, the Cartesian product.

*Question to ponder:* In what ways are concatenations similar to Cartesian products? In what ways are they different:<br>different: *Question to ponder:* In what ways are concatenations similar to Cartesian products? In what ways are they different?

- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 L_2 ?$
- Intuition can we split a string *w* into two strings  $xy$ such that  $x \in L_1$  and  $y \in L_2$ ?
- *Idea*:

- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 L_2 ?$
- Intuition can we split a string *w* into two strings  $xy$ such that  $x \in L_1$  and  $y \in L_2$ ?
- *Idea*:



Machine for  $L_{_1}$ 



 $r_{1}$  Machine for  $L_{2}$ 

- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 L_2 ?$
- Intuition can we split a string *w* into two strings  $xy$ such that  $x \in L_1$  and  $y \in L_2$ ?
- *Idea*:







Machine for  $L_1$  Machine for  $L_2$ 



- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 L_2 ?$
- Intuition can we split a string *w* into two strings  $xy$ such that  $x \in L_1$  and  $y \in L_2$ ?
- *Idea*:



Machine for  $L<sub>1</sub>$ 



Machine for  $L_1$  Machine for  $L_2$ 



- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 L_2 ?$
- Intuition can we split a string *w* into two strings  $xy$ such that  $x \in L_1$  and  $y \in L_2$ ?
- *Idea*:





Machine for *L*<sub>1</sub> Machine for *L*<sub>2</sub> Machine for  $L<sub>2</sub>$ 





- $\bullet$  If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages, is  $L_1 L_2 ?$
- Intuition can we split a string *w* into two strings  $xy$ such that  $x \in L_1$  and  $y \in L_2$ ?
- *Idea*:
	- Run a DFA/NFA for  $L_1$  on  $w$ .
	- Whenever it reaches an accepting state, optionally hand the rest of  $w$  to a DFA/NFA for  $L_2$ .
	- If the automaton for  $L_2$  accepts the rest,  $w \in L_1L_2$ .
	- $\bullet$  If the automaton for  $L_2$  rejects the remainder, the split was incorrect.

- 
- 
- 
- -
	-
	-











# Lots and Lots of Concatenation

- Consider the language  $L = \{aa, b\}$
- LL is the set of strings formed by concatenating pairs of strings in *L*.

#### $\{$ aaaa, aab, baa, bb $\}$

• LLL is the set of strings formed by concatenating triples of strings in *L*.

```
\{ aaaaaa, aaaab, aabaa, aabb, baaaa, baab, bbaa, bbb\}
```
• *LLLL* is the set of strings formed by concatenating quadruples of strings in *L*.

```
{ aaaaaaaa, aaaaaab, aaaabaa, aaaabb, aabaaaa,
aabaab, aabbaa, aabbb, baaaaaa, baaaab, baabaa,
      baabb, bbaaaa, bbaab, bbbaa, bbbb}
```
# Language Exponentiation

- We can define what it means to "exponentiate" a language as follows:
- $\bullet$  *L*<sup>0</sup> = {ε}
	- Intuition: The only string you can form by gluing no strings together is the empty string.
	- Notice that  $\{\epsilon\} \neq \emptyset$ . Can you explain why?
- $L^{n+1} = LL^{n}$ 
	- Idea: Concatenating  $(n+1)$  strings together works by concatenating *n* strings, then concatenating one more.
- **Question to ponder:** Why define  $L^0 = {\varepsilon}$ ?
- **Question to ponder:** What is Ø<sup>0</sup>?

# The Kleene Closure

• An important operation on languages is the *Kleene Closure*, which is defined as

 $L^* = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, w \in L^n \}$ 

• Mathematically:

 $w \in L^* \leftrightarrow \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, w \in L^n$ 

- Intuitively,  $L^*$  is the language all possible ways of concatenating zero or more strings in *L* together, possibly with repetition.
- **Question to ponder:** What is Ø\*?

### The Kleene Closure

If  $L = \{ a, bb \}$ , then  $L^* = \{$ ε, a, bb,

#### aa, abb, bba, bbbb,

#### aaa, aabb, abba, abbbb, bbaa, bbabb, bbbba, bbbbbb,

…

}<br>Think of L<sup>\*</sup> as the set of strings you can make if you have a collection of stamps – one for each string in *L* – and you form every possible string that can be made fom those stamps. Think of L\* as the set of strings you can make if you have a collection of stamps – one for each string in *L* – and you form every possible string that can be made from those stamps.

- If *L* is regular, is  $L^*$  necessarily regular?
- $\triangle$  A Bad Line of Reasoning:  $\triangle$ 
	- $\bullet$   $L^0 = \{ \varepsilon \}$  is regular.
	- $L^1 = L$  is regular.
	- $L^2 = LL$  is regular
	- $L^3 = L (LL)$  is regular
	- $\bullet$  …
	- Regular languages are closed under union.
	- So the union of all these languages is regular.

#### $\infty$  is finite  $^{\sim}$  not

# Reasoning About the Infinite

- If a series of finite objects all have some property, the "limit" of that process *does not* necessarily have that property.
- In general, it is not safe to conclude that some property that always holds in the finite case must hold in the infinite case.
	- (This is why calculus is interesting).
- So our earlier argument  $(L^* = L^0 \cup L^1 \cup ...)$  isn't going to work.
- We need a different line of reasoning.

*Idea:* Can we directly convert an NFA for language *L* to an NFA for language *L*\*?














## Closure Properties

- **Theorem:** If  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are regular languages over an alphabet  $\Sigma$ , then so are the following languages:
	- $\overline{L}_1$
	- *L*₁ ∪ *L*₂
	- *L*₁ ∩ *L*₂
	- $\bullet$   $L_1L_2$
	- $I_{.1}$ \*
- These properties are called *closure properties of the regular languages*.

## Next Time

- *Regular Expressions*
	- Building languages from the ground up!
- *Thompson's Algorithm*
	- A UNIX Programmer in Theoryland.
- *Kleene's Theorem*
	- From machines to programs!