Automata and Formal Languages

Email: christian.urban at kcl.ac.uk

Office: S1.27 (1st floor Strand Building)

Slides: KEATS (also home work is there)

2nd CW

Remember we showed that

$$der \ c \ (r^+) = (der \ c \ r) \cdot r^*$$

2nd CW

Remember we showed that

$$der c (r^+) = (der c r) \cdot r^*$$

Does the same hold for $r^{\{n\}}$ with n > 0

$$der\ c\ (r^{\{n\}}) = (der\ c\ r) \cdot r^{\{n-1\}}$$
?

2nd CW

• der

$$der \ c \ (r^{\{n\}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \varnothing & \text{if } n = 0 \\ der \ c \ (r \cdot r^{\{n-1\}}) & \text{o'wise} \end{cases}$$

mkeps

$$mkeps(r^{\{n\}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\underbrace{mkeps(r), \ldots, mkeps(r)}_{n \text{ times}}]$$
?

• inj

$$inj \ r^{\{n\}} \ c \ (v_{\scriptscriptstyle \rm I}, [vs]) \qquad \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [inj \ r \ c \ v_{\scriptscriptstyle \rm I} :: vs]$$

$$inj \ r^{\{n\}} \ c \ Left(v_{\scriptscriptstyle \rm I}, [vs]) \qquad \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [inj \ r \ c \ v_{\scriptscriptstyle \rm I} :: vs]$$

$$inj \ r^{\{n\}} \ c \ Right([v :: vs]) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [mkeps(r) :: inj \ r \ c \ v :: vs]$$

Compilers in Boeings 777

They want to achieve triple redundancy in hardware faults.

They compile 1 Ada program to

- Intel 80486
- Motorola 68040 (old Macintosh's)
- AMD 29050 (RISC chips used often in laser printers)

Proofs about Rexps

Remember their inductive definition:

If we want to prove something, say a property P(r), for all regular expressions r then ...

Proofs about Rexp (2)

- P holds for \emptyset , ϵ and c
- P holds for $r_1 + r_2$ under the assumption that P already holds for r_1 and r_2 .
- P holds for $r_1 \cdot r_2$ under the assumption that P already holds for r_1 and r_2 .
- P holds for r* under the assumption that P already holds for r.

```
zeroable(\varnothing) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} true
zeroable(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} false
zeroable(c) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} false
zeroable(r_1 + r_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} zeroable(r_1) \land zeroable(r_2)
zeroable(r_1 \cdot r_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} zeroable(r_1) \lor zeroable(r_2)
zeroable(r^*) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} false
```

$$zeroable(r)$$
 if and only if $L(r) = \{\}$

Correctness of the Matcher

• We want to prove

matches r s if and only if $s \in L(r)$

where matches $r s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} nullable(ders s r)$

Correctness of the Matcher

• We want to prove

matches
$$r$$
 s if and only if $s \in L(r)$

where *matches* $r s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} nullable(ders s r)$

• We can do this, if we know

$$L(der\ c\ r) = Der\ c\ (L(r))$$

Induction over Strings

• case []:

We need to prove

$$\forall r. \; nullable(ders [] \; r) \; \Leftrightarrow \; [] \in L(r)$$

$$nullable(ders [] r) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} nullable r \Leftrightarrow \dots$$

Induction over Strings

• case *c* :: *s*

We need to prove

$$\forall r. \ nullable(ders\ (c::s)\ r) \Leftrightarrow (c::s) \in L(r)$$

We have by IH

$$\forall r. \; nullable(ders \; s \; r) \; \Leftrightarrow \; s \in L(r)$$

$$ders (c :: s) r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ders s (der c r)$$

Induction over Regexps

• The proof hinges on the fact that we can prove

$$L(der\ c\ r) = Der\ c\ (L(r))$$

Some Lemmas

- $\bullet \ Der \ c \ (A \cup B) = (Der \ c \ A) \cup (Der \ c \ B)$
- If $[] \in A$ then $Der c (A@B) = (Der c A)@B \cup (Der c B)$
- If $[] \notin A$ then Der c (A @ B) = (Der c A) @ B
- $Der c(A^*) = (Der cA)@A^*$

(interesting case)

Why?

Why does $Der c(A^*) = (Der cA) @A^*$ hold?

$$Der c (A^*) = Der c (A^* - \{[]\})$$

$$= Der c ((A - \{[]\}) @A^*)$$

$$= (Der c (A - \{[]\})) @A^*$$

$$= (Der c A) @A^*$$

using the facts
$$Der\ c\ A = Der\ c\ (A - \{[]\})$$
 and $(A - \{[]\})\ @A^* = A^* - \{[]\}$