

4. **Problem:** Prove that the class of context-free languages is not closed under intersections and complements. (*Hint:* Represent the language $\{a^k b^k c^k \mid k \geq 0\}$ as the intersection of two context-free languages.)


Solution: Let $L = \{a^k b^k c^k \mid k \geq 0\}$. This language has been proven to be not context-free. We can prove that context-free languages are not closed under intersection by finding two context-free languages L_1 and L_2 such that $L = L_1 \cap L_2$. Languages $L_1 = \{a^* b^k c^k \mid k \geq 0\}$ and $L_2 = \{a^k b^k c^* \mid k \geq 0\}$ fulfill this condition.

A direct corollary is that the class of context-free languages cannot be closed under complementation, either, since they are closed under union and $L_1 \cap L_2 = \overline{\overline{L_1} \cup \overline{L_2}}$.

Finally, we prove that L_1 and L_2 are context-free by presenting context-free grammars that generate them. The language L_1 is generated by $G_1 = (\{S, A, B, a, b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}, P_1, S)$, where $P_1 = \{S \rightarrow AB, A \rightarrow aA \mid \varepsilon, B \rightarrow bBc \mid \varepsilon\}$. Similarly, L_2 is generated by $G_2 = (\{S, A, B, a, b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}, P_2, S)$, $P_2 = \{S \rightarrow AB, A \rightarrow aAb \mid \varepsilon, B \rightarrow cB \mid \varepsilon\}$.

5. **Problem:** Show that pushdown automata with two stacks (rather than just one as permitted by the standard definition) would be capable of recognizing exactly the same languages as Turing machines.

Solution: We first show that a two-stack pushdown automaton can simulate a Turing machine. The only difficulty is to find a way to simulate the Turing machine tape using two stacks. This can be done using a construction that is similar to the one presented in the first problem: the first stack holds the part of tape that is left to the read/write head (in reversed order), and the second stack holds the symbols that are right to the head.



The computation of the automaton can be divided into two parts:

- Initialization, when the automaton copies the input to stack S_1 one symbol at a time, and then moves it, again one-by-one, to stack S_2 . (With the exception of the first symbol).
- Simulation, where the automaton decides its next transition by examining the top symbol of S_1 . If the machine moves its head to left, the top element of S_1 is moved into S_2 . If it moves to the other direction, the top element of S_2 is moved to S_1 .

A two-stack pushdown automaton that is formed using these principles simulates a given Turing machine. The formal details are presented in an appendix.

Next we show that we can simulate a two-stack pushdown automaton using a Turing machine. This can be done trivially using a two tape nondeterministic Turing machine where both stacks are stored on their own tapes.

Appendix: the formalisation of solution 5

Let $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{\text{acc}}, q_{\text{rej}})$ be a Turing machine. We construct a two-stack push-down automaton $M' = (Q', \Sigma', \Gamma', \delta', p_0, q_{\text{acc}}, q_{\text{rej}})$ as follows:

$$Q' = Q \cup \{p_0, p_1, p_2\}$$

$$\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{<\}$$

$$\Gamma' = \Gamma \cup \{>, <\}$$

$$\delta' = \{((p_0, \varepsilon, \varepsilon, \varepsilon), (p_1, >, \varepsilon)), ((p_1, <, \varepsilon, \varepsilon), (p_2, \varepsilon, <))\}$$

$$\cup \{((p_1, x, \varepsilon, \varepsilon), (p_1, x, \varepsilon)) \mid x \in \Sigma\}$$

$$\cup \{((p_2, \varepsilon, x, \varepsilon), (p_2, \varepsilon, x)) \mid x \in \Sigma\}$$

$$\cup \{((q_1, \varepsilon, a, \varepsilon), (q_2, \varepsilon, b)) \mid (q_1, a, q_2, b, L) \in \delta\}$$

$$\cup \{((q_1, \varepsilon, a, x), (q_2, xb, \varepsilon)) \mid (q_1, a, q_2, b, R) \in \delta, x \in \Gamma'\}$$