BILL AND NATHAN START RECORDING

Context Sensitive Languages

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

I am supposed to say Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

Our interest in CFL's is:

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

Our interest in CFL's is:

1) Languages that require a LARGE CFG but a SMALL CSL

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

Our interest in CFL's is:

1) Languages that require a LARGE CFG but a SMALL CSL (Research Project—no results yet.)

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

Our interest in CFL's is:

- 1) Languages that require a LARGE CFG but a SMALL CSL (Research Project—no results yet.)
- 2) Closure properties of CSLs.

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

Our interest in CFL's is:

- 1) Languages that require a LARGE CFG but a SMALL CSL (Research Project—no results yet.)
- 2) Closure properties of CSLs.
- 3) How does CSL compare to P and other classes?

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

Our interest in CFL's is:

- 1) Languages that require a LARGE CFG but a SMALL CSL (Research Project—no results yet.)
- 2) Closure properties of CSLs.
- 3) How does CSL compare to P and other classes?

(Spoiler Alert: We don't know!)

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

Our interest in CFL's is:

- 1) Languages that require a LARGE CFG but a SMALL CSL (Research Project—no results yet.)
- 2) Closure properties of CSLs.
- 3) How does CSL compare to P and other classes?
- (Spoiler Alert: We don't know!)
- 4) Which languages are **not** context sensitive?

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

Our interest in CFL's is:

- 1) Languages that require a LARGE CFG but a SMALL CSL (Research Project—no results yet.)
- 2) Closure properties of CSLs.
- 3) How does CSL compare to P and other classes?

(Spoiler Alert: We don't know!)

4) Which languages are **not** context sensitive?

(Spoiler Alert: very few languages are known to not be in CSL.)

I am supposed to say

Context Sensitive Languages are important in Linguistics.

It is more accurate to say

Context Sensitive Languages were important in Linguistics.

Our interest in CFL's is:

- 1) Languages that require a LARGE CFG but a SMALL CSL (Research Project—no results yet.)
- 2) Closure properties of CSLs.
- 3) How does CSL compare to P and other classes?

(Spoiler Alert: We don't know!)

- 4) Which languages are **not** context sensitive?
- (Spoiler Alert: very few languages are known to not be in CSL.)
- 5) Languages that are CSL but not CFL.

Historical Note on Linguistics

One of the motivations for CFL's and CSL's is an attempt to model human language.

This was a success and a success.

Historical Note on Linguistics

One of the motivations for CFL's and CSL's is an attempt to model human language.

This was a success and a success.

 While human language is far more complicated than CFL or CSL; the Mathematical tools these grammars supply were a helpful starting point.

Historical Note on Linguistics

One of the motivations for CFL's and CSL's is an attempt to model human language.

This was a success and a success.

- While human language is far more complicated than CFL or CSL; the Mathematical tools these grammars supply were a helpful starting point.
- Computer languages are far easier to understand since we make them ourselves; hence, CFLs and (to a lesser extent) CSL's were useful within Computer Science.

```
S 	oup ABCS \mid e AB 	oup BA (Note- We allow two nonterminals on the LHS.) AC 	oup CA BC 	oup CB BA 	oup AB CA 	oup AC CB 	oup BC A 	oup AC CCB 	oup BC A 	oup AC CCB 	oup BC A 	oup AC CCB 	oup AC ACC ACC
```

```
S \rightarrow ABCS \mid e
AB \rightarrow BA (Note- We allow two nonterminals on the LHS.)
AC \rightarrow CA
BC \rightarrow CB
BA \rightarrow AB
CA \rightarrow AC
CB \rightarrow BC
A \rightarrow a
B \rightarrow b
C \rightarrow c
1) What lang does this generate?
```

```
S \rightarrow ABCS \mid e
AB \rightarrow BA (Note- We allow two nonterminals on the LHS.)
AC \rightarrow CA
BC \rightarrow CB
BA \rightarrow AB
CA \rightarrow AC
CB \rightarrow BC
A \rightarrow a
B \rightarrow b
C \rightarrow c
1) What lang does this generate?
\{w: \#_a(w) = \#_b(w) = \#_c(w)\}\ which is NOT a CFL.
```

```
S \rightarrow ABCS \mid e
AB \rightarrow BA (Note- We allow two nonterminals on the LHS.)
AC \rightarrow CA
BC \rightarrow CB
BA \rightarrow AB
CA \rightarrow AC
CB \rightarrow BC
A \rightarrow a
B \rightarrow b
C \rightarrow c
1) What lang does this generate?
\{w: \#_a(w) = \#_b(w) = \#_c(w)\}\ which is NOT a CFL.
2) Context-Free means can replace (say) A by (say) \alpha without
looking at the context of A.
```

```
S \rightarrow ABCS \mid e
AB \rightarrow BA (Note- We allow two nonterminals on the LHS.)
AC \rightarrow CA
BC \rightarrow CB
BA \rightarrow AB
CA \rightarrow AC
CB \rightarrow BC
A \rightarrow a
B \rightarrow b
C \rightarrow c
1) What lang does this generate?
```

- $\{w : \#_a(w) = \#_b(w) = \#_c(w)\}$ which is NOT a CFL.
- 2) Context-Free means can replace (say) A by (say) α without looking at the **context** of A.
- 3) Context-Sensitive means can replace (say) A by (say) α AND look at what is around A. We actually allow more than that.



(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.) $S \rightarrow \$ABCX\$$

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.) $S \to \$ABCX\$$ $X \to ABCX \mid e$

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.) $S \rightarrow \$ABCX\$$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right:

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right: $BA \rightarrow AB$

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right:

 $BA \rightarrow AB$

 $CA \rightarrow AC$

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right:

 $BA \rightarrow AB$

 $CA \rightarrow AC$

 $CB \rightarrow BC$

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right:

 $BA \rightarrow AB$

 $CA \rightarrow AC$

 $CB \rightarrow BC$

Can generate $A^nB^nC^n$ but can also generate other strings.

Want to replace A with a, etc, but only if of form $A^nB^nC^n$.

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right:

 $BA \rightarrow AB$

 $CA \rightarrow AC$

 $CB \rightarrow BC$

Can generate $A^nB^nC^n$ but can also generate other strings.

Want to replace A with a, etc, but only if of form $A^nB^nC^n$.

$$A \rightarrow a$$

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right:

 $BA \rightarrow AB$

 $CA \rightarrow AC$

 $CB \rightarrow BC$

Can generate $A^nB^nC^n$ but can also generate other strings.

Want to replace A with a, etc, but only if of form $A^nB^nC^n$.

 $A \rightarrow a$

 $C\$ \rightarrow \c

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right:

 $BA \rightarrow AB$

 $CA \rightarrow AC$

 $CB \rightarrow BC$

Can generate $A^nB^nC^n$ but can also generate other strings.

Want to replace A with a, etc, but only if of form $A^nB^nC^n$.

 $A \rightarrow a$

 $C\$ \rightarrow \c

 $\$ \rightarrow e$

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right:

 $BA \rightarrow AB$

 $CA \rightarrow AC$

 $CB \rightarrow BC$

Can generate $A^nB^nC^n$ but can also generate other strings.

Want to replace A with a, etc, but only if of form $A^nB^nC^n$.

 $A \rightarrow a$

 $C\$ \rightarrow \c

 $\$ \rightarrow e$

Grammar gen $\{a^nb^nc^n\}$. Need that it doesn't gen anything else.

(Warning I came up with this so its intuitive but might be wrong.)

 $S \rightarrow ABCX$

 $X \rightarrow ABCX \mid e$

So now have $ABCABCABCABC \cdots ABC$.

The next three rules get the A's to the left and the C's to the right:

 $BA \rightarrow AB$

 $CA \rightarrow AC$

CB o BC

Can generate $A^nB^nC^n$ but can also generate other strings.

Want to replace A with a, etc, but only if of form $A^nB^nC^n$.

 $A \rightarrow a$

 $C\$ \rightarrow \c

 $\$ \rightarrow e$

Grammar gen $\{a^nb^nc^n\}$. Need that it doesn't gen anything else. Don't know so won't prove. Don't care so no extra credit for it.

I knew that $\{a^{n^2}: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a CSL (will say why later).

I knew that $\{a^{n^2}: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a CSL (will say why later). I searched through books and the web to find a CSG for it since students are our future! and you deserve to know this grammar! (I sincerely meant this as a positive thing.)

I knew that $\{a^{n^2} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a CSL (will say why later).

I searched through books and the web to find a CSG for it since students are our future! and you deserve to know this grammar! (I sincerely meant this as a positive thing.)

I found an entry on Computer Science Stack Exchange so I do not know if it is correct, though I suspect it is.

Link: https://cs.stackexchange.com/questions/53530/grammar-for-square-numbers-in-unary

I knew that $\{a^{n^2} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a CSL (will say why later).

I searched through books and the web to find a CSG for it since students are our future! and you deserve to know this grammar! (I sincerely meant this as a positive thing.)

I found an entry on Computer Science Stack Exchange so I do not know if it is correct, though I suspect it is.

Link: https://cs.stackexchange.com/questions/53530/grammar-for-square-numbers-in-unary
In case that link goes away (plausible) and you are really eager to see the CSL (less plausible) next slide has the CSG for it (not quite).

```
FD \rightarrow DG
AD \rightarrow DaA
aD \rightarrow Da
Aa \rightarrow aA
BD \rightarrow BH
Ha \rightarrow aH
HA \rightarrow AI
IA \rightarrow AI
IG \rightarrow AAF
FF \rightarrow F
B \rightarrow e
AE \rightarrow E
E \rightarrow e
(Last four rules not allowed in a CSG but this can be dealt with.)
```

Def A **Context Sensitive Grammar** is a tuple $G = (N, \Sigma, R, S)$

N is a finite set of nonterminals.

- N is a finite set of nonterminals.
- ▶ Σ is a finite **alphabet**. Note $\Sigma \cap N = \emptyset$.

- N is a finite set of nonterminals.
- ▶ $R \subseteq (N \cup \Sigma)^* N(N \cup \Sigma)^* \times (N \cup \Sigma)^*$ and are called **Rules**.

- N is a finite set of nonterminals.
- ▶ Σ is a finite **alphabet**. Note $\Sigma \cap N = \emptyset$.
- ▶ $R \subseteq (N \cup \Sigma)^* N(N \cup \Sigma)^* \times (N \cup \Sigma)^*$ and are called **Rules**.
- ▶ **Important** For every rule the $\alpha \to \beta$, $|\alpha| \le |\beta|$. (CSG's are given that violate this but can be put into this form.)

- ► *N* is a finite set of **nonterminals**.
- $ightharpoonup \Sigma$ is a finite **alphabet**. Note $\Sigma \cap N = \emptyset$.
- ▶ $R \subseteq (N \cup \Sigma)^* N(N \cup \Sigma)^* \times (N \cup \Sigma)^*$ and are called **Rules**.
- ▶ **Important** For every rule the $\alpha \to \beta$, $|\alpha| \le |\beta|$. (CSG's are given that violate this but can be put into this form.)
- \triangleright $S \in N$, the start symbol.

Def A **Context Sensitive Grammar** is a tuple $G = (N, \Sigma, R, S)$

- N is a finite set of nonterminals.
- $ightharpoonup \Sigma$ is a finite **alphabet**. Note $\Sigma \cap N = \emptyset$.
- ▶ $R \subseteq (N \cup \Sigma)^* N(N \cup \Sigma)^* \times (N \cup \Sigma)^*$ and are called **Rules**.
- ▶ **Important** For every rule the $\alpha \to \beta$, $|\alpha| \le |\beta|$. (CSG's are given that violate this but can be put into this form.)
- $ightharpoonup S \in N$, the start symbol.

Note

Def A **Context Sensitive Grammar** is a tuple $G = (N, \Sigma, R, S)$

- N is a finite set of nonterminals.
- $ightharpoonup \Sigma$ is a finite **alphabet**. Note $\Sigma \cap N = \emptyset$.
- ▶ $R \subseteq (N \cup \Sigma)^* N(N \cup \Sigma)^* \times (N \cup \Sigma)^*$ and are called **Rules**.
- ▶ **Important** For every rule the $\alpha \to \beta$, $|\alpha| \le |\beta|$. (CSG's are given that violate this but can be put into this form.)
- \triangleright $S \in N$, the start symbol.

Note

1) The LHS must have at least one nonterminal.

Def A **Context Sensitive Grammar** is a tuple $G = (N, \Sigma, R, S)$

- N is a finite set of nonterminals.
- $ightharpoonup \Sigma$ is a finite **alphabet**. Note $\Sigma \cap N = \emptyset$.
- ▶ $R \subseteq (N \cup \Sigma)^* N(N \cup \Sigma)^* \times (N \cup \Sigma)^*$ and are called **Rules**.
- ▶ **Important** For every rule the $\alpha \to \beta$, $|\alpha| \le |\beta|$. (CSG's are given that violate this but can be put into this form.)
- \triangleright $S \in N$, the start symbol.

Note

- 1) The LHS must have at least one nonterminal.
- 2) There are alternative definitions that are equivalent, which I won't get into here.

Then, if w is string of **terminals only**, we define L(G) by:

Then, if w is string of **terminals only**, we define L(G) by:

$$L(G) = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid S \Rightarrow w \}$$

Then, if w is string of **terminals only**, we define L(G) by:

$$L(G) = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid S \Rightarrow w \}$$

Examples: If we have rules

 $A \rightarrow BCB$

 $BC \rightarrow bDb$

 $bB \rightarrow bb$

bD o aa

Then, if w is string of **terminals only**, we define L(G) by:

$$L(G) = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid S \Rightarrow w \}$$

Examples: If we have rules

 $A \rightarrow BCB$

 $BC \rightarrow bDb$

 $bB \rightarrow bb$

bD o aa

Then we have

Then, if w is string of **terminals only**, we define L(G) by:

$$L(G) = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid S \Rightarrow w \}$$

Examples: If we have rules

 $A \rightarrow BCB$

 $BC \rightarrow bDb$

bB o bb

bD o aa

Then we have

A o BCB o bDbB o aabB o aabb

Then, if w is string of **terminals only**, we define L(G) by:

$$L(G) = \{ w \in \Sigma^* \mid S \Rightarrow w \}$$

Examples: If we have rules

 $A \rightarrow BCB$

 $BC \to bDb$

bB o bb

 $bD \rightarrow aa$

Then we have

A o BCB o bDbB o aabB o aabb

So $A \Rightarrow aabb$

Example of a Lang that is NOT a CSL

We'll come back to this later.

CLOSURE PROPERTIES

If L_1, L_2 are Context Sensitive Languages then

1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang?

If L_1, L_2 are Context Sensitive Languages then

1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.

- 1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 2. Is $L_1 \cap L_2$ a context sensitive Lang?

- 1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 2. Is $L_1 \cap L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.

- 1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 2. Is $L_1 \cap L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.
- 3. Is $L_1 \cdot L_2$ a context sensitive Lang?

- 1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 2. Is $L_1 \cap L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.
- 3. Is $L_1 \cdot L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.

- 1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 2. Is $L_1 \cap L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.
- 3. Is $L_1 \cdot L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 4. Is $\overline{L_1}$ a context sensitive Lang?

- 1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 2. Is $L_1 \cap L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.
- 3. Is $L_1 \cdot L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 4. Is $\overline{L_1}$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.

- 1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 2. Is $L_1 \cap L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.
- 3. Is $L_1 \cdot L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 4. Is $\overline{L_1}$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.
- 5. IS L_1^* is a context sensitive Lang?

- 1. Is $L_1 \cup L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 2. Is $L_1 \cap L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.
- 3. Is $L_1 \cdot L_2$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.
- 4. Is $\overline{L_1}$ a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Hard.
- 5. IS L_1^* is a context sensitive Lang? Yes, Easy.

MISC

MISC

1) There is a no pumping theorem for CSL's.

- 1) There is a no pumping theorem for CSL's.
- 2) Recall:

- 1) There is a no pumping theorem for CSL's.
- 2) Recall:

DFA's are **Recognizers**, Regex are **Generators**.

- 1) There is a no pumping theorem for CSL's.
- 2) Recall:

DFA's are **Recognizers**, Regex are **Generators**.

PDA's are **Recognizers**, CFG's are **Generators**.

- 1) There is a no pumping theorem for CSL's.
- 2) Recall:

DFA's are **Recognizers**, Regex are **Generators**. PDA's are **Recognizers**, CFG's are **Generators**.

CSL's are **Generators**.

- 1) There is a no pumping theorem for CSL's.
- 2) Recall:

DFA's are **Recognizers**, Regex are **Generators**.

PDA's are **Recognizers**, CFG's are **Generators**.

CSL's are **Generators**.

There is a **Recognizer** equivalent to it:

LBA's

- 1) There is a no pumping theorem for CSL's.
- 2) Recall:

DFA's are **Recognizers**, Regex are **Generators**.

PDA's are **Recognizers**, CFG's are **Generators**.

CSL's are **Generators**.

There is a **Recognizer** equivalent to it:

LBA's

LBA stands for Linear Bounded Automata.

They are nondeterministic Turing machines with O(n) space.

- 1) There is a no pumping theorem for CSL's.
- 2) Recall:

DFA's are **Recognizers**, Regex are **Generators**.

PDA's are **Recognizers**, CFG's are **Generators**.

CSL's are **Generators**.

There is a **Recognizer** equivalent to it:

LBA's

LBA stands for Linear Bounded Automata.

They are nondeterministic Turing machines with O(n) space.

The proof that LBA-recognizers and CSG-generators are equivalent is messy so we won't be doing it. We won't deal with LBA's in this course at all.

Later is Now

I said earlier:

I knew that $\{a^{n^2}: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a CSL (will say why later).

Later is Now

I said earlier:

I knew that $\{a^{n^2} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a CSL (will say why later).

It is easy to write an LBA for $\{a^{n^2} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$

Later is Now

I said earlier:

I knew that $\{a^{n^2}: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a CSL (will say why later).

It is easy to write an LBA for $\{a^{n^2}:n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ Hence it is easy to show that $\{a^{n^2}:n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ and many other languages are CSL's without using CSG's.

In this slide we only refer to decidable languages.

1) Not known how CSL and NP compare. Likely incomparable.

- 1) Not known how CSL and NP compare. Likely incomparable.
- 2) Proving incompatibility seems hard.

- 1) Not known how CSL and NP compare. Likely incomparable.
- 2) Proving incompatibility seems hard.
- (Proving hard to show inc was part of my PhD Thesis.)

- 1) Not known how CSL and NP compare. Likely incomparable.
- 2) Proving incompatibility seems hard.
- (Proving hard to show inc was part of my PhD Thesis.)
- 3) Proving a langauge is NOT CSL seems hard.

- 1) Not known how CSL and NP compare. Likely incomparable.
- 2) Proving incompatibility seems hard.
- (Proving hard to show inc was part of my PhD Thesis.)
- 3) Proving a langauge is NOT CSL seems hard.
- 4) One can construct a (contrived) language that is NOT CSL.

- 1) Not known how CSL and NP compare. Likely incomparable.
- 2) Proving incompatibility seems hard.
- (Proving hard to show inc was part of my PhD Thesis.)
- 3) Proving a langauge is NOT CSL seems hard.
- 4) One can construct a (contrived) language that is NOT CSL.
- 5) I know of one natural language that is provably not CSL:

In this slide we only refer to decidable languages.

- 1) Not known how CSL and NP compare. Likely incomparable.
- 2) Proving incompatibility seems hard.

(Proving hard to show inc was part of my PhD Thesis.)

- 3) Proving a langauge is NOT CSL seems hard.
- 4) One can construct a (contrived) language that is NOT CSL.
- 5) I know of **one** natural language that is provably not CSL: Given two trex α and β , is $L(\alpha) = L(\beta)$.

In this slide we only refer to decidable languages.

- 1) Not known how CSL and NP compare. Likely incomparable.
- 2) Proving incompatibility seems hard.

(Proving hard to show inc was part of my PhD Thesis.)

- 3) Proving a langauge is NOT CSL seems hard.
- 4) One can construct a (contrived) language that is NOT CSL.
- 5) I know of **one** natural language that is provably not CSL: Given two trex α and β , is $L(\alpha) = L(\beta)$.

Open question Some variants of Chess and Go **might be** provably not CSL.

We have a table of Reg, CFL, CSL. Y is YES. N is NO E is Easy. H is Hard.

We have a table of Reg, CFL, CSL. Y is YES. N is NO E is Easy. H is Hard. PL means there is a Pumping Lemma.

We have a table of Reg, CFL, CSL.
Y is YES. N is NO
E is Easy. H is Hard.
PL means there is a Pumping Lemma.
Rcg means Regconizer
Gen means Generator

We have a table of Reg, CFL, CSL.

Y is YES. N is NO

E is Easy. H is Hard.

PL means there is a Pumping Lemma.

Rcg means Regconizer

Gen means Generator

)	Rcg			\cap			comp	
	Reg	DFA	Rgx	Y-E	Y-E	Y-E	Y-E	Y-E	Υ
	CFL	PDA	CFG	Y-E	N-E	Y-E	Y-E	N-E	Υ
	CSL	LBA	CSG	Y-E	Y-H	Y-E	Y-E	Y-H	Ν

1. Proving sets are not Regular is **Easy**.

- 1. Proving sets are not Regular is **Easy**.
- 2. Proving sets are not Context-Free is **Easy**.

- 1. Proving sets are not Regular is **Easy**.
- 2. Proving sets are not Context-Free is Easy.
- 3. Proving sets are not Context-Sensitive is **Hard**.