

5.2: Closure Properties of Recursive and Recursively Enumerable Languages

In this section, we will see that the recursive and recursively enumerable languages are closed under union, concatenation, closure and intersection.

The recursive languages are also closed under set difference and complementation.

In the next section, we will see that the recursively enumerable languages are not closed under complementation or set difference.

On the other hand, we will see in this section that, if a language and its complement are both r.e., then the language is recursive.

Closure Properties of Recursive Languages

Theorem 5.2.1

If L , L_1 and L_2 are recursive languages, then so are $L_1 \cup L_2$, $L_1 L_2$, L^ , $L_1 \cap L_2$ and $L_1 - L_2$.*

Proof. Let's consider the concatenation case as an example.

Since L_1 and L_2 are recursive languages, there are string predicate programs pr_1 and pr_2 that test whether strings are in L_1 and L_2 , respectively.

Closure Properties of Recursive Languages

Proof (cont.). We write a program $\textcolor{blue}{pr}$ with form

```
  lam( $w$ ,  
    letSimp( $f_1$ ,  
       $\textcolor{blue}{pr}_1$ ,  
      letSimp( $f_2$ ,  
         $\textcolor{blue}{pr}_2$ ,  
         $\dots$ ))),
```

which tests whether its input is an element of $\textcolor{blue}{L}_1 L_2$.

Closure Properties of Rec. Lan.

Proof (cont.). The elided part of pr generates all of the pairs of strings (x_1, x_2) such that $x_1 x_2$ is equal to the value of w . Then it works through these pairs, one by one.

- Given such a pair (x_1, x_2) , pr calls $f1$ with x_1 to check whether $x_1 \in L_1$. If the answer is const(false) , then it goes on to the next pair.
- Otherwise, it calls $f2$ with x_2 to check whether $x_2 \in L_2$. If the answer is const(false) , then it goes on to the next pair. Otherwise, it returns const(true) .
- If pr runs out of pairs to check, then it returns const(false) .

We can check that pr is a string predicate program testing whether $w \in L_1 L_2$. Thus $L_1 L_2$ is recursive. \square

Closure Properties of Rec. Lan.

Corollary 5.2.2

If Σ is an alphabet and $L \subseteq \Sigma^$ is recursive, then so is $\Sigma^* - L$.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 5.2.1, since Σ^* is recursive. \square

Closure Properties of Recursively Enumerable Languages

Theorem 5.2.2

If L , L_1 and L_2 are recursively enumerable languages, then so are $L_1 \cup L_2$, $L_1 L_2$, L^* and $L_1 \cap L_2$.

Proof. We consider the concatenation case as an example. Since L_1 and L_2 are recursively enumerable, there are closed programs pr_1 and pr_2 such that, for all $w \in \text{Str}$, $w \in L_1$ iff $\text{eval}(\text{app}(pr_1, \text{str}(w))) = \text{norm}(\text{const(true)})$, and for all $w \in \text{Str}$, $w \in L_2$ iff $\text{eval}(\text{app}(pr_2, \text{str}(w))) = \text{norm}(\text{const(true)})$. (Remember that pr_1 and pr_2 may fail to terminate on some inputs.)

To show that $L_1 L_2$ is recursively enumerable, we will construct a closed program pr such that, for all $w \in \text{Str}$, $w \in L_1 L_2$ iff $\text{eval}(\text{app}(pr, \text{str}(w))) = \text{norm}(\text{const(true)})$.

Closure Properties of R.E. Lan.

Proof (cont.). When pr is called with $\text{str}(w)$, for some $w \in \text{Str}$, it behaves as follows. First, it generates all the pairs of strings (x_1, x_2) such that $w = x_1 x_2$. Let these pairs be $(x_{1,1}, x_{2,1}), \dots, (x_{1,n}, x_{2,n})$. Now, pr uses our *incremental interpretation* function to run a fixed number of steps of $\underline{\text{app}(\text{pr}_1, \text{str}(x_{1,i}))}$ and $\underline{\text{app}(\text{pr}_2, \text{str}(x_{2,i}))}$ (working with $\underline{\text{app}(\text{pr}_1, \text{str}(x_{1,i}))}$ and $\underline{\text{app}(\text{pr}_2, \text{str}(x_{2,i}))}$), for all $i \in [1 : n]$, and then repeat this over and over again.

- If, at some stage, the *incremental interpretation* of $\underline{\text{app}(\text{pr}_1, \text{str}(x_{1,i}))}$ returns $\underline{\text{const(true)}}$, then $x_{1,i}$ is marked as being in L_1 .
- If, at some stage, the *incremental interpretation* of $\underline{\text{app}(\text{pr}_2, \text{str}(x_{2,i}))}$ returns $\underline{\text{const(true)}}$, then the $x_{2,i}$ is marked as being in L_2 .

Closure Properties of R.E. Lan.

Proof (cont.).

- If, at some stage, the incremental interpretation of $\text{app}(\textit{pr}_1, \text{str}(x_{1,i}))$ returns something other than $\underline{\text{const(true)}}$, then the i 'th pair is marked as discarded.
- If, at some stage, the incremental interpretation of $\text{app}(\textit{pr}_2, \text{str}(x_{2,i}))$ returns something other than $\underline{\text{const(true)}}$, then the i 'th pair is marked as discarded.
- If, at some stage, $x_{1,i}$ is marked as in L_1 and $x_{2,i}$ is marked as in L_2 , then Q returns const(true) .
- If, at some stage, there are no remaining pairs, then \textit{pr} returns const(false) .

□

Closure Properties of R.E. Lan.

Theorem 5.2.3

If Σ is an alphabet, $L \subseteq \Sigma^$ is a recursively enumerable language, and $\Sigma^* - L$ is recursively enumerable, then L is recursive.*

Proof. Since L and $\Sigma^* - L$ are recursively enumerable languages, there are closed programs pr_1 and pr_2 such that, for all $w \in \text{Str}$, $w \in L$ iff $\text{eval}(\text{app}(pr_1, \text{str}(w))) = \text{norm}(\text{const(true)})$, and for all $w \in \text{Str}$, $w \in \Sigma^* - L$ iff $\text{eval}(\text{app}(pr_2, \text{str}(w))) = \text{norm}(\text{const(true)})$.

We construct a string predicate program pr that tests whether its input is in L . Given $\text{str}(w)$, for $w \in \text{Str}$, pr proceeds as follows. If $w \notin \Sigma^*$, then pr returns const(false) . Otherwise, pr alternates between incrementally interpreting $\text{app}(pr_1, \text{str}(w))$ (working with $\text{app}(pr_1, \text{str}(w))$) and $\text{app}(pr_2, \text{str}(w))$ (working with $\text{app}(pr_2, \text{str}(w))$).

Closure Properties of R.E. Lan.

Proof (cont.).

- If, at some stage, the first incremental interpretation returns **const(true)**, then *pr* returns **const(true)**.
- If, at some stage, the second incremental interpretation returns **const(true)**, then *pr* returns **const(false)**.
- If, at some stage, the first incremental interpretation returns anything other than **const(true)**, then *pr* returns **const(false)**.
- If, at some stage, the second incremental interpretation returns anything other than **const(true)**, then *pr* returns **const(true)**.

□