

“To loop is human; to recurse is divine.” – L. Peter Deutsch

1. Construct Turing Machines that accept the following languages. You do not need to explicitly define the 7-tuple. Instead, write in clear and concise steps, as done in Examples 3.6 and 3.7 from Sipser’s book.

(a) $\{ww \mid w \in \{a, b\}^*\}$

(b) $\{b_1\#b_2 \mid b_1, b_2 \in \{0, 1\}^*, \text{ as binary numbers } b_1 > b_2\}$

Using part (b), convince yourself that sorting of a given set of binary numbers separated by a special symbol is possible on a Turing Machine.

2. Are recursive languages closed under the following operations?

- (a) union
- (b) concatenation
- (c) complementation
- (d) star
- (e) intersection
- (f) homomorphism
- (g) inverse homomorphism

What about the same operations for recursively enumerable languages?

3. Show that a language is decidable iff some enumerator enumerates the language in the standard order of strings, i.e. lengthwise followed by lexicographic.
4. We know that CFLs are a strict subset of recursive languages. Now, extend the model of PDAs by adding one additional stack. On reading a word we can push and pop both stacks independently of each other. Thus the transition function now looks like:

$$\delta : Q \times \Sigma \times \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma^* \times \Gamma^*$$

Show that 1(a) is accepted by such a machine. Attempt to characterise the class of languages accepted by such machines. What if we add even more stacks?

5. Consider the following restricted version of the halting problem: we are given a Turing Machine M , a word w and a constant c . We know that M , on any input w_0 , is restricted to use at most $c|w_0|$ space on its tape. Does M halt on w ?

Think if this problem is recursive.