

# Fonctions primitives récursives sur les mots avec/sans concaténation

(On the power of recursive word-functions without concatenation)

Jérôme Durand-Lose



Laboratoire d'Informatique Fondamentale d'Orléans  
ÉA 4022  
Université d'Orléans, Orléans, FRANCE



JIRC 2022 — 22 oct., Orléans (DCFS 2022)

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Complexity
- 3 Computing without concatenation
- 4 Conclusion

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Complexity
- 3 Computing without concatenation
- 4 Conclusion

## Well-known: Classical recursion (on natural numbers)

Functions from  $\mathbb{N}^k$  to  $\mathbb{N}$  constructed from

- constant 0 function,
- successor function
- projections  $(\pi_n^i)$
- composition **Comp** $(g, (h_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k})$
- recursion  $f = \mathbf{Rec}(g, h)$  defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} f(0, \vec{y}) &= g(\vec{y}) && \text{and} \\ f(n+1, \vec{y}) &= h(n, f(n, \vec{y}), \vec{y}) \end{aligned}$$

- (add minimisation to get all recursive functions)

## Pros

- simple
- relate to arithmetic

## Cons

- unfit for symbolic manipulation
- complexity blowup



# Recursion on string/words

- $\Sigma = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\}$
- $\varepsilon$  empty word

## Functions from $(\Sigma^*)^k$ to $\Sigma^*$ constructed from

- constant  $\widehat{\varepsilon}$ ,
- all left concatenation by one letter/symbol  $a \cdot (w) = a \cdot w = aw$
- projections  $(\pi_n^i)$
- composition **Comp** $(g, (h_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k})$
- (left) recursion  $f = \mathbf{Rec}(g, (h_a)_{a \in \Sigma})$  defined by:

$$f(\varepsilon, \vec{y}) = g(\vec{y}) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\forall a \in \Sigma, \quad f(a \cdot w, \vec{y}) = h_a(w, f(w, \vec{y}), \vec{y})$$

- (what minimisation to get all recursive functions?)

## Observations

1 letter alphabet corresponds to  $\mathbb{N}$  (in unary)

- everything matches

$r$ -adic encoding function from  $\Sigma^*$  to  $\mathbb{N}$

- $\Sigma = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\}$
- $\langle \varepsilon \rangle = 0$
- $a_k \cdot w, \langle a_k \cdot w \rangle = k + r \cdot \langle w \rangle$
- division, modulo, multiplication, addition...  
are primitive recursive (on  $\mathbb{N}$ )

Since the functions are the same (up to some encoding)...

- Why bother?

## Why bother? indeed

### Tropism

- culture and education stress on numbers, symbols are only to write sentences with
- proof by recursion and not induction (up to introducing measures like depth to do recursion)

### Symbols are what is relevant

- in nowadays computations, computers. . .
- natural numbers are represented by *sequences of symbols*

### Computability. . .

- is about symbol manipulation
- not natural numbers
- The term *Recursive* is getting replaced by *computable* (Soare, 2007)

## State of the art... ancient and number oriented — 1

- *recursion on string, recursion on word, recursive string-functions, recursive word-functions*
- *recursion on representation: representation of natural numbers by words in shortlex/military order, non-trivial successor word-function*
- peak in the 1960's
- Most papers deal with hierarchies and is number-centric

## Cook and Kapron (2017)

- $m$ -adic notation of numbers (digits exclude 0) and relations on weak classes
- primitives  $\{n \mapsto 10^n + i\}_{0 \leq i \leq 9}$



## State of the art... ancient and number oriented — 2

### von Henke et al. (1975)

- survey on counterparts on words of classical results for primitive recursion on numbers

### Variations

- infinite alphabet (Vučkovi, 1970), computation over finite sequences of numbers encoded by numbers
- restriction to unitary word-functions is considered in (Asser, 1987; Santean, 1990; Calude and Sântean, 1990)
- the nowhere defined function is added to primitive recursive word-functions in Khachatryan (2015)

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Complexity
- 3 Computing without concatenation
- 4 Conclusion

## Complexity measure

### Needed

- formalism defines functions, not evaluation!
- what is a computation?
- what is the measure?

### Dynamical computation

- store every result of evaluation
- do not recompute

### Delayed evaluation

- compute value when need
- call by name

## Complexity classes

### Simulation of a Turing machine

- encoding: state \$ read symbol \$ word on left \$ word on right
- update in linear time

### Class P is the same

- similar definition
- (one way) simulation of a Turing machine
- (other way) construction of the DAG in quasi-linear time

### Same for higher classes

- NP (with certificate)
- EXP time...

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Complexity
- 3 Computing without concatenation**
- 4 Conclusion

## Strong limitation

### Lemma

- the output is a suffix of an input

### Corollary

- paring is not possible anymore!
- indeed  $\{\varepsilon, a, aa\} \times \{\varepsilon, a, aa\}$   
has to be mapped one-to-one into  $\{\varepsilon, a, aa\}$

### Language decision

- $L = f^{-1}(\{\varepsilon\})$

### Regular languages

- decided with the addition of constants

## Boolean operators — closure properties

- $\top$  identified with  $\varepsilon$

### Ternary operator / test function

- $\text{if}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{Rec}(\pi_2^1, (\pi_4^4, \pi_4^4))$

### Conjunction and disjunction

- $\wedge$  is  $\text{and}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{Comp}(\text{if}_\varepsilon, (\pi_2^1, \pi_2^2, \pi_2^1))$
- $\vee$  is  $\text{or}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{Comp}(\text{if}_\varepsilon, (\pi_2^1, \widehat{\varepsilon}, \pi_2^2))$

### Negation — non- $\varepsilon$ argument is needed

- $\neg$  is  $\mathbf{Comp}(\text{if}_\varepsilon, (\pi_2^1, \pi_2^2, \widehat{\varepsilon}))$  — arity is 2

## Equality test to palindrome decision

$$\text{Comp} \left( \text{Rec} \left( \pi_2^1 \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{Comp} \left( \text{Rec} \left( \text{id} \mid \begin{array}{l} \pi_3^1 \\ \pi_3^3 \end{array} \mid \begin{array}{l} \pi_4^2 \\ \pi_4^4 \end{array} \right) \\ \text{Comp} \left( \text{Rec} \left( \text{id} \mid \begin{array}{l} \pi_3^3 \\ \pi_3^1 \end{array} \mid \begin{array}{l} \pi_4^2 \\ \pi_4^4 \end{array} \right) \end{array} \right) \mid \begin{array}{l} \pi_2^1 \\ \pi_2^2 \\ \pi_2^1 \end{array} \right)$$

- test if one is the reverse of the other!
- $\rightsquigarrow$  palindrome test
- algebraic language, non-ambiguous but not deterministic



## Algebraic languages

$a_1^n a_2^n$

- non-ambiguous, deterministic
- read  $a_1$  and stack functions to remove  $a_2$

$a_1^n a_2^n a_1^m \cup a_1^n a_2^m a_1^m$

- ambiguous (non-deterministic)

## Non-algebraic languages

$$a_1^n a_2^n a_1^n = a_1^n a_2^n a_1^m \cap a_1^n a_2^m a_1^m$$

$a_1^n a_2^{P(n)}$  with  $P$  polynomial with positive coefficients

any boolean combination of the latter ones

- with prefixes and suffixes  $a_3^*$

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Complexity
- 3 Computing without concatenation
- 4 Conclusion**

## Results

### With concatenation

- computability: identical
- complexity: compatible (P and above)

### Without concatenation, decides...

- all recursive languages
- some algebraic (deterministic/non ambiguous/ambiguous)
- some non algebraic
- languages with polynomial conditions on exponents/repetitions (unary encoding of natural numbers)

## Perspectives — concatenation-less

- Test identity
  - Polynomials in many variables, negative coefficients
  - All algebraic languages (deterministic, non-ambiguous, ambiguous)
- 
- Condition for not computability/decision

- Asser, G. (1987). Primitive recursive word-functions of one variable. In Börger, E., editor, *Computation Theory and Logic, In Memory of Dieter Rödding*, volume 270 of LNCS, pages 14–19. Springer.
- Calude, C. and Sântean, L. (1990). On a theorem of günter asser. *Math. Log. Q.*, 36(2):143–147.
- Cook, S. A. and Kapron, B. M. (2017). A survey of classes of primitive recursive functions. *Electron. Colloquium Comput. Complex.*, page 1.
- Khachatryan, M. H. (2015). On generalized primitive recursive string functions. *Mathematical Problems of Computer Science*, 43:42–46.
- Santean, L. (1990). A hierarchy of unary primitive recursive string-functions. In Dassow, J. and Kelemen, J., editors, *Aspects and Prospects of Theoretical Computer Science, 6th International Meeting of Young Computer Scientists, Smolenice, Czechoslovakia, November 19-23, 1990, Proceedings*, volume 464 of LNCS, pages 225–233. Springer.
- Soare, R. I. (2007). Computability and incomputability. In Cooper, S. B., Löwe, B., and Sorbi, A., editors, *Computation and Logic in the Real World, Third Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2007, Siena, Italy, June 18-23, 2007, Proceedings*, volume 4497 of LNCS, pages 705–715. Springer.
- von Henke, F. W., Rose, G., Indermark, K., and Weihrauch, K. (1975). On primitive recursive wordfunctions. *Computing*, 15(3):217–234.
- Vučkovi, V. (1970). Recursive word-functions over infinite alphabets. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 13(2):123–138.