

# An ACCL which is not a CRCL

Colm Ó Dúnlaing\*

Mathematics, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland

October 14, 2019

## Abstract

It is fairly easy to show that every regular set is an almost-confluent congruential language (ACCL), and it is known [3] that every regular set is a Church-Rosser congruential language (CRCL). Whether there exists an ACCL, which is not a CRCL, seems to remain an open question. In this note we present one such ACCL.

## 1 Introduction

$\Sigma^*$  denotes the set of ‘strings’ over an alphabet  $\Sigma$  —  $\Sigma$  can be any finite set; strings over  $\Sigma$  are finite sequences drawn from  $\Sigma$ .  $\Sigma^*$  is a monoid (with identity  $\lambda$ , the empty string) under string concatenation. The length of a string  $x$  is denoted  $|x|$  ( $|\lambda| = 0$ ). If  $x \in \Sigma^*$  and  $a \in \Sigma$  then

$$|x|_a$$

is the number of occurrences of  $a$  in  $x$ , so

$$\sum_{a \in \Sigma} |x|_a = |x|.$$

**(1.1) Definition** A Thue system over a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$  is a set of ordered pairs  $(u, w)$  of strings in  $\Sigma^*$ . In this note only finite Thue systems are considered.

If  $T$  is a Thue system, then we call the pairs  $(u, w)$  in  $T$  its rules, sometimes written  $u \leftrightarrow_T w$ .

A congruence on  $\Sigma^*$  (or any semigroup) is an equivalence relation  $\equiv$  such that for all  $u, v, x, y \in \Sigma^*$ ,

$$x \equiv y \implies uxv \equiv uyv$$

The equivalence classes can be multiplied and thus there is a quotient monoid

$$\Sigma^* / \equiv .$$

If  $\equiv$  is a congruence and  $x$  a string, we write

$$[x]_{\equiv}$$

for the congruence class of  $x$  modulo  $\equiv$ .

---

\*e-mail: odunlain@maths.tcd.ie. Mathematics department website: <http://www.maths.tcd.ie>.

Given  $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ , we write

$$x \leftrightarrow_T y$$

if there exist strings  $t, u, v, w$ , such that  $x = tuv$ ,  $y = twv$ , and either  $(u, w) \in T$  or  $(w, u) \in T$ .

This relation is symmetric, and its reflexive transitive closure

$$\overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}_T$$

is a congruence on  $\Sigma^*$ . The notation for congruence class is simplified as follows.

$$[x]_T = (\text{def}) [x]_{\overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}_T}.$$

Emphasis is placed on the relative lengths of strings in rules of  $T$ .

If  $x \leftrightarrow_T y$  and in addition  $|x| > |y|$ ,  $|x| \geq |y|$ , or  $|x| = |y|$ , respectively, write

$$x \rightarrow_T y, \quad \text{OR} \quad x \mapsto_T y, \quad \text{OR} \quad x \dashv\vdash_T y,$$

respectively.

Since the relation  $\leftrightarrow_T$  is symmetric, we can assume that for any  $(u, w) \in T$ ,

$$|u| \geq |w|$$

**(1.2) Definition** When  $x = tuv \rightarrow_T twv = y$ , so  $|u| > |w|$ , we call  $u$  the *redex* and  $w$  the *reduct*.

**(1.3) Definition** A Thue system  $T$  is, respectively, (i) *Church-Rosser*, (ii) *almost confluent*, (iii) *preperfect*, (see [1]), if whenever  $x \overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}_T y$ ,

(i) *there exists a string  $z$  such that  $x \overset{*}{\rightarrow}_T z$  and  $y \overset{*}{\rightarrow}_T z$ ;*

(ii) *there exist strings  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  such that  $x \overset{*}{\rightarrow}_T z_1$ ,  $y \overset{*}{\rightarrow}_T z_2$ , and  $z_1 \dashv\vdash_T z_2$ ;*

(iii) *there exists a string  $z$  such that  $x \dashv\vdash_T z$  and  $y \dashv\vdash_T z$ .*

**(1.4) Definition** If  $T$  is a Church-Rosser Thue system, then for any string  $x$ , every string  $y$  in  $[x]_T$  reduces (modulo  $T$ ) to the same irreducible string; we call this string

$$\text{irr}_T(x).$$

The word problem for Church-Rosser systems is in linear time, and for the other two kinds it is PSPACE complete; testing for the Church-Rosser property is tractable; testing for almost confluence is in PSPACE; it is undecidable whether a Thue system is preperfect [1].

**(1.5) Definition** A language  $L$  is *congruential* if there exists a congruence  $\equiv$  and a finite set of strings

$$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \quad \text{such that} \\ L = [x_1]_{\equiv} \cup [x_2]_{\equiv} \cup \dots \cup [x_n]_{\equiv}$$

If the congruence is generated by a Thue system, i.e., it is  $\overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}_T$  for some finite Thue system  $T$ , and  $T$  is, respectively, Church-Rosser, or almost confluent, or preperfect, then  $L$  is a Church-Rosser, or almost confluent, or preperfect congruential language: CRCL, ACCL, or PPCL.

An interesting and old result is that every regular set is an ACCL. It can be shown as follows: if  $L$  is a regular set then there exists a finite monoid  $M$  and a homomorphism from  $\Sigma^*$  to  $M$  such that  $L$  is a union of  $h^{-1}(g)$  for suitable  $g$  in  $M$ . But this partition

$$\{h^{-1}(g) : g \in M\}$$

can also be realised by a finite almost-confluent system, namely: let  $N$  be the maximal length of minimal strings in this partition (a  $x$  string is minimal if whenever  $x \xrightarrow{*}_T y$ ,  $|x| \leq |y|$ ). Then the system

$$S = \{(x, y) : x, y \in \Sigma^*, |x| \leq N + 1, x \xrightarrow{*}_T y, y \text{ minimal}\}$$

is almost confluent and its congruence classes coincide with the inverse images  $h^{-1}(g)$ , as required.

A long-standing open problem was whether every regular set is a CRCL: it was settled in the affirmative a few years ago [3].

That left open the unlikely possibility that every ACCL is a CRCL. This note shows the contrary.

The analysis in this paper is simple and direct. In fact, the problem is not susceptible to more sophisticated methods. As noted in [4], Kolmogorov-complexity-based analyses showing palindromes not to be Church-Rosser<sup>1</sup> also shows them not to be almost confluent. Indeed, in [4] we were only able to show that they are ‘preperfect languages’.

All Church-Rosser monoids are  $FP_\infty$  [5,2]. On the other hand, if one inspects the group furnished by Squier [5], which is not  $FP_3$ , it has an obvious presentation as a monoid, but the presentation again turns out to be preperfect rather than almost confluent.

Book’s reduction machine [1] can be used with almost-confluent Thue systems, from which it follows that ACCLs are linear time recognisable. The word problem for an almost confluent Thue system is PSPACE-complete, but (as is easy to show) if the system presents a *group* then the word problem is linear time. So there are few complexity-based arguments separating ACCLs from CRCLs.

## 2 An ACCL which is not a CRCL

We shall introduce an almost confluent Thue system over a 4-letter alphabet  $\Sigma = \{a, b, c, d\}$ , and an involution

$$a \mapsto c \mapsto a, \quad b \mapsto d \mapsto b$$

or

$$\bar{a} = c, \bar{c} = a, \bar{b} = d, \bar{d} = b.$$

Any string in  $\Sigma^*$  can and will be written using  $a, b, \bar{a}, \bar{b}$ .

**(2.1) Definition** We call  $a, b$  positive and  $c, d$  (i.e.,  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ ) negative.

Given a string  $x$  over  $a, b, \bar{a}, \bar{b}$ ,

$$|x|_{\text{pos}} = |x|_a + |x|_b,$$

$$|x|_{\text{neg}} = |x|_{\bar{a}} + |x|_{\bar{b}},$$

the number of occurrences of positive and negative letters in  $x$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Church-Rosser languages are a much richer class of languages than Church-Rosser congruential.

Let

$$h : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

(the additive group of integers) denote the following map:

$$h(x) = |x|_{\text{pos}} - |x|_{\text{neg}}.$$

This is a homomorphism, and

$$a \mapsto 1, b \mapsto 1, \bar{a} \mapsto -1, \bar{b} \mapsto -1.$$

Let  $S$  be the Thue system

$$\begin{aligned} a\bar{a} \rightarrow \lambda, \quad \bar{a}a \rightarrow \lambda, \quad a\bar{b} \rightarrow \lambda, \quad \bar{b}a \rightarrow \lambda, \quad b\bar{a} \rightarrow \lambda, \quad \bar{a}b \rightarrow \lambda, \quad b\bar{b} \rightarrow \lambda, \quad \bar{b}b \rightarrow \lambda, \\ a \mapsto b, \quad b \mapsto a, \quad \bar{a} \mapsto \bar{b}, \quad \bar{b} \mapsto \bar{a}. \end{aligned}$$

The map  $h$  preserves both sides of each rule in  $S$ , and therefore induces a homomorphism

$$\Sigma^* / \langle\!\langle S \rangle\!\rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}.$$

For the rest of this paper, we assume that strings are written in terms of  $a, b, \bar{a}, \bar{b}$ .

**(2.2) Definition** Given a string  $x = a_1 a_2 \dots a_k$ , the string  $\tilde{x}$  is defined as

$$\tilde{x} = \bar{a}_k \bar{a}_{k-1} \dots \bar{a}_1.$$

Clearly  $h(x\tilde{x}) = 0$  and  $[x\tilde{x}]_S = [\tilde{x}x]_S = [\lambda]_S$ .

**(2.3) Definition** A string  $x$  is mixed if it contains both positive ( $a$  or  $b$ ) and negative ( $\bar{a}$  or  $\bar{b}$ ) letters. Else it is unmixed. Unmixed strings can be empty, positive, or negative, in the obvious sense.

If  $x$  is mixed, then it contains an adjacent pair of positive and negative letters which can be reduced (modulo  $S$ ). Thus mixed strings are reducible. Unmixed strings are irreducible.

Thus every string  $x$  can be reduced to a positive or negative string. If  $x$  is positive then  $h(x) = |x|$ . If  $x$  is negative then  $h(x) = -|x|$ .

**(2.4) Lemma** If  $x$  and  $y$  are both positive strings, or both negative, and  $|x| = |y|$ , then  $x \xrightarrow{*}_S y$ . ■

**(2.5) Corollary**  $S$  is almost confluent and  $h$  induces an isomorphism of  $\Sigma^* / \langle\!\langle S \rangle\!\rangle$  with  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

**Proof.** Suppose  $h(x) = h(y)$ .

Reduce  $x$  and  $y$  (modulo  $S$ ) to irreducible strings  $x'$  and  $y'$ . Then  $h(x') = h(x) = h(y) = h(y')$ , and  $x'$  and  $y'$  are unmixed.

If  $h(x) = 0$ , then  $x' = y' = \lambda$ . If  $h(x) > 0$ , then  $x'$  and  $y'$  are entirely positive,  $|x'| = |y'|$ , and  $x' \xrightarrow{*}_S y'$ .

Similarly if  $h(x) < 0$ .

We have shown that if  $h(x) = h(y)$  then there exist irreducible strings  $x'$  and  $y'$  such that  $x \xrightarrow{*}_S x'$ ,  $y \xrightarrow{*}_S y'$ , and  $x' \xrightarrow{*}_S y'$ .

In particular,  $x \xleftrightarrow{*}_S y$ . Conversely, as has been noted, if  $x \xleftrightarrow{*}_S y$  then  $h(x) = h(y)$ :  $h$  induces an isomorphism of  $\Sigma^*/\xleftrightarrow{*}_S$  with its image,  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

Finally, if  $x \xleftrightarrow{*}_S y$ , then  $h(x) = h(y)$ , so there exist strings  $x', y'$  so

$$x \xrightarrow{*}_S x' \xrightarrow{*}_S y' \xleftarrow{*}_S y$$

so  $S$  is almost confluent. ■

**(2.6) Definition**

$$L = [\lambda]_S = h^{-1}(0).$$

*This is our candidate for a non-CRCL.*

**(2.7) Corollary**  $L$  is an ACCL. ■

**(2.8) Theorem**  $L$  is not a CRCL.

We prove this by contradiction. Otherwise there exists a Church-Rosser Thue system  $T$  and a list of irreducible strings

$$u_1, \dots, u_n$$

in  $L$  such that

$$(2.9) \quad L = [\lambda]_S = [u_1]_T \cup \dots \cup [u_n]_T$$

or equivalently

$$x \in L \iff \text{irr}_T(x) \in \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}.$$

Associated with  $T$  and the strings  $u_j$ , we define the following constants:

**(2.10) Definition**

$$Q = \max_{(\ell,r) \in T} |\ell| \quad \text{and} \quad R = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |u_j|_{\text{neg}}.$$

*( $Q$  is the maximum length of redexes in  $T$ .)*

**(2.11) Lemma** *If such a Thue system  $T$  exists, then  $T$  refines  $S$  (in the sense that  $x \xleftrightarrow{*}_T y \implies x \xleftrightarrow{*}_S y$ ).*

**Proof.** It is enough to show that whenever

$$x \rightarrow_T y,$$

$[x]_S = [y]_S$ . Clearly

$$x\tilde{x} \rightarrow_T y\tilde{x}$$

But  $x\tilde{x} \in [\lambda]_S$ , which is a union of congruence class modulo  $T$ , so  $y\tilde{x} \in [\lambda]_S$ . Then  $[y\tilde{x}]_S = [\lambda x]_S = [x]_S$ . But  $[y\tilde{x}x]_S = [y\lambda]_S = [y]_S$ , so  $[x]_S = [y]_S$ , as required. ■

**(2.12) Corollary** *If  $x$  is unmixed, then  $x$  is irreducible (modulo  $T$ ).*

**Proof:**  $x$  is irreducible (modulo  $S$ ) and  $T$  refines  $S$ . ■

**(2.13) Lemma** Suppose that  $xy \rightarrow_T z$  where  $y$  is unmixed (and  $|z| \geq Q$ ). Then  $z$  can be factored as  $x'y'$  where  $y'$  is unmixed and  $|y'| > |y| - Q$  (2.10).

**Proof.** The redex in  $xy$  cannot be entirely in  $y$  since  $y$  is irreducible. Therefore the redex is in  $xs$  where  $|s| < Q$  (possibly  $s = \lambda$ ). Setting  $xy = xsy'$ ,  $y'$  is a suffix of  $z$ ,  $y'$  is unmixed, and  $|y'| > |y| - Q$ . ■

**(2.14) Lemma** Suppose  $x \rightarrow_T y$ . Then  $|x|_{\text{pos}} > |y|_{\text{pos}}$  and  $|x|_{\text{neg}} > |y|_{\text{neg}}$ .

**Proof** Since  $h(x) = h(y)$ ,  $|x|_{\text{neg}} - |y|_{\text{neg}} = |x|_{\text{pos}} - |y|_{\text{pos}}$ , so the number of positive and negative letters is reduced by the same amount, namely,  $(|x| - |y|)/2$ . ■

**(2.15) Corollary** For any positive integer  $k$ , if  $y$  is positive of length  $QR + k$  (2.10), then for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,

$$y \quad \text{and} \quad \text{irr}_T(u_i y)$$

agree on their rightmost  $k$  letters.

**Proof.** Lemma 2.13 can be extended inductively so that if  $u_i y$  is reduced  $t$  times, then the reduced string agrees with  $y$  on their rightmost  $|y| - tQ$  letters. By Lemma 2.14,  $u_i y$  can be reduced at most  $|u_i y|_{\text{neg}}$  times. But  $|u_i y|_{\text{neg}} = |u_i|_{\text{neg}}$  and  $|u_i|_{\text{neg}} \leq R$ , so  $y$  and  $\text{irr}_T(u_i y)$  agree on their rightmost  $|y| - QR$  letters; and  $|y| - QR = k$ . ■

**Proof of Theorem 2.8.** Let  $k = \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil$  and let  $x$  be a positive string of length  $QR + k$ . For any positive string  $y$  of the same length as  $x$ ,  $x \xrightarrow{*}_S y$ .

Let  $u_i = \text{irr}_T(x\tilde{x})$  (noting that  $x\tilde{x} \in L$ ). For any positive string  $y$  with  $|y| = |x|$ ,  $x \xrightarrow{*}_S y$  so  $\tilde{x}x \xrightarrow{*}_S \tilde{x}y$ . But  $\tilde{x}x \xrightarrow{*}_S \lambda$ , so  $\tilde{x}y \in L$  and  $\text{irr}_T(\tilde{x}y) = u_j$  for some  $j$ . Therefore  $[\tilde{x}y]_T = [u_j]_T$  and  $[x\tilde{x}y]_T = [xu_j]_T$ . But  $u_i = \text{irr}_T(x\tilde{x})$ , so, for every positive  $y$  with  $|y| = |x|$ ,

$$(2.16) \quad [u_i y]_T = [xu_j]_T$$

for some  $j$ . Let  $\{y_q\}$  be an enumeration of all positive strings  $y$  of length  $|x|$  which agree with  $x$  on their first  $QR$  letters. There are  $2^k$  such strings. By Corollary 2.15, for each string  $y_q$ ,

$$y_q \quad \text{and} \quad \text{irr}_T(u_i y_q)$$

agree on their rightmost  $k$  letters. The irreducible strings belong to different congruence classes. Therefore there are at least  $2^k$  congruence classes fitting the left-hand side of equation 2.16, and there are at most  $n$  classes matching the right-hand side. Since  $2^k > n$ , we have a contradiction:  $L$  is not a CRCL. ■

### 3 Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to Friedrich Otto for some corrections and helpful suggestions.

## 4 References

1. Ronald V. Book and Friedrich Otto (1993). *String-rewriting systems*. Springer texts and monographs in computer science.
2. Daniel E. Cohen (1997). String rewriting and homology of monoids. *Math. Structures in Computer Science* **7:3**, 207–240.
3. Volker Diekert, Manfred Kufleitner, Klaus Reinhardt, and Tobias Walter (2012). Regular languages are Church-Rosser congruential. *Proc. 39th. ICALP II, Springer LNCS 7392*, 177–188.
4. Colm Ó Dúnlaing and Natalie Schluter (2010). A shorter proof that palindromes are not a Church-Rosser language, with extensions to almost-confluent and preperfect Thue systems. *Theoretical Computer Science* **411**, 677–690.
5. Craig C. Squier (1987). Word problems and a homological finiteness condition for monoids. *J. Pure and Applied Algebra* **49**, 201–217.