

A *pushdown automata* is a finite automaton with a stack. A stack can contain any number of elements, but only the top element may be accessed.

We represent a stack as a sequence of elements, $s_0s_1 \dots s_n$ where s_0 is the top of the stack. We use Γ (Gamma) to represent the stack alphabet. Γ is a finite set of symbols. So, a stack is an element of Γ^* .

A *deterministic pushdown automaton* (DPDA) is a 6-tuple $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)$ where $Q, \Sigma, q_0,$ and F are defined as they are for a deterministic finite automaton, Γ is a finite state (the stack alphabet), and transition function:

$$\delta : Q \times \Sigma_\epsilon \times \Gamma_\epsilon \rightarrow (Q \times \Gamma_\epsilon) \cup \{\emptyset\}$$

Note: Sipser defines a *nondeterministic pushdown automaton* (Definition 2.1) and uses *pushdown automata* to mean “deterministic pushdown automata”, but does not define a *deterministic pushdown automaton*.

Since the DPDA is *deterministic*, the δ function must not have only one possible choice at all steps. What rules ensure this?

We can use any symbols we want in the stack alphabet, Γ . As with state labels, in designing a DPDA, it is important to give symbols names that have meaning. Typically, we use $\$$ as a special symbol, often meaning the bottom of the stack.

We use label arrows in a DPDA as $\Sigma, \Gamma_\epsilon \rightarrow \Gamma_\epsilon$. For $a \in \Sigma, h_t, h_p \in \Gamma$:

- $a, h_t \rightarrow h_p$ means if the current input is a and the top-of-stack is h_t , follow this transition and pop the h_t off the stack, and push the h_p .
- $a, \epsilon \rightarrow h_p$ means if the current input is a , follow this transition and push h_p on the stack. (It doesn't matter what is on top of the stack.)
- $a, h_t \rightarrow \epsilon$ means if the current input is a and the top-of-stack is h_t , follow this transition and pop the h_t off the stack.
- $a, \epsilon \rightarrow \epsilon$ means if the current input is a , follow this transition and don't modify the stack.

Prove that a DPDA is *more powerful* than a DFA.

Describe a DPDA that can recognize the language $\{w \mid w \text{ contains more } a\text{s than } b\text{s}\}$.

Model of Computation for Deterministic Pushdown Automata

To define the model of computation for a DPDA, we define the extended transition function, δ^* , similarly to how we did for DFAs, except we need to model the stack.

$\forall q \in Q, \forall a \in \Sigma, x \in \Sigma^*, \gamma \in \Gamma^*, h \in \Gamma$:

$$\delta^*(q, \epsilon, \gamma) = E(q, \gamma)$$

$$\delta(q, a, h_t) \rightarrow (q_t, h_p) \Rightarrow \delta^*(q, ax, h_t\gamma) = \delta^*(q_r, x, \gamma_r) \text{ where } (q_r, \gamma_r) = E(q_t, h_p\gamma)$$

$E : Q \times \Gamma^* \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma^*$ is the forced-follow ϵ -transitions function defined by:

$$\delta(q, \epsilon, \gamma) = \emptyset : E(q, \gamma) = (q, \gamma)$$

$$\delta(q, \epsilon, h_t\gamma) = (q_t, h_p\gamma) : E(q, h_t\gamma) = E(q_t, h_p\gamma)$$

Accepting State Model: A deterministic pushdown automata, $A = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)$ accepts a string $w \in \Sigma^*$ if and only if: $\delta^*(q_0, w, \epsilon) \rightarrow (q_f, s) \wedge q_f \in F$.

Empty Stack Model: A deterministic pushdown automata, $A = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0)$ (note there is no F now) accepts a string $w \in \Sigma^*$ if and only if: $\delta^*(q_0, w, \epsilon) \rightarrow (q, s) \wedge s = \epsilon$.

Nondeterministic Pushdown Automaton

A *nondeterministic pushdown automaton* (this is what Sipser calls a *pushdown automaton*) is a 6-tuple $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, F)$ where $Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, q_0, F$ are defined as they are for DPDA and the transition function is defined:

$$\delta : Q \times \Sigma_\epsilon \times \Gamma_\epsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma_\epsilon)$$

Example. Define a NPDA that recognizes the language $\{ww^R \mid w \in \Sigma^*\}$.