

A Note on Context[C Sensitive Languages and Word Problems

Michael Shapiro*

In [AS], Anisimov and Seifert show that a group has a regular word problem if and only if it is finite. Muller and Schupp [MS] (together with Dunwoody's accessibility result [D]) show that a group has context free word problem if and only if it is virtually free. In this note, we exhibit a class of groups where the word problem is as close as possible to being a context sensitive language. This class includes the automatic groups of [ECHLPT] and is closed under passing to finitely generated subgroups. Consequently, it is quite large. For example, it contains all finitely generated subgroups of the n -fold product of free groups, $F_2 \times \dots \times F_2$. For $n = 2$, these include groups which are not finitely presented, and for $n > 2$, these include groups which are FP_n but not FP_{n+1} .

Let us make clear what we mean by saying that the word problem is as close as possible to being a context sensitive language. Recall that a context sensitive language cannot contain the empty word e . Since the empty word is always an element of the word problem, strictly speaking, the word problem can never be a context sensitive language. So we will abuse terminology and say that the word problem is context sensitive if, after deleting the empty word, it is context sensitive. We feel that this is not a grievous abuse: in any practical situation where one is trying to either decide or enumerate the word problem, the empty word is the least of one's problems!

There are two ingredients to our Theorem. One is the notion of a *asynchronous combing* of a group (see below). The other is the following characterization of context sensitive languages. Given a language L , $L - \{e\}$ is context sensitive if and only if L is the language of a nondeterministic linear bounded Turing machine†. (See, for example, [HU].) Thus, to see that the word problem is context sensitive, we must exhibit an algorithm which, given w with $\bar{w} = 1$, verifies membership in the word problem using an amount of space which is linear in the length of w . In fact, the process we will describe gives a deterministic linear bounded automaton in the case where the combing language is also the language of a deterministic linear bounded automaton. In this case, our algorithm acts to decide the word problem rather than merely verify membership in the word problem.

We start by fixing our terminology. Given a group G and a finite monoid generating set A , we take A^* to be the free monoid on A . For each $w \in A^*$ we denote the length of

* I wish to thank the NSF for support.

† Indeed, as Neumann has pointed out to me, one might wish to cure this mismatch by the following method. We could change the definition of a context sensitive language to allow a finite number of start words rather than a single start symbol. If none of these is e , each could be produced from a single start symbol by a single production rule. Thus the result of this change of definition would be to include L if and only if $L - \{e\}$ is context sensitive under the old definition.

w by $\ell(w)$. The *empty word* is the unique word of length 0 and we denote it by e . We map A^* to G by the monoid homomorphism which takes each letter of A to its value in G . We denote this map by $w \mapsto \overline{w}$. We call $\{w \in A^* \mid \overline{w} = 1\}$ the *word problem*. We will assume that A is supplied with an involution denoted by $a \mapsto a^{-1}$ and that $\overline{a^{-1}} = (\overline{a})^{-1}$ for all $a \in A$. This allows one to build the *Cayley graph* Γ of G with respect to A . This is the labelled directed graph whose vertices are the elements of G and whose edges are $\{(g, a, g') \mid g, g' \in G, a \in A, g' = g\overline{a}\}$. Each edge (g, a, g') is labelled by a . Elements of A^* are called words, and each word now labels a unique edge path of Γ based at $1 \in \Gamma$. Declaring each edge isometric to the unit interval induces the *word metric* $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ on G and a *length function* $\ell(g) = d(1, g)$. We call a subset of A^* a *language*. We call a language L a *normal form* if $\overline{L} = G$. (We do not demand that this is a bijection.) We call a normal form L an *asynchronous combing* if there is a constant K so that for any $w, w' \in L$ with $d(\overline{w}, \overline{w'}) \leq 1$, we can find monotone reparameterizations of $[0, \infty)$ $t \mapsto t'$ and $t \mapsto t''$ so that for all t , $d(w(t'), (w'')) \leq K$. We say that D is a *departure function* for L if for any $w = xyz \in L$, $\ell(\overline{y}) \geq n$ whenever $\ell(y) \geq D(n)$. We say a language L is *short* if there are λ and ϵ so that if $w \in L$ then $\ell(w) \leq \lambda\ell(\overline{w}) + \epsilon$. In addition, we say that L consists of (λ, ϵ) -*quasigeodesics* if for any $w = xyz \in L$, $\ell(y) \leq \lambda\ell(\overline{y}) + \epsilon$.

Theorem. *Suppose that H is a finitely generated subgroup of G and suppose that G possesses a short asynchronous context sensitive combing with a departure function. Then H has a context sensitive word problem.*

Corollary. *A finitely generated subgroup of an automatic group has context sensitive word problem.*

Indeed, we may replace “automatic” by the less popular but equally serviceable class “quasigeodesic asynchronously automatic” [N].

Proof. As we remarked above, we need to give a linear bounded algorithm for verifying membership in the word problem. Thus, it suffices to see that G has context sensitive word problem. For suppose that H is generated by $B = \{h_1, \dots, h_k\}$. We choose $w_1, \dots, w_k \in A^*$ so that $\overline{w_i} = h_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then, given $w' = h_{i_1} \dots h_{i_n} \in B^*$, we replace this by $w = w_{i_1} \dots w_{i_n} \in A^*$. This has increased length by at most a factor of $\max\{\ell(w_i)\}$. We now appeal our linear bounded algorithm to determine if $\overline{w} = 1$, and this will be linearly bounded in the length of our original word w' .

Let L be our combing, and suppose that we are given $w = a_1 \dots a_n \in A^*$. Suppose that for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $u_i \in L$ and $\overline{u_i} = w(i)$. Then for each i , $\ell(u_i) \leq \lambda n + \epsilon$, where λ and ϵ are the constants which assure us that L is short. Further, $\overline{w} = 1$ if and only if $\overline{u_n} = 1$ and this happens if and only if u_n is one of finitely many words (all of length at most ϵ .) So once we have found u_n , it is easy to determine if $\overline{w} = 1$. Thus it suffices to see that we can find u_n in a linearly bounded manner, and to do this, it will suffice to show that we can find each u_{i+1} from u_i and a_{i+1} in a manner which is linearly bounded in terms of $\ell(u_i)$, since this latter is itself linearly bounded in terms of $\ell(w)$.

To do this, we start enumerating the words of A^* , say in short-lex order, and test each one to see if it is an element of L . Since L is context sensitive, we can do this in a linearly bounded fashion. When we find a word u in L , we must check to see if it can be taken as u_{i+1} . That is, we must check whether $\overline{u} = w(i+1) = \overline{u_i a_{i+1}}$.

Now L is an asynchronous combing with a departure function. Thus for each $a \in A$, one can build an asynchronous two tape finite state automaton which determines when given $u, u' \in L$ whether or not $\overline{u} = \overline{u'a}$. (For details see [EHLPT] or [BGSS].) Thus the decision as to whether or not to take u as u_{i+1} can be made using an amount of memory which is bounded by a global constant.

If we have not found u_{i+1} , we go on to the next element of A^* and discard u . Eventually, we find u_{i+1} , and we need never check any word of length longer than $\lambda(\ell(u_i) + 1) + \epsilon$. Since no u_i has length longer than $\lambda n + \epsilon$ we shall eventually find u_n in a linearly bounded way. ■

The Corollary follows by noting that an automatic group has an automatic structure with uniqueness. This will consist of quasigeodesics and hence is short and has a departure function. We can assume it does not contain e . This, together with the fact that it is regular, ensures that it is context sensitive.

In the case where L is an automatic structure with uniqueness, [EHLPT] show that u_{i+1} can be found from u_i by a process whose time is linearly bounded in $\ell(u_i)$. This gives a method for solving the word problem in quadratic time. In a similar vein, if G is a direct product of word hyperbolic groups, the word problem for H can be solved in linear time using pushdown automata [S].

References

- [AS] A.V. Anisimov and F.D. Seifert, Zur algebraischen charakteristik der durch kontextfreie Sprachen definierten Gruppen, Elektron. Informationsverarb. Kybernet. 11 (1975) 695—702.
- [BGSS] G. Baumslag, S.M. Gersten, M. Shapiro and H. Short, Automatic groups and amalgams, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra 76 (1991), 229—316.
- [D] W. Dunwoody, The Accessibility of finitely presented groups, Inventiones Mathematica, (1985), 449—457.
- [EHLPT] D.B.A. Epstein, J.W. Cannon, D.F. Holt, S.V.F. Levi, M.S. Paterson and W.P. Thurston, “Word Processing in Groups,” Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Boston, 1992.
- [HU] J.E. Hopcroft and J.D. Ullman, “Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation,” Addison Wesley, Reading, 1979.
- [MS] D.E. Muller and P.E. Schupp, Groups, the theory of ends, and context-free languages, Journal of Computer and System Sciences, 26 (1983), 295—310.
- [N] W.D. Neumann, Asynchronous combings of groups, International Journal of Algebra and Computation, 2 (1992), 179—185.
- [S] H. Short *et al.*, Notes on word hyperbolic groups, in Group Theory from a Geometric Viewpoint, E. Ghys, A. Haefliger, A. Verjovsky eds., World Scientific, 1991.