

Star-Free Languages are Church-Rosser Congruential

Volker Diekert* Manfred Kufleitner[†] Pascal Weil[‡]

November 17, 2011

Abstract. The class of Church-Rosser congruential languages has been introduced by McNaughton, Narendran, and Otto in 1988. A language L is Church-Rosser congruential (belongs to CRCL), if there is a finite, confluent, and length-reducing semi-Thue system S such that L is a finite union of congruence classes modulo S . To date, it is still open whether every regular language is in CRCL. In this paper, we show that every star-free language is in CRCL. In fact, we prove a stronger statement: For every star-free language L there exists a finite, confluent, and subword-reducing semi-Thue system S such that the total number of congruence classes modulo S is finite and such that L is a union of congruence classes modulo S . The construction turns out to be effective.

Keywords. String rewriting; Church-Rosser system; star-free language; aperiodic monoid; local divisor.

*Institut für Formale Methoden der Informatik, University of Stuttgart. The work on this paper has been initiated by the program *Automata Theory and Applications* at the Institute for Mathematical Sciences, National University of Singapore in September 2011. The first author would like to thank NUS for the hospitality and the organizing committee chaired by Frank Stephan for the invitation. He also thanks Klaus Reinhardt for the introduction to the topic.

[†]Institut für Formale Methoden der Informatik, University of Stuttgart, Germany. The second author was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) under grant DI 435/5-1.

[‡]LaBRI, Université de Bordeaux and CNRS, France. The third author was supported by the grant ANR 2010 BLAN 0202 01 FREC.

1 Introduction

Church-Rosser congruential languages (CRCL) are a nonterminal-free form of Church-Rosser languages (CRL). Both classes have been defined in [9], and it was shown there that CRCL forms a proper subclass in CRL. Languages in CRL enjoy various nice properties. For example their word problem is decidable in linear time. A detailed discussion with links to further references can be found in the PhD-thesis of Niemann [12], see also [13]. We content ourselves to define CRCL: A language $L \subseteq A^*$ is called a *Church-Rosser congruential language*, if there is a finite, length-reducing, and confluent semi-Thue system $S \subseteq A^* \times A^*$ such that L is a finite union of congruence classes modulo S . This means that L contains a finite set F of shortest words such that we have $w \in L$ if and only if every rewriting procedure starting on w and using S terminates in one of the finitely many words in F .

It was also shown in [9] that all deterministic context-free languages are Church-Rosser. However, surprisingly it is not known whether all regular languages are CRCL. The general conjecture is “yes”, but so far only partial results have been established as in [14]. The most advanced result has been announced by Reinhardt and Thérien [15]: According to their manuscript, if a regular language has a group as its syntactic monoid, then this language is in CRCL.

In this note we consider the complementary class of group-free regular languages; and we show that they belong to CRCL. A regular language is *group-free* if its syntactic monoid is group-free. This means it is *aperiodic*. There are many other characterizations for this class. A fundamental result of Schützenberger says that the class of aperiodic language $\text{AP}(A)$ is exactly the same as the class of star-free languages $\text{SF}(A)$ [17]. It is the class where the Krohn-Rhodes decomposition leads to a wreath product of the three-element commutative idempotent reset-monoid U_2 [8]. It is also the class $\text{FO}(A, <)$ of languages definable in first-order logic [10]; and this is the same as the class $\text{LTL}(A)$ of languages definable in the linear temporal logic [7].

A proof that $\text{FO}(A, <) = \text{SF}(A) = \text{AP}(A) = \text{LTL}(A)$ can be conveniently arranged in a cycle. The inclusion $\text{FO}(A, <) \subseteq \text{SF}(A)$ can be explained very nicely with Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé-games [5]. The inclusion $\text{SF}(A) \subseteq \text{AP}(A)$ follows Schützenberger’s original idea. The inclusion $\text{AP}(A) \subseteq \text{LTL}(A)$ is done in the survey [3] with the concept of *local divisors* which play a prominent role here, too. The final inclusion $\text{LTL}(A) \subseteq \text{FO}(A, <)$ is trivial.

Coming back to the class of Church-Rosser congruential languages, our main result shows $\text{SF}(A) \subseteq \text{CRCL}$. Actually, we prove a much stronger result. First we define subword-reducing semi-Thue systems which are a proper subclass of finite length-reducing semi-Thue systems. For every language $L \in \text{AP}(A)$ we effectively construct a finite subword-reducing confluent semi-Thue system $S \subseteq A^* \times A^*$ such

that the total number of congruence classes modulo S is finite and L is a union of such classes, see Theorem 6. A main tool in our proof is the notion of *local divisor*, see Section 3 for a definition.

In the final section of this paper, Section 5, we explain our constructions in a rigorously algebraic framework. This part is mainly intended for possible future work.

In order to give a complete positive solution to the conjecture that all regular languages are CRCL, it remains to combine our approach with the one in [15]. There are however quite a number of obstacles for a fruitful combination. So, we leave the general conjecture as a challenging research problem.

2 Preliminaries and Notation

In the following A means a finite alphabet, an element of A is called a *letter*, and A^* denotes the *free monoid* generated by A . It is the set of *words* over A . The empty word is denoted by 1. The *length* of a word u is denoted by $|u|$. We have $|u| = n$ for $u = a_1 \cdots a_n$ where $a_i \in A$. The empty word has length 0. We carefully distinguish between the notion of factor and subword. Let $u, v \in A^*$. The word u is called a *factor* of v if there is a factorization $v = xuy$. It is called a *subword* of v if there is a factorization $v = x_0u_1x_1 \cdots u_kx_k$ such that $u = u_1 \cdots u_k$. A subword is also sometimes called a *scattered subword* in the literature.

A *semi-Thue system* over A is a subset $S \subseteq A^* \times A^*$. The elements are called *rules*. We frequently write $\ell \rightarrow r$ for rules (ℓ, r) . A system S is called *length-reducing* if we have $|\ell| > |r|$ for all rules $(\ell, r) \in S$. It is called *subword-reducing*, if r is a subword of ℓ and $\ell \neq r$ for all rules $(\ell, r) \in S$. Every subword-reducing system is length-reducing, but not vice versa.

Every system S defines the rewriting relation $\Rightarrow_S \subseteq A^* \times A^*$ by

$$u \Rightarrow_S v \text{ if } u = p\ell q, v = prq \text{ for some rule } (\ell, r) \in S.$$

By $\xRightarrow{*}_S$ we mean the reflexive and transitive closure of \Rightarrow_S . By $\xleftarrow{*}_S$ we mean the symmetric, reflexive, and transitive closure of \Rightarrow_S . We also write $u \xleftarrow{*}_S v$ whenever $v \xRightarrow{*}_S u$. The system S is *confluent* if for all $u \xleftarrow{*}_S v$ there is some w such that $u \xRightarrow{*}_S w \xleftarrow{*}_S v$.

Note that $u \Rightarrow_S v$ implies that $|u| > |v|$ for length-reducing systems. For subword-reducing systems it implies that the set of subwords in v is a proper subset of the set of subwords in u .

By $\text{IRR}(S)$ we denote the set of irreducible words, i.e., the set of words where no left-hand side occurs as any factor. The relation $\xleftarrow{*}_S \subseteq A^* \times A^*$ is a congruence,

hence the congruence classes $[u]_S = \{v \in A^* \mid u \xrightarrow[S]{*} v\}$ form a monoid which is denoted by A^*/S . A finite semi-Thue system S can be viewed as a finite set of defining relations. Hence, A^*/S becomes a finitely presented monoid.

Definition 1. A semi-Thue system S is called a Church-Rosser system if it is length-reducing and confluent. A language $L \subseteq A^*$ is called a Church-Rosser congruential language if there is a finite Church-Rosser system S such that L can be written as a finite union of congruence classes $[u]_S$.

Remark 2. A semi-Thue system S is a Church-Rosser system if and only if (1) it is length-reducing and (2) every congruence class has exactly one irreducible element.

Let $\pi : A^* \rightarrow A^*/S$, $u \mapsto [u]_S$ be the canonical homomorphism and S be a finite Church-Rosser system. Then $\pi^{-1}(K)$ is a Church-Rosser congruential language as soon as K is finite.

Conjecture 1. Every regular language is a Church-Rosser congruential language.

Example 3. Consider the language $L = (bc)^+$. A Church-Rosser system for L is given by the one-rule semi-Thue system $S = \{cbc \rightarrow c\}$. The monoid $\{b, c\}^*/S$ is infinite. However $L = [bc]_S$; and hence $u \in L$ if and only if $u \xrightarrow[S]{*} bc$. \diamond

A manuscript of Reinhardt and Thérien [15] says that Conjecture 1 is true in case that the syntactic monoid of the regular language is a group. Here, we are going to prove an even stronger result for aperiodic languages, i.e., for languages where the syntactic monoid is group-free. As our proof uses subword-reducing systems in the induction hypothesis, we cannot incorporate the statement of Reinhardt and Thérien (using length-reducing rather than subword-reducing systems) as base in our induction scheme. So the status of Conjecture 1 remains open, in general.

Definition 4. Let $\varphi : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a homomorphism to a finite monoid M . We say φ factorizes through a finite Church-Rosser monoid A^*/S if there is a finite Church-Rosser system S such that A^*/S is a finite monoid and $[u]_S \subseteq \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(u))$ for all $u \in A^*$.

A classical fact states that a language $L \subseteq A^*$ is regular if and only if it is recognizable, i.e., there is a homomorphism $\varphi : A^* \rightarrow M$ to a finite monoid M such that $L = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(L))$. We also say that φ (or that M) recognizes L . Recall that a finite monoid M is called *aperiodic* if there exists some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^n = x^{n+1}$ for all $x \in M$. Accordingly, a language $L \subseteq A^*$ is called *aperiodic* if it is recognized by some finite aperiodic monoid M .

Note that if φ factorizes through a finite Church-Rosser monoid, then we have

$$\varphi : A^* \xrightarrow{\pi} A^*/S \xrightarrow{\psi} M,$$

where S is a Church-Rosser system such that A^*/S is a finite.

Conjecture 2. *Let $\varphi : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a homomorphism to a finite monoid M . Then φ factorizes through a finite Church-Rosser monoid.*

Conjecture 2 is stronger than Conjecture 1. However, we believe that a positive solution to Conjecture 1 comes through a proof of Conjecture 2. Actually, the result in [15] also announces that Conjecture 2 is true for finite groups. We are going to show here that an even stronger statement than Conjecture 2 holds for finite aperiodic monoids.

Example 5. Consider again the language $L = (bc)^+$ from Example 3. Another Church-Rosser system for L is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S = \{ & bbb \rightarrow bb, \ bbc \rightarrow bb, \ cbb \rightarrow bb, \\ & ccc \rightarrow bb, \ ccb \rightarrow bb, \ bcc \rightarrow bb \\ & bcb \rightarrow b, \ cbc \rightarrow c \}. \end{aligned}$$

As in Example 3 we have $L = [bc]_S$; but here, the monoid $\{b, c\}^*/S$ is finite. It has 7 elements: $[1]_S$, $[b]_S$, $[c]_S$, $[bc]_S$, $[cb]_S$, $[bb]_S$, and $[cc]_S$. Note that S is not subword-reducing. \diamond

3 Local divisors

The notion of *local divisor* dates back to a technical report of Meyberg where he introduced this concept in commutative algebra, see [6, 11]. In finite semigroup theory and formal language theory the explicit definition of a local divisor appeared first in [2]. Since then it turned out to be a very useful tool for simplifying classical proofs like in [3, 4] or in finding new results like in this paper. The definition of a local divisor extends the definition of a Schützenberger group for the \mathcal{H} -class of an arbitrary element, [1, 16]. A category generalization is being used by Steinberg and Costa in the context of symbolic dynamics (unpublished).

In this paper we use local divisors for aperiodic monoids, only. Let M be a monoid and let $c \in M$. We put on the subsemigroup $cM \cap Mc$ a monoid structure by defining a new multiplication \circ as follows:

$$xc \circ cy = xcy.$$

It is straightforward to see that \circ is well-defined and $(cM \cap Mc, \circ)$ is a monoid with neutral element c .

The following observation is crucial: If the monoid M is finite and aperiodic, then $|cM \cap Mc| < |M|$ whenever $c \neq 1$. This is clear, because $1 \in cM \cap Mc$ implies that c is a unit of M , but $c \neq 1$ and there are no non-trivial units in aperiodic monoids. The set $M' = \{x \mid cx \in Mc\}$ is a submonoid of M , and $c \cdot : M' \rightarrow cM \cap Mc : x \mapsto cx$ is a surjective homomorphism. In particular, if M is aperiodic, then $(cM \cap Mc, \circ)$ is aperiodic, too. Since $(cM \cap Mc, \circ)$ is the homomorphic image of a submonoid it is a divisor of M . We therefore call $(cM \cap Mc, \circ)$ the *local divisor* of M at c . Note that if $c = c^2$ is an idempotent, then $(cM \cap Mc, \circ) = (cMc, \cdot)$ is the usual *local monoid* defined by the subsemigroup cMc of M . Thus, the notion of local divisor generalizes the notion of local monoid from idempotents to arbitrary elements.

4 Conjecture 2 holds for aperiodic monoids

We have the following result.

Theorem 6. *Let $\varphi : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a homomorphism to a finite aperiodic monoid M . Then φ factorizes through a finite aperiodic Church-Rosser monoid A^*/S where S is subword-reducing.*

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 6. The proof is by induction on the parameter $(|M|, |A|)$ with lexicographic order. The result is true if $\varphi(A^*)$ is trivial. Note that this covers $M = \{1\}$ as well as $A = \emptyset$. In the remaining case there is a letter $c \in A$ such that $\varphi(c) \neq 1$. We let $B = A \setminus \{c\}$, and for better reading we identify c and $\varphi(c) \in M$. Since $c \neq 1 \in M$ and M is aperiodic, c is not a unit. Hence $M_c = cM \cap Mc$ has less elements than M .

Since $|B| < |A|$ we find, by induction, a finite subword-reducing Church-Rosser system $R \subseteq B^* \times B^*$ such that the restriction $\varphi|_{B^*} : B^* \rightarrow M$ factorizes through a finite Church-Rosser monoid B^*/R . In particular, $(\ell, r) \in R$ implies $\varphi(\ell) = \varphi(r)$.

For $u \in B^*$ let \widehat{u} denote the unique word such that $\widehat{u} \in \text{IRR}(R)$ and $u \xrightarrow[R]{*} \widehat{u}$.

The subset $K = \text{IRR}(R)c \subseteq A^*$ is a finite code. This means that K^* is freely generated, as a submonoid of A^* , by the finite set K . Note that $K^+ \subseteq A^*c$. Consider the homomorphism $\psi : K^* \rightarrow (M_c, \circ)$ which is given by $\psi(\widehat{u}c) = c\varphi(u)c$. We have $c\varphi(u)c = \varphi(c\widehat{u}c)$. In particular, ψ is well-defined. By induction $\psi : K^* \rightarrow (M_c, \circ)$ factorizes through a finite aperiodic Church-Rosser monoid K^*/T , where $T \subseteq K^* \times K^*$ is a finite subword-reducing Church-Rosser system.

Consider a rule $(\ell, r) \in T$. It has the form

$$\widehat{u}_1 c \cdots \widehat{u}_m c \longrightarrow \widehat{v}_1 c \cdots \widehat{v}_n c$$

where the $\widehat{u}_i c$ and $\widehat{v}_j c$ are letters in K , every right-hand side $\widehat{v}_1 c \cdots \widehat{v}_n c \in K^*$ is a proper subword of $\widehat{u}_1 c \cdots \widehat{u}_m c \in K^+$. Since $K^* \subseteq A^*$ we can read T as a semi-Thue system over A as well. Next, we define a new system $\widehat{T} \subseteq A^* \times A^*$ as follows:

$$\widehat{T} = \{cl \longrightarrow cr \mid (\ell, r) \in T\}.$$

We collect some important properties of \widehat{T} in a remark:

Remark 7. *The semi-Thue system $\widehat{T} \subseteq A^* \times A^*$ satisfies the following assertions.*

1. \widehat{T} is subword-reducing, because T has this property. This is crucial. Knowing only that T is length-reducing as a system over K^* would not be enough to conclude that \widehat{T} is length-reducing as a system over A^* .
2. \widehat{T} is confluent. For this it is crucial that we added a letter c on the left. This allows to read the words $\widehat{u}c$ as letters in K and the confluence of T transfers to the confluence of \widehat{T} . If there was no c on the left, then T could contain rules $abc \longrightarrow 1$ and $bc \longrightarrow 1$, but a is no left-hand side in T . Over K the words abc and bc are letters, hence there is no overlap in K^* .
3. $cl \longrightarrow cr \in \widehat{T}$ implies $\varphi(cl) = \varphi(cr)$. This is a straightforward calculation in local divisors: Let $cl = cu_1c \cdots u_m c$ and $cr = cv_1c \cdots v_n c$ with $u_i, v_i \in \text{IRR}(R)$. By induction, we have $\psi(\ell) = \psi(r)$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(cl) &= \varphi(cu_1c) \circ \cdots \circ \varphi(cu_m c) \\ &= \psi(u_1c) \circ \cdots \circ \psi(u_m c) \\ &= \psi(u_1c \cdots u_m c) = \psi(v_1c \cdots v_n c) \\ &= \psi(v_1c) \circ \cdots \circ \psi(v_n c) \\ &= \varphi(cv_1c) \circ \cdots \circ \varphi(cv_n c) = \varphi(cr). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 6 is now a direct consequence of the following lemma which shows that the system $S = R \cup \widehat{T}$ has the desired properties.

Lemma 8. *The semi-Thue system $S = R \cup \widehat{T}$ over A satisfies the following assertions.*

1. S is subword-reducing.
2. S is confluent.
3. $\ell \longrightarrow r \in S$ implies $\varphi(\ell) = \varphi(r)$.
4. A^*/S is a finite aperiodic monoid.

Proof. Assertion 1 is clear, because R and \widehat{T} are subword-reducing. Assertion 2 is clear, because there is no overlap of left-hand sides between rules of R and \widehat{T} .

Assertion 3 is clear, because R and \widehat{T} have this property. It remains to show 4. By induction K^*/T is finite. Hence there is a maximal value μ such that every word in K^* of length at least μ is reducible. We conclude that:

$$\text{IRR}(S) \subseteq \{\widehat{u}_0 c \widehat{u}_1 \cdots c \widehat{u}_m \mid \widehat{u}_i \in \text{IRR}(R) \wedge 0 \leq m \leq \mu\}.$$

Since $\text{IRR}(R)$ is finite, we see that $\text{IRR}(S)$ is a subset of a finite set, and thus the finiteness of $\text{IRR}(S)$ and of A^*/S follow. This leaves us to show that A^*/S is aperiodic. We have to show that there exists some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $u = \widehat{u}_0 c \widehat{u}_1 \cdots c \widehat{u}_m \in \text{IRR}(S)$ we have $u^{n+1} \xleftrightarrow[S]{*} u^n$. Let $v = \widehat{u}_1 c \cdots \widehat{u}_m c$. Then $u^{n+1} \xleftrightarrow[R]{*} p c v^n q$ and $u^n \xleftrightarrow[R]{*} p c v^{n-1} q$ for some $p, q \in A^*$. Therefore, it is enough to show that $c v^n \xleftrightarrow[S]{*} c v^{n-1}$ whenever n is large enough. The \widehat{u}_i c 's are code words of K , hence letters in the alphabet K and we can read $v \in K^*$. Here we can use induction, and we know $v^n \xleftrightarrow[T]{*} v^{n-1}$ if n is large enough, because K^*/T is aperiodic. This implies $c v^n \xleftrightarrow[\widehat{T}]{*} c v^{n-1}$ and hence the result. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 6.

Example 9. Consider again the language $L = (bc)^+$ from Example 3 and Example 5. Its syntactic monoid is $M = \{1, b, c, bc, cb, 0\}$ with $bb = cc = 0$, $bc b = b$, $c b c = c$, 1 is neutral, and 0 is a zero element. In particular, bc and cb are idempotent. Here, the syntactic homomorphism $\varphi_L : \{b, c\}^* \rightarrow M$ is induced by $b \mapsto b$ and $c \mapsto c$. We apply the above algorithm for obtaining a Church-Rosser monoid factorizing φ_L .

First we choose to localize at c . Then $N = \{1, b, 0\}$ is the submonoid generated by b . The restriction of φ_L to b^* factorizes through the Church-Rosser monoid defined by the system

$$R = \{bbb \rightarrow bb\}.$$

This leads to the irreducible elements $\text{IRR}(R) = \{1, b, bb\}$. Now, the homomorphism $\psi : \{c, bc, bbc\}^* \rightarrow M_c$ is defined by $x \mapsto cx$ for $x \in \{c, bc, bbc\}$. Note that we consider $\{c, bc, bbc\}$ as a three-letter alphabet. In particular, $M_c = \{c, 0\}$ and $c \mapsto 0$, $bbc \mapsto 0$, and $bc \mapsto c$.

For ψ we obtain the rules

$$T = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (c)(c) \rightarrow (c), \\ (bc) \rightarrow 1, \\ (bbc)(bbc) \rightarrow (bbc), \\ (c)(bbc)(c) \rightarrow (c) \end{array} \right\}$$

The parenthesis are for identifying letters of the alphabet of ψ . This leads to the system

$$\widehat{T} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} ccc \longrightarrow cc, \\ cbc \longrightarrow c, \\ cbbcbbc \longrightarrow cbbc, \\ ccbbcc \longrightarrow cc \end{array} \right\}$$

and $S = R \cup \widehat{T}$ is the system for φ . In $\text{IRR}(S)$ there are 65 irreducible elements and $bbcbbccbbcbb$ is the longest one. \diamond

5 Algebraic constructions

The aim of this section is to place the explicit constructions from the previous Section 4 into a broader algebraic context. It shows that the quotient monoid A^*/S in Lemma 8 has an algebraic interpretation.

5.1 Rees-extension monoids and Church-Rosser systems

Let $\rho : P \rightarrow Q$ be a mapping between two monoids P and Q . We are going to define the *Rees-extension monoid* of ρ which we shall denote by $E(\rho)$. If ρ is chosen properly, then $E(\rho)$ coincides with the monoid A^*/S where $S \subseteq A^* \times A^*$ is the subword-reducing confluent semi-Thue system of Lemma 8, see Proposition 10. As a carrier set for the monoid $E(\rho)$ we choose the disjoint union $P \dot{\cup} (P \times Q \times P)$. The multiplication is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} u \cdot v &= uv && \text{for } u, v \in P. \\ x \cdot (u, q, v) \cdot y &= (xu, q, vy) && \text{for } x, u, v, y \in P \text{ and } q \in Q. \\ (u, q, v) \cdot (x, r, y) &= (u, q\rho(vx)r, y) && \text{for } u, v, x, y \in P \text{ and } q, r \in P. \end{aligned}$$

Now, P is a submonoid of $E(\rho)$ and $P \times Q \times P$ is an ideal. As a semigroup, $P \times Q \times P$ is a special case of the Rees-matrix construction, see e.g. [1, 16]: The mapping ρ defines a $P \times P$ matrix \mathcal{R} with coefficients in Q by $\mathcal{R}(v, x) = \rho(vx)$; and the multiplication in $P \times Q \times P$ can be written as $(u, p, v) \cdot (x, q, y) = (u, p\mathcal{R}(v, x)q, y)$.

In the following we let $c = \rho(1) \in Q$. Multiplying triples $(1, q, 1)$ and $(1, r, 1)$ yields $(1, q, 1) \cdot (1, r, 1) = (1, q\rho(1)r, 1) = (1, qcr, 1)$. In particular, the sandwich construction $(Q, \#_c)$ appears as a subsemigroup, where $\#_c$ denotes the standard sandwich-multiplication defined by $q \#_c r = qcr$. We have $(1, 1, 1)^n = (1, c^{n-1}, 1)$ and, more general, $(u, q, v)^n = (u, (q\rho(vu))^{n-1}q, v)$ for all $n \geq 1$. It follows that $E(\rho) = P \dot{\cup} (P \times Q \times P)$ is aperiodic if both P and Q are aperiodic.

For Proposition 10 below, we apply the Rees-extension monoid to the setting in Section 4. We start with a homomorphism $\varphi : A^* \rightarrow M$ to a finite aperiodic monoid M , the alphabet A is the disjoint union of B and $\{c\}$, P is the quotient B^*/R , Q is the quotient K^*/T for $K = \text{IRR}(R)c$. Since we can identify $P = B^*/R$ and $\text{IRR}(R)$, we define $\rho : P \rightarrow Q$ by $\rho(u) = [uc]_T$ for $u \in \text{IRR}(R)$. Now, A^*/S from Section 4 and $E(\rho)$ coincide:

Proposition 10. *In the situation above, A^*/S and $E(\rho)$ are isomorphic.*

Proof. Let $\sigma : \text{IRR}(S) \rightarrow E(\rho)$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(u_0) &= u_0 \quad \text{and} \\ \sigma(u_0cu_1 \cdots cu_{k+1}) &= (u_0, \rho(u_1) \cdots \rho(u_k), u_{k+1})\end{aligned}$$

for $k \geq 0$ and $u_i \in B^* \cap \text{IRR}(R)$. Here, we indentify P with $\text{IRR}(R)$, and Q with $\text{IRR}(T)$. In particular, by definition of P and Q , the mapping σ is surjective. Suppose $\sigma(u_0cu_1 \cdots cu_{k+1}) = \sigma(v_0cv_1 \cdots cv_{\ell+1})$ for $k, \ell \geq 0$ and $u_i, v_i \in B^* \cap \text{IRR}(R)$. Then $u_0 = v_0$ and $u_{k+1} = v_{\ell+1}$. Moreover, $cu_1c \cdots u_kc \in \text{IRR}(S)$ and thus $(u_1c) \cdots (u_kc) \in K^* \cap \text{IRR}(T)$. Similarly, $(v_1c) \cdots (v_{\ell}c) \in K^* \cap \text{IRR}(T)$. Now, $\rho(u_1) \cdots \rho(u_k) = \rho(v_1) \cdots \rho(v_{\ell})$ implies $(u_1c) \cdots (u_kc) = (v_1c) \cdots (v_{\ell}c)$ in K^* and thus $cu_1c \cdots u_kc = cv_1c \cdots v_{\ell}c$ in A^* . This shows $u_0cu_1 \cdots cu_{k+1} = v_0cv_1 \cdots cv_{\ell+1}$. We conclude that σ is injective.

It remains to show that σ is a homomorphism. Let $u, v \in \text{IRR}(S)$ and $uv \xrightarrow[S]{*} w \in \text{IRR}(S)$, i.e., $[u]_S[v]_S = [w]_S$. If $u, v \in B^*$, then $\sigma(u)\sigma(v) = w = \sigma(w)$. Let now $uv, w \in A^*cA^*$ and $w = w_0cw_1 \cdots cw_{m+1}$. If $u \in B^*$, $v = v_0cv_1 \cdots cv_{\ell+1}$ and $uv_0 \xrightarrow[S]{*} x \in \text{IRR}(S)$, then $w_0 = x$ and $cw_1 \cdots cw_{m+1} = cv_1 \cdots cv_{\ell+1}$. It follows $\sigma(u)\sigma(v) = (x, \rho(w_1) \cdots \rho(w_m), w_{m+1}) = \sigma(w)$. The case $v \in B^*$ is symmetric.

Let now $u = u_0cu_1 \cdots cu_{k+1} \in A^*cA^*$ and $v = v_0cv_1 \cdots cv_{\ell+1} \in A^*cA^*$ with $u_i, v_i \in B^*$. Let $u_{k+1}v_0 \xrightarrow[S]{*} x \in \text{IRR}(S)$. Then $u_{k+1}v_0 \xrightarrow[R]{*} x$. We have $cu_1 \cdots cu_{k+1}v_0c \cdots v_{\ell}c \xrightarrow[S]{*} cw_1c \cdots w_m c$. By construction of S we see that

$$cu_1 \cdots cu_kcxv_1c \cdots v_{\ell}c \xrightarrow[\hat{T}]{*} cw_1c \cdots w_m c,$$

and hence

$$(u_1c) \cdots (u_kc)(xc)(v_1c) \cdots (v_{\ell}c) \xrightarrow[T]{*} (w_1c) \cdots (w_m c),$$

i.e., $\rho(u_1) \cdots \rho(u_k)\rho(x)\rho(v_1) \cdots \rho(v_{\ell}) = \rho(w_1) \cdots \rho(w_m)$ in Q . We conclude that $\sigma(u)\sigma(v) = \sigma(w)$. \square

5.2 Rees-extension monoids and local divisors

Let $\rho : P \rightarrow Q$ be arbitrary again. Observe that $c \neq 1 \in Q$, in general. In the remainder of this section, we draw a connection between local divisors and the Rees-extension monoid. We define an alphabet C by the disjoint union $C = (P \setminus \{1\}) \dot{\cup} \{c\}$. The mapping ρ induces a homomorphism $\tau : C^* \rightarrow E(\rho)$ by defining $\tau(x) = x$ for $x \in P \setminus \{1\}$ and $\tau(c) = (1, 1, 1)$. By considering $(P \setminus \{1\})^*c$ as an infinite alphabet, ρ also induces a homomorphism $\sigma : ((P \setminus \{1\})^*c)^* \rightarrow Q$ by $\sigma(uc) = \rho(\varepsilon(u))$ for $u \in (P \setminus \{1\})^*$. Here, $\varepsilon : (P \setminus \{1\})^* \rightarrow P$ is the evaluation homomorphism.

Consider a homomorphism $\gamma : C^* \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(c) = c \in M$. The aim is to find a condition such that γ factorizes through $\tau : C^* \rightarrow E(\rho)$. This means we wish to write $\gamma = \tau\psi$ for some suitable homomorphism $\psi : E(\rho) \rightarrow M$. The condition we are looking for is statement 1 of Proposition 11.

Proposition 11. *Let $\gamma : C^* \rightarrow M$ be a homomorphism with $\gamma(c) = c \in M$. If Q is generated by $\rho(P)$, then the following assertions are equivalent.*

1. *For $w, w' \in ((P \setminus \{1\})^*c)^*$ the equality $\sigma(w) = \sigma(w') \in Q$ implies $c\gamma(w) = c\gamma(w') \in cM \cap Mc$.*
2. *There exists a homomorphism $\psi_c : Q \rightarrow M_c$ with $M_c = (cM \cap Mc, \circ)$ such that the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} ((P \setminus \{1\})^*c)^* & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & Q \\ \gamma \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi_c \\ Mc \cup \{1\} & \xrightarrow{c \cdot} & M_c \\ & x \mapsto cx & \end{array}$$

3. *There exists a homomorphism $\psi : E(\rho) \rightarrow M$ such that the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C^* & \xrightarrow{\tau} & E(\rho) \\ \gamma \downarrow & \swarrow \psi & \\ M & & \end{array}$$

Proof. 1 \Rightarrow 2: We define $\psi_c(\sigma(w)) = c\gamma(w)$. Condition 1 says that $\psi_c : Q \rightarrow M_c$ is well-defined. It is a homomorphism because γ and the left-shift $c \cdot : Mc \cup \{1\} \rightarrow M_c, x \mapsto cx$ are homomorphisms and $Q \setminus \{1\} \subseteq \sigma(C^*c)$.

2 \Rightarrow 3: For $u \in P \subseteq E(\rho)$ we define $\psi(u) = \gamma(u) = u \in P \subseteq M$. All other elements in $E(\rho)$ have the form $(u, \sigma(\alpha), v)$ with $u, v \in P$ and $\alpha \in ((P \setminus \{1\})^*c)^*$.

Define $\psi(u, \sigma(\alpha), v) = u\psi_c(\sigma(\alpha))v$. This is an element in M because $M_c \subseteq M$. Now, $\psi_c(\sigma(\alpha)) = c\gamma(\alpha)$. Hence, $\psi(u, \sigma(\alpha), v) = \gamma(uc\alpha v)$. Since γ, τ are homomorphisms and τ is surjective, ψ is a homomorphism, too.

3 \Rightarrow 1: Consider $w \in (P^*c)^*$. We have $\tau(cw) = (1, \sigma(w), 1)$. By 3 we have $\gamma(cw) = \psi(1, \sigma(w), 1)$. In particular, $\sigma(w) = \sigma(w') \in Q$ implies $c\gamma(w) = c\gamma(w') \in M_c$. \square

References

- [1] A. H. Clifford and G. B. Preston. *The algebraic theory of semigroups*, volume 1,2. American Mathematical Society, 1961,1967.
- [2] V. Diekert and P. Gastin. Pure future local temporal logics are expressively complete for Mazurkiewicz traces. *Information and Computation*, 204:1597–1619, 2006. Conference version in LATIN 2004, LNCS 2976, 170–182, 2004.
- [3] V. Diekert and P. Gastin. First-order definable languages. In *Logic and Automata: History and Perspectives*, Texts in Logic and Games, pages 261–306. Amsterdam University Press, 2008.
- [4] V. Diekert, M. Kufleitner, and B. Steinberg. The Krohn-Rhodes Theorem and Local Divisors. *ArXiv e-prints* 1111.1585v1, Nov. 2011.
- [5] A. Ehrenfeucht. An application of games to the completeness problem for formalized theories. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 49:129–141, 1961.
- [6] A. Fernández López and M. Tocón Barroso. The local algebras of an associative algebra and their applications. In J. Misra, editor, *Applicable Mathematics in the Golden Age*, pages 254–275. Narosa, 2002.
- [7] J. A. W. Kamp. *Tense Logic and the Theory of Linear Order*. PhD thesis, University of California, Los Angeles (California), 1968.
- [8] K. Krohn and J. Rhodes. Algebraic theory of machines. I: Prime decomposition theorem for finite semigroups and machines. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 116:450–464, 1965.
- [9] R. McNaughton, P. Narendran, and F. Otto. Church-Rosser Thue systems and formal languages. *J. ACM*, 35(2):324–344, 1988.
- [10] R. McNaughton and S. Papert. *Counter-Free Automata*. The MIT Press, 1971.

- [11] K. Meyberg. Lectures on algebras and triple systems. Technical report, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, 1972.
- [12] G. Niemann. *Church-Rosser Languages and Related Classes*. Kassel University Press, 2002.
- [13] G. Niemann and F. Otto. The Church-Rosser languages are the deterministic variants of the growing context-sensitive languages. *Inf. Comput.*, 197:1–21, 2005.
- [14] G. Niemann and J. Waldmann. Some regular languages that are Church-Rosser congruential. In *Revised Papers from the 5th International Conference on Developments in Language Theory*, DLT '01, pages 330–339, London, UK, 2002. Springer-Verlag.
- [15] K. Reinhardt and D. Thérien. Some more regular languages that are Church-Rosser congruential. In *13. Theorietag, Automaten und Formale Sprachen, Herrsching*, pages 97–103, 2003.
- [16] J. Rhodes and B. Steinberg. *The \mathbf{q} -theory of finite semigroups*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, 2009.
- [17] M. P. Schützenberger. On finite monoids having only trivial subgroups. *Inf. Control*, 8:190–194, 1965.