Sec. 4: Turing Machines

- (a) Definition of the Turing Machine.
- (b) URM computable functions are Turing computable.
- (c) Undecidability of the Turing Halting Problem

First Problem of URMs

- That incrementing a number by one takes arbitrarily many steps happens on a real computer as well:
 - If we want to represent arbitrary big numbers on the computer, we have to represent them by multiple machine integers
 - Then incrementing a number by one will correspond to arbitrarily many machine instructions (although usually only a few).
 - However, often in complexity theory this problem is ignored because the effect is marginal in real applications.
 - The exception are applications in which very big integers occur, e.g. tests for primality. There this effect cannot be ignored any more.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sect. 4

4-1

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

First Problem of URMs

- If one takes this effect into account, one needs in many examples to multiply the running time by a factor of ln(n), where n is the largest number occurring.
- Therefore URMs unsuitable as a basis for defining the precise complexity of algorithms.
- However, there are theorems linking complexity of URMs to actual complexities of algorithms.

(a) Definition of TMs

- There are two problems with the model of a URM:
- Execution of a single URM instruction might take arbitrarily long:
 - Consider succ(n).
 - If R_n contains in binary $\underbrace{111\cdots 111}_{k \text{ times}}$, this instruction

replaces it by $1 \underbrace{000 \cdots 000}_{k}$.

k times

- We have to replace k symbols 1 by 0.
- k is arbitrary
 - \rightarrow this single step might take arbitrarily long time.

Second Problem of URMs

- We aim at a notion of computability, which covers all possible ways of computing something, independently of any concrete machine.
- URMs are a model of computation which covers current standard computers.
- However, there might be completely different notions of computability, based on symbolic manipulations of a sequence of characters, where it might be more complicated to see directly that all such computations can be simulated by a URM.
- It is more easy to see that such notions are covered by the Turing machine model of computation.

Idea of a Turing Machine

- Steps in this formulation:
 - Algorithm should be deterministic.

 \rightarrow The agent will use only finitely many symbols, put at discrete positions on the paper.



CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Idea of a Turing Machine

- We can replace a two-dimensional piece of paper by one potentially infinite tape, by using a special symbol for a line break.
- Each entry on this tape is called a <u>cell</u>:



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Idea of a Turing Machine

 Idea of a Turing machine (TM): Analysis of a computation carried out by a human being (agent) on a piece of paper.

15 .	16=		
	15		
	90		
	$\overline{240}$		

4-5

Steps in Formalising TMs

 In the real situation, agent can look at several cells at the same time,

but bounded by his physical capability.

Can be simulated by looking at one cell only at any time, and moving around in order to get information about neighbouring cells.



Steps in Formalising TMs

 In the real situation, an agent can make arbitrary jumps, but bounded by the physical ability of the agent.

Each such jump can be simulated by finitely many one-step jumps.

 \rightarrow Restriction to one-step movements.



CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Steps in Formalising TMs

 In the real situation, an agent can make arbitrary jumps, but bounded by the physical ability of the agent.

Each such jump can be simulated by finitely many one-step jumps.

 \rightarrow Restriction to one-step movements.



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-9

Steps in Formalising TMs

 In the real situation, an agent can make arbitrary jumps, but bounded by the physical ability of the agent.

Each such jump can be simulated by finitely many one-step jumps.

 \rightarrow Restriction to one-step movements.

Steps in Formalising TMs

 In the real situation, an agent can make arbitrary jumps, but bounded by the physical ability of the agent.

Each such jump can be simulated by finitely many one-step jumps.

 \rightarrow Restriction to one-step movements.



Steps in Formalising TMs

 Agent operates purely mechanistically: Reads a symbol, and depending on it changes it and makes a movement.

Agent himself will have only finite memory.

 \rightarrow There is a finite state of the agent, and, depending on the state and the symbol at the head, a next state, a new symbol, and a movement is chosen.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-10

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Steps in Formalising TMs

 In the real situation, an agent can make arbitrary jumps, but bounded by the physical ability of the agent.

Each such jump can be simulated by finitely many one-step jumps.

 \rightarrow Restriction to one-step movements.



Steps in Formalising TMs

 Agent operates purely mechanistically: Reads a symbol, and depending on it changes it and makes a movement.

Agent himself will have only finite memory.

 \rightarrow There is a finite state of the agent, and, depending on the state and the symbol at the head, a next state, a new symbol, and a movement is chosen.



Steps in Formalising TMs

 Agent operates purely mechanistically: Reads a symbol, and depending on it changes it and makes a movement.

Agent himself will have only finite memory.

 \rightarrow There is a finite state of the agent, and, depending on the state and the symbol at the head, a next state, a new symbol, and a movement is chosen.



Steps in Formalising TMs

 Agent operates purely mechanistically: Reads a symbol, and depending on it changes it and makes a movement.

Agent himself will have only finite memory.

 \rightarrow There is a finite state of the agent, and, depending on the state and the symbol at the head, a next state, a new symbol, and a movement is chosen.



CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Steps in Formalising TMs

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

 Agent operates purely mechanistically: Reads a symbol, and depending on it changes it and makes a movement.

Agent himself will have only finite memory.

 \rightarrow There is a finite state of the agent, and, depending on the state and the symbol at the head, a next state, a new symbol, and a movement is chosen.



Definition of TMs



- A Turing machine is a five tuple (or quintuple) $(\Sigma, S, I, \sqcup, s_0)$, where
 - Σ is a finite set of symbols, called the <u>alphabet</u> of the Turing machine. On the tape, the symbols in Σ will be written.
 - S is a finite set of states.

4-11

Definition of TMs



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-13

Meaning of Instructions

- A instruction $(s, a, s', a', D) \in I$ means the following:
 - If the Turing machine is in state s, and the symbol at position of the head is a, then
 - \bullet the state is changed to s',
 - the symbol at this position is changed to a',
 - if D = L, the head moves left,
 - if D = R, the head moves right.

Example:

 $(s_0, 1, s_1, 0, \mathsf{R})$ $(s_1, 6, s_2, 7, \mathsf{L})$

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Meaning of Instructions

- A instruction $(s, a, s', a', D) \in I$ means the following:
 - If the Turing machine is in state s, and the symbol at position of the head is a, then
 - the state is changed to s',
 - the symbol at this position is changed to a',
 - if D = L, the head moves left,
 - if D = R, the head moves right.

Example:



Meaning of Instructions

- A instruction $(s, a, s', a', D) \in I$ means the following:
 - If the Turing machine is in state s, and the symbol at position of the head is a, then
 - \bullet the state is changed to s',
 - \bullet the symbol at this position is changed to a',
 - \square if D = L, the head moves left,
 - \bullet if D = R, the head moves right.

Meaning of Instructions

- A instruction $(s, a, s', a', D) \in I$ means the following:
 - If the Turing machine is in state s, and the symbol at position of the head is a, then
 - the state is changed to s',
 - $\hfill {\scriptstyle extsf{s}}$ the symbol at this position is changed to a',
 - if D = L, the head moves left,
 - if D = R, the head moves right.

Example:



```
26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)
```

4-14

Meaning of Instructions

- A instruction $(s, a, s', a', D) \in I$ means the following:
 - If the Turing machine is in state s, and the symbol at position of the head is a, then
 - $\ensuremath{\,{\rm s}}$ the state is changed to s' ,
 - $\ensuremath{\,{\scriptstyle \bullet}}$ the symbol at this position is changed to a',
 - if D = L, the head moves left,
 - if D = R, the head moves right.

Example:



Meaning of Instructions

- Note that for the above it is important that for every $s \in S$, $a \in \Sigma$ there is at most one s', a', D s.t. $(s, a, s', a', D) \in S$.
 - Without this condition, there might be more than one choice of selecting a new tape symbol, next state and direction.
 - If we omit this definition, we obtain a non-deterministic TM. In this case the machine selects in each step one of the possible choices (provided there exist one) at random.
- If the Turing machine is in a state *s* and reads symbol *a* at his head, and there are no s', a', D s.t. $(s, a, s', a', D) \in I$, then the Turing machine stops.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

TM Architecture vs. TM Program

- As for URMs a TM means both the TM architecture and the TM program.
 - The TM architecture describes that a TM has a tape, a head, a state, and how it is executed.
 - The TM program consists of the alphabet on the tape, the set of states, the instructions, the symbol for blank and the initial state.
- When asked to define a TM which has a certain behaviour oen usually actually asks for a TM program, such that a TM with this program has this behaviour.

Visualisation of TMs

🍠 A TM

 $(\Sigma, \mathsf{S}, \mathsf{I}, \sqcup, s_0)$

can be visualised by a labelled graph as follows:

- Vertices: states (i.e. S).
- Edges: If $(s, a, t, b, D) \in I$, then there is an edge



- Furthermore we write an arrow to the initial state coming from nowhere.
- If there are several vertices from s to s', one draws only one arrow with one label for each vertex.

```
26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)
```

4-16

Example

The Turing machine with initial state s_0 and instructions

$$\{ (s_0, 0, s_0, 0, \mathsf{R}), \\ (s_0, 1, s_0, 0, \mathsf{R}), \\ (s_0, \sqcup, s_1, \sqcup, \mathsf{L}), \\ (s_1, 0, s_1, 0, \mathsf{L}), \\ (s_1, \sqcup, s_2, \sqcup, \mathsf{R}) \}$$

is visualised as follows (we write B instead of \Box):



Example

The TM on the previous slide sets the binary number the head is pointing to to zero, provided to the left of the head there are is a blank.

Exercise:

- This example assumes that the TM points to the left most digit of a binary number.
- Modify this TM, so that it works as well if the TM points initially to any digit of a binary number.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Example of a TM

- Development of a TM with $\Sigma = \{0, 1, \bot J\}$,
 - where \square is the symbol for the blank entry.
- Functionality of the TM:
 - Assume initially the following:
 - The tape contains binary number,
 - ✓ The rest of the tape contains ∟.
 - The head points to any digit of the number.
 - The TM in state s_0 .
 - Then the TM stops after finitely many steps and then
 - the tape contains the original number incremented by one,
 - the rest of tape contains \Box ,
 - the head points to most significant bit.

Equivalent Representations

- The pictorial representation is equivalent to the set of instructions plus an initial state.
- Therefore a TM can both be given by listing its instructions and by the pictorial representation.
- Furthermore the only relevant sets of instructions are those occurring in the picturial representation. Similarly for the set of symbols on the tape.
- Therefore, assuming that the blank symbol is canonical, we can take the picturial representation as the complete definition of a TM (with states being the set of states occurring in the diagram, and alphabet consisting of the canonical blank symbol and the states occurring in the diagram).

```
26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)
```

4-19a

Example

Initially



Example

Initially



CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Construction of the TM

- TM is $(\{0, 1, \sqcup, S, I, \sqcup, s_0)$.
- States S and instructions I developed in the following.

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:



At the end TM is in state s_1 .

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-22

Step 1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:

 $(s_0, 0, s_0, 0, \mathsf{R})$ $(s_0, 1, s_0, 1, \mathsf{R})$ $(s_0, \sqcup, s_1, \sqcup, \mathsf{L})$



At the end TM is in state s_1 .



Step 1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:



• At the end TM is in state s_1 .



Step 1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:

1

1

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)



0 1

 s_0

1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:



• At the end TM is in state s_1 .



Step 1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.

B/B.L

Achieved by the following instructions:



• At the end TM is in state s_1 .



0/0. R

1/1, R

Step 1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:





Step 1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:



 s_0

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:



• At the end TM is in state s_1 .



Step 1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:





At the end TM is in state s_1 .



Step 1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:



• At the end TM is in state s_1 .



Step 1

- Initially, move head to least significant bit.
 - I.e. as long as symbol at head is 0 or 1, move right, leave symbol as it is.
 - If symbol is ∟, move head left, leave symbol again as it is.
- Achieved by the following instructions:



 s_1

CS_226 Computability Theory,	Michaelmas Term	n 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Increasing a binary number *b* done as follows:

- Case number consists of 1 only:
 - I.e. $b = (\underbrace{111 \cdots 111}_{k \text{ times}})_2$.
 - $b+1 = (1 \underbrace{000 \cdots 000}_{p})_2.$

k times

- Obtained by replacing all ones by zeros and then replacing the first blank symbol by 1.
- That's what happens when we add by hand:



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-23

Step 2

Increasing a binary number *b* done as follows:

- **•** Case number consists of 1 only:
 - I.e. $b = (\underbrace{111 \cdots 111}_{)2}$.

k times

• $b+1 = (1 \underbrace{000 \cdots 000}_{2})_2$.

k times

- Obtained by replacing all ones by zeros and then replacing the first blank symbol by 1.
- That's what happens when we add by hand:



Step 2

Increasing a binary number *b* done as follows:

- **•** Case number consists of 1 only:
 - I.e. $b = (\underbrace{111 \cdots 111}_{k \text{ times}})_2$.

• $b+1 = (1 \underbrace{000 \cdots 000}_{)2})_2$.

k times

- Obtained by replacing all ones by zeros and then replacing the first blank symbol by 1.
- That's what happens when we add by hand:



CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Step 2

Increasing a binary number *b* done as follows:

- Case number consists of 1 only:
 - I.e. $b = (\underbrace{111 \cdots 111}_{2})_2$.

k times

• $b+1 = (1 \underbrace{000 \cdots 000}_{2})_2$.

k times

- Obtained by replacing all ones by zeros and then replacing the first blank symbol by 1.
- That's what happens when we add by hand:

	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	
+							1	
				1	1	1		
					0	0	0	

²⁶ Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Increasing a binary number *b* done as follows:

- Case number consists of 1 only:
 - I.e. $b = (\underbrace{111 \cdots 111}_{2})_2$. k times
 - $b+1 = (1 000 \cdots 000)_2$.

k times

- Obtained by replacing all ones by zeros and then replacing the first blank symbol by 1.
- That's what happens when we add by hand:



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-23

Step 2

Increasing a binary number *b* done as follows:

- Case number consists of 1 only:
 - I.e. $b = (\underline{111} \cdot \cdot \cdot \underline{111})_2$.

k times

• $b+1 = (1 \underbrace{000 \cdots 000}_{2})_2$.

k times

- Obtained by replacing all ones by zeros and then replacing the first blank symbol by 1.
- That's what happens when we add by hand:



Step 2

Increasing a binary number *b* done as follows:

- Case number consists of 1 only:
 - I.e. $b = (\underbrace{111} \cdots \underbrace{111})_2$. k times

• $b+1 = (1 \underbrace{000 \cdots 000}_{2})_2$.

k times

- Obtained by replacing all ones by zeros and then replacing the first blank symbol by 1.
- That's what happens when we add by hand:

	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
+							1
			1	1	1	1	
		0	1	0	0	0	0

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Step 2

Increasing a binary number *b* done as follows:

- Case number consists of 1 only:
 - I.e. $b = (\underbrace{111} \cdots \underbrace{111})_2$.

k times

• $b+1 = (1 \underbrace{000 \cdots 000}_{2})_2$.

k times

- Obtained by replacing all ones by zeros and then replacing the first blank symbol by 1.
- That's what happens when we add by hand:

	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	
+							1	
			1	1	1	1		
	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Otherwise:

- Then the representation of the number contains at the end one 0 followed by ones only. Includes case where the least significant digit is 0.
 - Example 1: $b = (0100010111)_2$, one 0 followed by 3 ones.
 - Example 2: $b = (0100010010)_2$, least significant digit is 0.
- Let $b = (b_0 b_1 \cdots b_k 0 \underbrace{111 \cdots 111}_{l \text{ times}})_2$.
- b+1 obtained by replacing the final block of ones by 0 and the 0 by 1:

 $b+1 = (b_0 b_1 \cdots b_k 1 \underbrace{000 \cdots 000}_{2})_2.$

l times

```
26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)
```

4-24

Step 2 – General Situation

- We have to replace, as long as we find ones, the ones by zeros, and move left, until we encounter a 0 or a LJ, which is replaced by a 1.
- So we need a new state s₂, and the following instructions

 $\begin{array}{l} (s_1, 1, s_1, 0, \mathsf{L}) \\ (s_1, 0, s_2, 1, \mathsf{L}) \\ (s_1, \sqcup, s_2, 1, \mathsf{L}) \end{array}$



• At the end the head will be one field to the left of the 1 written, and the state will be s_2 .

Step 2 – General Situation

- We have to replace, as long as we find ones, the ones by zeros, and move left, until we encounter a 0 or a LJ, which is replaced by a 1.
- So we need a new state s₂, and the following instructions





• At the end the head will be one field to the left of the 1 written, and the state will be s_2 .



CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Step 2 – General Situation

- We have to replace, as long as we find ones, the ones by zeros, and move left, until we encounter a 0 or a ∟ , which is replaced by a 1.
- So we need a new state s₂, and the following instructions

 $(s_1, 1, s_1, 0, L)$ $(s_1, 0, s_2, 1, L)$ $(s_1, \sqcup, s_2, 1, L)$



• At the end the head will be one field to the left of the 1 written, and the state will be s_2 .



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Step 2 – General Situation

- We have to replace, as long as we find ones, the ones by zeros, and move left, until we encounter a 0 or a ∟J, which is replaced by a 1.
- So we need a new state s₂, and the following instructions

 $(s_1, 1, s_1, 0, L)$ $(s_1, 0, s_2, 1, L)$ $(s_1, \sqcup, s_2, 1, L)$



• At the end the head will be one field to the left of the 1 written, and the state will be s_2 .



Step 2 – General Situation

- We have to replace, as long as we find ones, the ones by zeros, and move left, until we encounter a 0 or a LJ, which is replaced by a 1.
- So we need a new state s₂, and the following instructions

 $(s_1, 1, s_1, 0, L)$ $(s_1, 0, s_2, 1, L)$ $(s_1, \sqcup, s_2, 1, L)$



At the end the head will be one field to the left of the 1 written, and the state will be s₂.



Step 2 – General Situation

- We have to replace, as long as we find ones, the ones by zeros, and move left, until we encounter a 0 or a LJ, which is replaced by a 1.
- So we need a new state s₂, and the following instructions





• At the end the head will be one field to the left of the 1 written, and the state will be s_2 .



Step 3

Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows

 $(s_2, 0, s_2, 0, L)$ $(s_2, 1, s_2, 1, L)$ $(s_2, \sqcup, s_3, \sqcup, R)$



The program terminates in state s_3 .

Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows

 $(s_2, 0, s_2, 0, L)$ $(s_2, 1, s_2, 1, L)$ $(s_2, \sqcup, s_3, \sqcup, R)$



The program terminates in state s_3 .



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-26

Step 3

Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows

 $(s_2, 0, s_2, 0, L)$ $(s_2, 1, s_2, 1, L)$ $(s_2, \sqcup, s_3, \sqcup, R)$



The program terminates in state s_3 .



Step 3

Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows





The program terminates in state s_3 .



CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Step 3

Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows

 $(s_2, 0, s_2, 0, \mathsf{L})$ $(s_2, 1, s_2, 1, \mathsf{L})$ $(s_2, \sqcup, s_3, \sqcup, \mathsf{R})$



The program terminates in state s_3 .



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows

 $(s_2, 0, s_2, 0, L)$ $(s_2, 1, s_2, 1, L)$ $(s_2, \sqcup, s_3, \sqcup, R)$



The program terminates in state s_3 .



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-26

Step 3

Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows

 $(s_2, 0, s_2, 0, \mathsf{L})$ $(s_2, 1, s_2, 1, \mathsf{L})$ $(s_2, \sqcup, s_3, \sqcup, \mathsf{R})$



The program terminates in state s_3 .



Step 3

Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows





The program terminates in state s_3 .



CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Step 3

Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows

 $(s_2, 0, s_2, 0, L)$ $(s_2, 1, s_2, 1, L)$ $(s_2, \sqcup, s_3, \sqcup, R)$



The program terminates in state s_3 .



Finally, we have to move the most significant bit, which is done as follows

 $(s_2, 0, s_2, 0, L)$ $(s_2, 1, s_2, 1, L)$ $(s_2, \sqcup, s_3, \sqcup, R)$



The program terminates in state s_3 .



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-26

Complete TM

The complete TM is as follows:

 $\{\{0, 1, \sqcup, 1\}, \\ \{s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3\}, \\ \{(s_0, 0, s_0, 0, \mathsf{R}), \\ (s_0, \bot, s_0, 1, \mathsf{R}), \\ (s_0, \sqcup, s_1, \sqcup, \mathsf{L}), \\ (s_1, 1, s_1, 0, \mathsf{L}), \\ (s_1, 0, s_2, 1, \mathsf{L}), \\ (s_1, \sqcup, s_2, 1, \mathsf{L}), \\ (s_2, 0, s_2, 0, \mathsf{L}), \\ (s_2, 1, s_2, 1, \mathsf{L}), \\ (s_2, \sqcup, s_3, \sqcup, \mathsf{R})\}, \sqcup, s_0)$

Complete TM



CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Notation: bin

- TMs usually operate on binary numbers.
- Therefore we define for a natural number bin(n) as the

sequence of digits representing the unique standard binary representation of n.

- So bin(n) has no leading zeros, except for bin(0) := "0".
- Examples:
 - bin(0) = "0",
 - bin(1) = "1",
 - bin(2) = "10",
 - bin(3) = "11",
 - bin(4) = "100", etc.

Notation: bin

- In order to read off the final result, we need to interpret an arbitrary finite sequence of 0, 1 as a binary number, even if it has leading zeros.
- We define $\widetilde{bin}(n)$ as one of the possible binary representations of *n*, allowing leading 0.
 - So bin(1) can be "1", "01", "001", etc.
 - In the special case 0 we treat the empty string as one of the possible representations, so bin(0) can be "", "0", "00", "000", etc.

$(b_0,\ldots,b_{k-1})_2$, $(d_0,\ldots,d_{k-1})_{10}$

- We write as well
 - $(b_0, \ldots, b_{k-1})_2$ for the natural number having binary representation b_0, \ldots, b_{k-1}), e.g.

 $(01010)_2 = 12$

• $(d_0, \ldots, d_{k-1})_{10}$ for the natural number with decimal representation d_0, \ldots, d_{k-1} e.g.

 $(101)_{10} = 101$

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Notation: bin

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

- When carrying out intermediate calculations, it is easier to refer to bin(n) rather than bin(n)
 - E.g. we can set a number on the tape easily to an element of bin(0) by overwriting it with 0s.
 - In order to set it to bin(0) one would need to make sure that exactly one 0 remains. Then one usually has to shift left the content of the tape to the right of the original number.

Definition 4.1

Let $T = (\Sigma, S, I, \sqcup, s_0)$ be a Turing machine with $\{0, 1\} \subseteq \Sigma$. Define for every $k \in \mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{T(k)} : \mathbb{N}^k \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{N}$, where

 $T^{(k)}(a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1})$ is computed as follows:

Initialisation:

- We write on the tape
 - $bin(a_0) \sqcup bin(a_1) \sqcup \cup \sqcup \sqcup bin(a_{k-1}).$
 - E.g. if k = 3, $a_0 = 0$, $a_1 = 3$, $a_2 = 2$ then we write $0 \perp 11 \perp 10$.
- All other cells contain ∟.
- The head is at the left most bit of the arguments written on the tape.
- The state is set to s_0 .
- **Iteration:** Run the TM, until it stops.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-31

4-30

Definition 4.1

Output:

Case 1: The TM stops. Only finitely many cells are non-blank. Let tape, starting from the head-position, contain $b_0 b_1 \cdots b_{k-1} c$ where $b_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $c \notin \{0, 1\}$. (k might be 0).Let

$$a = (b_0, \ldots, b_{k-1})_2$$

(in case k = 0, a = 0). This means " $b_0 \cdots b_{k-1}$ " is one of the choices for bin(a). Then

$$\Gamma^{(k)}(a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1})\simeq a$$
.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-33

Remark

- If the TM terminates with the head in the middle of a binary number, only the portion of this number starting with the head counts.
- Example: Assume the TM ends as follows



Then the output is $(011)_2$ which is 3.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

Definition 4.2

Definition 4.1

Example: Let $\Sigma = \{0, 1, a, b, \sqcup\}$ where $0, 1, a, b, \sqcup$ are different.

- If the tape starting with the head is as follows:
 - · 01001__0101__
 - · or 01001aLJ,

output is $(01001)_2 = 9$.

- If tape starting with the head is as follows:
 - $\cdot ab \square$
 - \cdot or a,
 - \cdot or $_ _$,

```
the output is 0.
```

Case 2: Otherwise.

```
Then T^{(k)}(a_0, \ldots, a_{k-1})\uparrow.
```

 $f: \mathbb{N}^k \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{N}$ is Turing-computable, in short **TM-computable**, if $f = T^{(k)}$ for some TM T, the alphabet of which contains $\{0,1\}$.

Example: That succ : $\mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{N}$ and zero : $\mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{N}$ are Turing computable was shown above.

Simpler Solution for zero

zero can be defined in a simpler way by defining a TM which writes a blank and moves right, then moves back (left) and stops with the head pointing to this blank:



The final state of this TM, run with input some binary number, is as follows (x is 0, 1 or $_$):



26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

4-35a

Simpler Solution for zero

- The output of $T^{(1)}(x)$ is the value of largest binary string in the final configuration starting with the head position.
- This string is the empty string, which is interpreted as 0.

Remark

- If the tape of the Turing machine initially contains only finitely many cells which are not blank, then at any step during the execution of the TM only finitely many cells are non blank.
 - Follows since in each step at most one cell can be modified to become non-blank.
 - So in finitely many steps only finitely many cells can be converted from blank to non-blank.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (a)

(b) URM Comput. \Rightarrow TM Comput.

Theorem 4.3 If $f : \mathbb{N}^n \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{N}$ is URM-computable, then it is as well Turing-computable by a TM with alphabet $\{0, 1, \sqcup, I\}$.

Notation

The tape of a TM contains a_0, \ldots, a_l means:

- Starting from the head position, the cells of the tape contain a_0, \ldots, a_l .
- All other cells contain LJ.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

4-38

Proof of Theorem 4.3

Assume

- $f = U^{(n)}$,
- U refers only to R_0, \ldots, R_{l-1} and l > n,

We define a TM $\rm T$, which simulates $\rm U.$ Done as follows:

- That the registers R_0, \ldots, R_{l-1} contain a_0, \ldots, a_{l-1} is simulated by the tape containing $\widetilde{bin}(a_0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{l-1})$.
- An instruction I_j will be simulated by states $s_{j,0}, \ldots, s_{j,i}$ with instructions for those states.

Conditions on the Simulation

- \checkmark Assume the URM $\rm U$ is in a state s.t.
 - $R_0, ..., R_{l-1}$ contain $a_0, ..., a_{l-1}$,
 - the URM is about to execute I_i .
- Assume after executing I_j , the URM is in a state where
 - $R_0, ..., R_{l-1}$ contain $b_0, ..., b_{l-1}$,
 - the PC contains k.
- Then we want that, if configuration of the TM $\rm T$ is, s.t.
 - the tape contains $\widetilde{bin}(a_0) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{l-1})$,
 - and the TM is in state $s_{j,0}$,
- then the TM reaches a configuration s.t.
 - the tape contains $\widetilde{bin}(b_0) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(b_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(b_{l-1})$,
 - the TM is in state $s_{k,0}$.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

Example

- Assume the URM is about to execute instruction
 - $I_4 = pred(2)$ (i.e. PC = 4),
 - with register contents

- Then the URM will end with
 - PC = 5
 - and register contents

$$\begin{array}{c|c} R_0 & R_1 & R_2 \\ \hline 2 & 1 & 2 \end{array}$$

Example

- Then we want that, if the simulating TM is
 - in state $s_{4,0}$,
 - with tape content $\widetilde{bin}(2) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(1) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(3)$
- it should reach
 - state $s_{5,0}$
 - with tape content $\widetilde{bin}(2) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(1) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(2)$

Proof of Theorem 4.3

Assume the run of the URM, starting with R_i containing $a_{0,i} = a_i \ i = 0, \dots, n-1$, and $a_{0,i} = 0$ for $i = n, \dots, l-1$ is as follows:

Instruction	\mathbf{R}_{0}	\mathbf{R}_{1}	• • •	R_{n-1}	\mathbf{R}_n	•••	R_{l-1}
I_0	a_0	a_1	•••	a_{n-1}	0	•••	0
=	=	=		=	=		=
I_{k_0}	$a_{0,0}$	$a_{0,1}$	•••	$a_{0,n-1}$	$a_{0,n}$	•••	$a_{0,l-1}$
I_{k_1}	$a_{1,0}$	$a_{1,1}$	•••	$a_{1,n-1}$	$a_{1,n}$	•••	$a_{1,l-1}$
I_{k_2}	$a_{2,0}$	$a_{2,1}$	•••	$a_{2,n-1}$	$a_{2,n}$	•••	$a_{2,l-1}$
		•					

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

4-42

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

Proof of Theorem 4.3

Then the corresponding TM will successively reach the following configurations:

State	Tape contains
$s_{init,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(a_0) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_1) \sqcup \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{n-1}) \sqcup \sqcup$
$s_{0,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(a_0) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_1) \sqcup \Box \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{n-1}) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(0) \sqcup \Box \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(0)$
=	=
$s_{k_0,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(a_{0,0}) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{0,1}) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{0,l-1}) \sqcup \sqcup$
$s_{k_1,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(a_{1,0}) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{1,1}) \sqcup \Box \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{1,l-1}) \sqcup \Box$
$s_{k_{2},0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(a_{2,0}) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{2,1}) \sqcup \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(a_{2,l-1}) \sqcup \sqcup$

Proof of Theorem 4.3

- Furthermore, we need initial states s_{init,0},..., s_{init,j} and corresponding instructions, s.t.
 - if the TM initially contains

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(b_0) \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(b_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(b_{n-1})$$

• it will reach state $s_{0,0}$ with the tape containing

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(b_0) \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(b_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(b_{n-1}) \sqcup \underbrace{0 \sqcup 0 \sqcup 1 \cdots \sqcup 0}_{l-n \text{ times}} \sqcup$$

Example

Consider the URM program U (which was discussed already in the section on URMs):

 $I_0 = ifzero(0,3)$ $I_1 = pred(0)$ $I_2 = ifzero(1,0)$

 $\mathrm{U}^{(1)}(a) \simeq 0.$

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

Corresponding TM Simulation

$I_0 = ifzero($	(0, 3)			
$I_1 = pred(0)$	1 ()			
$I_2 = ifzero($	(1, 0)			
Instruction	\mathbf{R}_{0}	\mathbf{R}_{1}	State of TM	Content of Tape
			$s_{\sf init,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(2)$ LJ
I_0	2	0	$s_{0,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(2)$ \sqcup $\widetilde{bin}(0)$ \sqcup \sqcup
I_1	2	0	$s_{1,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(2) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(0) \sqcup \lrcorner$
I_2	1	0	$s_{2,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(1) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(0) \sqcup \lrcorner$
I_0	1	0	$s_{0,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(1) \llcorner \lrcorner \widetilde{bin}(0) \llcorner \lrcorner$
I_1	1	0	$s_{1,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(1) \llcorner \lrcorner \widetilde{bin}(0) \llcorner \lrcorner$
I_2	0	0	$s_{2,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(0) \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(0) \sqcup \lrcorner$
I_0	0	0	$s_{0,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(0) \llcorner \lrcorner \widetilde{bin}(0) \llcorner \lrcorner$
I_3	0	0	$s_{3,0}$	$\widetilde{bin}(0)\llcorner \lrcorner \widetilde{bin}(0) \llcorner \lrcorner$
	tone			1 Stope

Example

 $I_0 = ifzero(0,3)$ $I_1 = pred(0)$

```
I_2 = ifzero(1,0)
```

We saw in the last section that a run of $U^{(1)}(2)$ is as follows:

Instruction R_0 R_1

I_0	2	0	
I_1	2	0	
I_2	1	0	
I_0	1	0	
I_1	1	0	
I_2	0	0	
I_0	0	0	
I_3	0	0	

URM Stops 26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b) 4-46

URIVI STOPS CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

IM Stops

Proof of Theorem 4.3

If we have defined this we have

🥒 lf

 $\mathbf{U}^{(n)}(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1})\downarrow ,$ $\mathbf{U}^{(n)}(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1})\simeq c \;\;,$

then U eventually stops with R_i containing some values b_i , where $b_0 = c$. Then, the TM T starting with

 $bin(a_0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup bin(a_{n-1})$ will eventually terminate in a configuration

 $\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(b_0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(b_{k-1})$.

for some $k \ge n$. Therefore $T^{(n)}(a_0, ..., a_{n-1}) \simeq b_0 = c$.

🍠 lf

 $\mathrm{U}^{(n)}(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1})\uparrow$,

the URM $\rm U$ will loop and the TM $\rm T$ will carry out the same steps as the URM and loop as well. Therefore

 $\mathbf{T}^{(n)}(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1})\uparrow$,

again

$$U^{(n)}(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \simeq T^{(n)}(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$$

Proof of Theorem 4.3

Informal description of the simulation of URM instructions.

Initialisation.

Initially, the tape contains $bin(a_0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup bin(a_{n-1})$. We need to obtain configuration:

 $\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(a_0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(a_{n-1}) \sqcup \underbrace{\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(0)}_{l-n \text{ times}}.$

Achieved by

- moving head to the end of the initial configuration
- inserting, starting from the next blank, l n-times $0_{L \neg}$,
- then moving back to the beginning.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

4-50

Proof of Theorem 4.3

It follows

$$\mathbf{U}^{(n)} = \mathbf{T}^{(n)}$$

and the proof is complete, if the simulation has been introduced.

 The following slides contain a detailed proof, which will not be presented in the lecture this year.
 Jump over remaining proof. CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

Proof of Theorem 4.3

- Simulation of URM instructions.
 - Simulation of instruction I_k = succ(j).
 Need to increase (j + 1)st binary number by 1 Initial configuration:

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf$$

• First move to the (j + 1)st blank to the right. Then we are at the end of the (j + 1)st binary number.

 $\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j)$ \uparrow

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \ \square \ \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \ \square \ \cdots \ \square \ \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j) \ \square \ \cdots \ \square \ \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_l) \ \square \ \uparrow$$

 Now perform the operation for increasing by 1 as above.
 At the end we obtain:

 $\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \quad \text{if } \cdots \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j+1) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_l) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_l)$

It might be that we needed to write over the separating blank a 1, in which case we have:

 $\underbrace{\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0)}_{\mathsf{26} \mathsf{ Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)}} \underbrace{\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_{j-1})}_{\mathsf{4-54}} \underbrace{\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j+1)}_{\mathsf{4-54}} \underbrace{\mathsf{bin}}_{\mathsf{4-54}}$

Proof of Theorem 4.3

In the latter case, shift all symbols to the left once left, in order to obtain a separating ∟J between the *l*th and *l* − 1st entry.
 We obtain

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \sqcup \cdots \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_{j-1}) \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j+1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup$$

• Otherwise, move the head to the left, until we reach the (j+1)st blank to the left, and then move it once to the right.

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \quad \text{if } \cdots \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j+1) \quad \text{if } \cdots \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_l) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{$$

Proof of Theorem 4.3

- Simulation of instruction $I_k = pred(j)$.
 - Assume the configuration at the beginning is :

 $\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \sqcup \cdots \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j)$

We want to achieve

 $\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \quad \text{if } \cdots \quad \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j \doteq 1) \quad \text{if } \cdots \quad \text{if }$

Done as follows:

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

Proof of Theorem 4.3

Initially: $\widetilde{bin}(c_0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(c_j) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(c_j)$ \uparrow Finally: $\widetilde{bin}(c_0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(c_j - 1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(c_j - 1)$

- Move to end of the (j + 1)st number.
- Check, if the number consists only of zeros or not.
 - If it consists only of zeros, pred(j) doesn't change anything.
 - Otherwise, number is of the form $b_0 \cdots b_k 1 \underbrace{00 \cdots 0}_{l' \text{ times}}$.

Replace it by $b_0 \cdots b_k 0 \underbrace{11 \cdots 1}_{k}$.

l' times

Done as for succ.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

Initially:
$$\widetilde{bin}(c_0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(c_j) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(c_l) \sqcup$$

 \uparrow
Finally: $\widetilde{bin}(c_0) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(c_j \div 1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \widetilde{bin}(c_l) \sqcup$
 \uparrow

We have achieved

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j - 1) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_l)$$

Move back to the beginning:

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_0) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_1) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_j - 1) \quad \text{if } \widetilde{\mathsf{bin}}(c_l)$$

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

4-58

Remark

- We will later show that all TM-computable functions are URM-computable.
 - This will be done by showing that
 - all TM-computable functions are partial recursive,
 - all partial recursive functions are URM-computable.
 - This will be easier than showing directly that TM-computable functions are URM-computable.
- Therefore the set of TM-computable functions and the set of URM-computable functions coincide.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

Extension to Arbitrary Alphabets

- Let A be a finite alphabet s.t. $\Box \not\in A$, and $B := A^*$.
- To a Turing machine $T = (\Sigma, S, I, \sqcup, s_0)$ with $A \subseteq \Sigma$ corresponds a partial function $T^{(A,n)} : B^n \xrightarrow{\sim} B$, where $T^{(A,n)}(a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1})$ is computed as follows:
 - Initially write $a_0 \sqcup \sqcup \sqcup \sqcup \sqcup a_{n-1}$ on the tape, otherwise

Start in state s_0 on the left most position of a_0 .

- Iterate TM as before.
- In case of termination, the output of the function is $c_0 \cdots c_{l-1}$, if the tape contains, starting with the head position $c_0 \cdots c_{l-1}d$ with $c_i \in A$, $d \notin A$.
- Otherwise, the function value is undefined.

Proof of Theorem 4.3

- **9** Simulation of instruction $I_k = ifzero(j, k')$.
 - Move to j + 1st binary number on the tape.
 - Check whether it contains only zeros.
 - If yes, switch to state $s_{k',0}$.
 - Otherwise switch to state $s_{k+1,0}$.

This completes the simulation of the URM $\operatorname{U}\!.$

Characteristic function

- In order to introduce the notion of Turing-decidable we need to remind us of the following definition:
- Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}^n$ be a predicate. The characteristic function $\chi_M : \mathbb{N}^n \to \mathbb{N}$ for *M* is defined as follows:

$$\chi_{M}(\vec{x}) := \left\{ egin{array}{cc} 1 & \mbox{if } M(\vec{x}) \mbox{ holds,} \\ 0 & \mbox{otherwise} \end{array}
ight.$$

If we treat true as 1 and false as 0, then the characteristic function is nothing but the Boolean valued function which decides whether $M(\vec{x})$ holds or not:

 $\chi_M(\vec{x}) = \begin{cases} \text{true} & \text{if } M(\vec{x}) \text{ holds,} \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

Extension to Arbitrary Alphabets

- Notion is modulo encoding of A^* into \mathbb{N} equivalent to the notion of Turing-computability on \mathbb{N} .
- However, when considering complexity bounds, this notation might be more appropriate.
 - Avoids encoding/decoding into N.

Turing-Computable Predicates

- A predicate *A* is Turing-decidable, iff χ_A is Turing-computable.
- Instead of simulating χ_A
 - means to write the output of χ_A (a binary number 0 or 1) on the tape

it is more convenient, to take TM with two additional special states s_{true} and s_{false} corresponding to truth and falsity of the predicate.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (b)

Turing-Computable Predicates

- Then a predicate is Turing decidable, if, when we write initially the inputs as before on the tape and start executing the TM,
 - it always terminates in s_{true} or s_{false} ,
 - and it terminates in s_{true}, iff the predicate holds for the inputs,
 - and in s_{false} , otherwise.
- The latter notion is equivalent to the first notion.
- Usually the latter one is taken as basis for complexity considerations.

4-62

(c) Undecid. of the Halting Problem

- Undecidability of the Halting Problem first proved 1936 by Alan Turing.
- In this Section, we will identify computable with Turing-computable.
 - This will later be justified by the Church-Turing thesis.

Definition 4.4

- (a) A **problem** is an *n*-ary predicate $M(\vec{x})$ of natural numbers, i.e. a property of n-tuples of natural numbers.
- (b) A problem (or predicate) M is (Turing-)decidable, if the characteristic function χ_M of M is (Turing-)computable.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

4-66

History of Computability Theory



Alan Mathison Turing (1912 – 1954) Introduced the Turing machine. Proved the undecidability of the Turing-Halting problem. CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

Example of Decidable Problems

The binary predicate

 $Multiple(x, y) :\Leftrightarrow x \text{ is a multiple of } y$

is a predicate and therefore a problem.

• $\chi_{\text{Multiple}}(x, y)$ decides, whether Multiple(x, y) holds (then it returns 1 for yes), or not:

 $\chi_{\mathsf{Multiple}}(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \text{ is a multiple of } y, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \text{ is not a multiple of } y. \end{cases}$

• χ_{Multiple} is intuitively computable, therefore Multiple is decidable.

Need of Encoding of TMs

- We want to show that it is not decidable whether a Turing Machine terminates or not.
- For this we need to be able to talk about programs which have as input a Turing Machine.
- For this we need to give a formalisation of what a Turing Machine is.
- Since we are restricting ourselves to functions having as arguments elements of N^k, we need to encode a TM as an element of N^k for some k.
- We will actually encode TMs as elements of \mathbb{N} .

Encoding of Turing Machines

- Let for a Turing machine T, $encode(T) \in \mathbb{N}$ be its code.
- It is intuitively decidable, whether a string of ASCII symbols is a Turing machine.
 - One can show that this can be decided by a Turing machine.
- ⇒ It is intuitively decidable, whether n = encode(T) for a Turing machine T.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

Encoding of Turing Machines

- A Turing Machine is a quintuple $(\Sigma, S, I, \sqcup, s_0)$.
- We can assume that L, each symbol of the alphabet, and each state can be represented by a string of letters and numbers.
- Then this quintuple can be written as a string of ASCII-symbols.
- \Rightarrow Turing machines can be represented as elements of A^* , where

A =set of ASCII-symbols.

- ⇒ Turing machines can be encoded as natural numbers.
 - Of course more efficient encoding exist.

 $\{e\}^k(n)$

● Assume $e \in \mathbb{N}$. We define a partial function $\{e\}^k : \mathbb{N}^k \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{N}$, by

 $\{e\}^k(\vec{x}) \simeq \begin{cases} m & \text{if } e = \text{encode}(\mathbf{T}) \text{ for some Turing machin} \\ & \text{and } \mathbf{T}^{(k)}(\vec{x}) \simeq m, \\ \bot & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

- So if e = encode(T), $\{e\}^k = T^{(k)}$.
 - Roughly speaking, $\{e\}^k$ is the function computed by the *e*th Turing machine.
 - So for every computable (more precisely Turing-computable) function f : N^k → N there exists an e s.t. f = {e}^k.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

4-69a

²⁶ Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

 $\{e\}^k$

- The notation $\{e\}^k$ is due to Stephen Kleene.
- {} are called Kleene-Brackets.
- We write $\{e\}$ for $\{e\}^1$.

The Halting Problem

Definition 4.5

The Halting Problem is the following binary predicate:

 $\mathsf{Halt}(e,n):\Leftrightarrow \{e\}(n){\downarrow}$

We will show that Halt is undecdiable.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

4-73

Stephen Cole Kleene



Stephen Cole Kleene (1909 – 1994)

Probably the most influential computability theorist up to now. Introduced the partial recursive functions. CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

Example

Let e = encode(T), where T is the Turing machine T which translates the URM program consisting of only one instruction

$$I_0 = ifzero(0,0)$$

- If this TM is run with arguments written on the tape, it loops if the first argument is 0, and terminates otherwise with its first argument unchanged.
- So we have

$$\{e\}(k) \simeq \mathbf{T}^{(1)}(k) \simeq \begin{cases} k & \text{if } k > 0 \\ \bot & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore Halt(e, k) holds for k > 0 and does not hold for k = 0.

Remark

- Below we will see: Halt is undecideable.
- However, the following function WeakHalt is computable:

• Computed as follows:

First check whether e = encode(T) for some Turing machine T.

If not, enter an infinite loop.

Otherwise, simulate T with input n.

If simulation stops, output 1, otherwise the program loops for ever.

```
26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)
```

4-77

Question

What is WeakHalt(e, n), where e is a code for the Turing machine corresponding to the URM program

 $I_0 = \texttt{ifzero}(0,0) ~?$

Theorem 4.6

Theorem 4.6 The halting problem is undecidable.

Proof:

- Assume the Halting problem is decidable i.e. assume that we can decide using a Turing machine whether {e}(n)↓ holds.
- We will define below a computable function f : N → N,
 s.t. f ≠ {e}.
- Therefore *f* cannot be computed by the Turing machine with code *e* for any *e*, i.e. *f* is noncomputable.
- Therefore we obtain a contradiction.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

Proof of Theorem 4.6

- We argue similarly as in the proof of $\mathbb{N} \not\approx \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$
 - We define f(e) in such a way that $f = \{e\}$ is violated by having $f(e) \not\simeq \{e\}(e)$.
- If $\{e\}(e)\downarrow$, then we let $f(e)\uparrow$.
- If $\{e\}(e)\uparrow$, we let $f(e)\downarrow$, e.g. by defining $f(e) \simeq 0$ (any other defined result would be appropriate as well).
- So we define

$$f(e) \simeq \begin{cases} \perp, & \text{if } \{e\}(e) \downarrow \\ 0, & \text{if } \{e\}(e) \uparrow \end{cases}$$

 $f(e) \simeq \begin{cases} \perp, & \text{if } \{e\}(e) \downarrow \\ 0, & \text{if } \{e\}(e) \uparrow \end{cases}$

• We obtain $f(e) \downarrow \Leftrightarrow \{e\}(e) \uparrow$.

(*)

- Since Halt is decidable, f is computable (Exercise: show that f is computable by a Turing machine, assuming a Turing machine for Halt).
- Therefore $f = \{e\}$ for some e.
- But then by (*)

$$f(e) \downarrow \stackrel{(*)}{\Leftrightarrow} \{e\}(e) \uparrow \stackrel{f=\{e\}}{\Leftrightarrow} f(e) \uparrow$$

a contradiction.

26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

4-81

Proof of Theorem 4.6

The complete proof on one slide is as follows:

- Assume Halt were decidable.
- Define

$$f(e) \simeq \begin{cases} \perp, & \text{if } \{e\}(e) \downarrow \\ 0, & \text{if } \{e\}(e) \uparrow \end{cases}$$

- By Halt decidable, we obtain f is computable, so $f = \{e\}$ for some e.
- But then

$$f(e) \downarrow \stackrel{\mathsf{Def of } f}{\Leftrightarrow} \{e\}(e) \uparrow \stackrel{f=\{e\}}{\Leftrightarrow} f(e) \uparrow$$

Remark

- The above proof can easily be adapted to any reasonable programming language, in which one can define all intuitively computable functions.
- Such programming languages are called <u>Turing-complete</u> languages.
 - Babbage's machine was, if one removes the restriction to finite memory, Turing-complete, since it had a conditional jump.
- For standard Turing complete languages, the unsolvability of the Turing-halting problem means: it is not possible to write a program, which checks, whether a program on given input terminates.

CS_226 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)

Halting Problem with no Inputs

- Theorem 4.7: It is undecidable, whether a Turing machine started with a blank tape terminates.
- Proof:
 - Let

 $\mathsf{Halt}'(e) :\Leftrightarrow e \text{ is a code for a Turing machine}_{\mathsf{T}}$ and T started with a blank tape terminates

• Assume Halt' were decidable.

Halting Problem with no Inputs

- Then we can decide Halt(e, n) as follows:
 - Assume inputs *e*, *n*.
 - If e is not a code for a Turing machine, we return 0.
 - Otherwise, let encode(T) = e.
 - Define a Turing machine V as follows:
 - V first writes bin(n) on the tape and moves head to the left most bit of bin(n).
 - Then it executes the Turing machine T.
 - We have
 - V, run with blank tape, terminates
 - iff T run with tape containing bin(n) terminates
 - iff $T^{(1)}(n) \downarrow$
 - iff $\{e\}(n)\downarrow$.

```
26 Computability Theory, Michaelmas Term 2008, Sec. 4 (c)
```

4-85

Halting Problem with no Inputs

- V, run with blank tape, terminates iff $\{e\}(n)\downarrow$.
 - Let encode(V) = e'. Then

 $\mathsf{Halt}'(e') \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{Halt}(e,n)$

- Therefore using the decidability of Halt' we can decide $\operatorname{Halt}(e, n)$.
- So we have decided Halt, a contradiction.