Turing Machines

Lecture 8
Course Trajectory

We will see algorithms, what *can* be done.

But what *cannot* be done?
Computation

**Problem:**
To compute a function F that maps each input (a string) to an output bit

**Program:**
A finitely described process taking a string as input, and outputting a bit (or not halting)

P computes F if for every x, P(x) outputs F(x) and halts

- A program is a finite bit string
- Programs can be *enumerated* — listed sequentially — (say, lexicographically) so that every program appears somewhere in the list
- The set of all programs is countable.
**Computation**

**Problem:** To compute a function $F$ that maps each input (a string) to an output bit

**Program:** A finitely described process taking a string as input, and outputting a bit (or not halting)

$P$ computes $F$ if for every $x$, $P(x)$ outputs $F(x)$ and halts

- A function assigns a bit to each finite string
- Corresponds to an infinite bit string
- The set of all functions is **uncountable**!
  - As numerous as, say, real numbers in $[0,1]$
Computation

**Problem:**
To compute a function $F$ that maps each input (a string) to an output bit

**Program:**
A finitely described process taking a string as input, and outputting a bit (or not halting)

$P$ computes $F$ if for every $x$, $P(x)$ outputs $F(x)$ and halts

There are uncountably many functions!

But only countably many programs

Almost every function is uncomputable!

(non constructive proof)
Course Trajectory

We will be looking at what can be computed at all?

What cannot be decided (undecidability)
What about a particular problems?

• Given program $P$, input $w$:

Will halt or run into an infinite loop?

Halting problem!
Halting Problem Undecidable

• Given program $P$:

• Write a program that decides if a program halts.

• Dual view of program as program and as data.
Alas!

There is no program that solves the Halting Problem!

Way to view code as data allows diagonalization proof.
Computing

What does it mean to compute something?

“There is no algorithm for the halting problem”

What does it mean for something to be an algorithm formally?

Then I can say “For all algorithms…”
A Brief History of Computing

• Leibnitz (circa 1600): Believed in universal language for encoding any problem (math, philosophy, religion).

• Thought if you properly encode any problem in binary form, there is a way to calculate an answer (run the algorithm)

calculemus!
A Brief History of Computing

• Babbage (circa 1860): built Difference and Analytical Engine (Add, multiply, etc).

• It marks the transition from mechanised arithmetic to fully-fledged general purpose computation.

• Hypothesized that any mathematical question can be answered by the analytical engine, suitably encoded.
A Brief History of Computing

• Hilbert (circa 1900): What can we prove in mathematical world?

• Proving and computing almost identical, proof = trace the program.

• The Entscheidungsproblem (decision problem): is there an algorithm that takes as input a statement of a first-order logic and answers "Yes" or "No" according to whether the statement is universally valid, i.e., valid in every structure satisfying the axioms.
A Brief History of Computing

• Gödel: no! there is no such algorithm

• Church: better way to prove it with functional programming
Alan Turing

• British mathematician
  – cryptanalysis during WWII
  – arguably, father of AI, CS Theory
  – several books, movies

• Mathematically defined computation
  – Invented Turing Machines at 23 (1936). Turing machines can compute everything that is computable. He proved that **The Halting Problem** has no general algorithm (it is not possible to decide whether a turing machine will ever halt)
Computation

- Computers were people at that time!
- The way people do math is write-erase-throw away.
- Turing proposed to abstract this process.
Turing Machine
Turing Machine

Finite alphabet
Read
Write
Move +1 or -1
Halt condition
Turing Machine

Finite number of internal states

Finite alphabet

Read

Write

Move +1 or -1

Halt condition

Internal state (finite number)

Was designed as a model of human computation but it models computers as we know them.
Why do we care?

- I need a model of computation that is simple enough to convince you that a TM can take as input a description of a TM and simulate it.
- Python interpreter in Python? Harder to explain Python semantics
- Will be able to define “what can we compute?”
TM for Decision Problems

\[ M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, B, \delta, q_{\text{start}}, q_{\text{accept}}, q_{\text{reject}}) : \]

\( \Gamma \) is a finite tape alphabet.

- \( B \) or \( \square \) is the blank symbol (special symbol)
- \( \Sigma \) is a finite input alphabet \( \Sigma \subseteq \Gamma \setminus B \)

\( Q \) is a finite set of states

\[ q_{\text{start}} \in Q \] is the initial state

\[ q_{\text{accept}}, q_{\text{reject}} \in Q \] accept/reject states

Or maybe run forever
TM for Decision Problems

\[ M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, B, \delta, q_{\text{start}}, q_{\text{accept}}, q_{\text{reject}}) : \]

\( \Gamma \) is a finite tape alphabet.

- \( B \) or \( \square \) is the blank symbol (special symbol)
- \( \Sigma \) is a finite input alphabet \( \Sigma \subseteq \Gamma \setminus B \)

\( Q \) is a finite set of states

\( q_{\text{start}} \in Q \) is the initial state

\( q_{\text{accept}}, q_{\text{reject}} \in Q \) accept/reject states

Or maybe run forever

Transition function: \( \delta : Q \times \Gamma \) (read) \( \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma \) (write) \( \times \{ \text{L, R} \} \)
Turing Machine

\[ \text{tape} = \text{string in } \Gamma^* \text{ followed by infinite stream of } \square \]

we will treat \(011111\) = \(011111 \square \square \square \square \ldots\)

\textbf{configuration} = state, string (content of tape), and integer (position of tape).  \((Q, x, i) \in Q \times \Gamma^* \times \mathbb{N}\)

e.g. (pink, 01011, 5)
Configuration = ID (Instantaneous Description)
Contains all necessary information to capture the “current configuration of the computation”

state, tape-contents & head-location

Easy-to-read notation: \((q,xay,i)\)

\(x \in \Gamma^*\) : tape contents left of the head
\(q \in Q\) : state
\(y \in \Gamma^*\) : tape contents at & right of the head (till last non-blank)

Initial ID: \((q_{\text{start}}, \langle \text{input} \rangle, 0)\)
Relations $\Rightarrow$ on IDs

$\text{ID}_1 \Rightarrow \text{ID}_2$ iff $\text{ID}_1$ evolves into $\text{ID}_2$ in one step.

E.g., if $\delta(q, a_i) = (q', b, L)$, then

$(q, a_1 a_2 \ldots a_{i-1} a_i a_{i+1} \ldots a_n, i) \Rightarrow (q', a_1 a_2 \ldots a_{i-2} a_{i-1} b a_{i+1} \ldots a_n, i-1)$

$\Rightarrow^*$ is the reflexive & transitive closure of $\Rightarrow$

Thus, $\text{ID}_1 \Rightarrow^* \text{ID}_2$ iff $M$, when run from $\text{ID}_1$, reaches $\text{ID}_2$ after some finite number (0 or more) of moves.
In DFAs it was clear when to accept an input string or reject it.

TM can:

• go back and forth over the input
• overwrite the input
• write on the tape way past the end of the input
• need an explicit state
Definition of Acceptance

\$M \text{ accepts } w \text{ iff } (q_{\text{start}}, w, 0) \Rightarrow^* (q_{\text{accept}}, x, i) \text{ for some } x \in \Gamma^*$

Note that \$M\$ is allowed to accept \$w\$ without scanning all of \$w\$

\[ L(M) = \{ w \mid M \text{ accepts } w \} \]

\$M\$ does not accept \$w\$ if starting from the ID \$q_{\text{start}}\$ \$w\$:

1. \$M\$ halts in \$q_{\text{reject}}\$, or
2. \$M\$ crashes (head moves off the tape), or
3. \$M\$ never stops
Deciding/Recognizing a Language

\[ L(M) = \{w \mid M \text{ accepts } w\} \]

is called the language \textit{recognized} by \( M \)

\( M \text{ decides } L(M) \) if on input \( w \notin L \), \( M \) halts in \( q_{\text{reject}} \)

If a TM decides the language it recognizes, then, on every input, it halts in \( q_{\text{accept}} \) or \( q_{\text{reject}} \)

Easy to change “crashes” to rejects

But turns out the we can’t avoid infinite executions! (can’t tell if it is going to be infinite)
Deciding/Recognizing a Language

\[ L(M) = \{ w \mid M \text{ accepts } w \} \]

is called the language \textit{recognized} by \( M \)

\( M \) \textit{decides} \( L(M) \) if on input \( w \notin L \), \( M \) halts in \( q_{\text{reject}} \)

Fundamental questions of computability:

Which languages are recognizable?

Which languages are decidable?
What does this TM do?

Input alphabet: $\Sigma = \{0,1\}$
Tape alphabet: $\Gamma = \{0,1,0', 1', _\}$

Example
Example

Input alphabet : $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$
Tape alphabet : $\Gamma = \{0, 1, 0', 1', _\}$
Example

Input alphabet: $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$

Tape alphabet: $\Gamma = \{0, 1, 0', 1', _\}$

Maps $w$ to $ww^R$

Next?
Crashes! Head moves out of the tape.
What does this TM do?

\[
\begin{align*}
\delta(p, a) &= (q, b, \Delta) \\
\delta(0, \emptyset) &= (0, \emptyset, +1) \\
\delta(0, 1) &= (1, \emptyset, +1) \\
\delta(0, \square) &= (\text{halt}, \emptyset, +1) \\
\delta(1, \emptyset) &= (0, 1, +1) \\
\delta(1, 1) &= (1, 1, +1) \\
\delta(1, \square) &= (\text{halt}, 1, +1)
\end{align*}
\]
What does this TM do?
Example

Input alphabet : $\Sigma = \{0,1\}$

Tape alphabet : $\Gamma = \{0,1,0', 1', _\}$

Maps $w$ to $ww^R$

Next?
Crashes! Head moves out of the tape.
Avoiding Crashing

Given $M$ (that may crash), an “equivalent” $M'$ which goes to $q_{\text{reject}}$ instead of crashing

Idea: Rewrite input $w$ to be $\$$, place the head on the first symbol of $w$ and run $M$. If head ever scans $\$$, move to $q_{\text{reject}}$ (and move the head right)
Shifting by \( k \) Positions

Can do “shift-by-1” \( k \) times. But \( k \) scans of tape.

To shift by \( k \) positions to the right in a single scan:
Remember last \( k \) symbols. Overwrite current cell with symbol from \( k \) cells behind.
Binary Addition

\[ L = \{ x\#y\#z \mid x, y, z \in \{0,1\}^*, \ |x|=|y|=|z|, \ x+y=z \text{ in binary} \} \]

Plan:

- **Shift**:
  - \( \begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c} 0 & 1 & \# & 0 & 1 & \# \end{array} \)  
  - \( \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 0 & 1 & \# & 0 & 1 & \# \end{array} \)  
  - \( \begin{array}{c|c|c} 0 & \# & @ \end{array} \)  
  - \( \begin{array}{c|c|c} 0 & \# & @ \end{array} \)  
  - \( \begin{array}{c|c|c} 0 & \# & @ \end{array} \)  

**Check LSB**:
- \( \text{carry } c=0 \)

**Check MSB**:
- \( \text{carry } c=1 \)

**Check finished**:
- \( \text{carry } c=0 \)
Binary Addition

$L = \{ x\#y\#z \mid x, y, z \in \{0,1\}^*, \|x\|=\|y\|=\|z\|, x+y=z \text{ in binary} \}$

Shift input $w$ to make it $\$w$.
Scan the tape to ensure $w$ matches $(0+1)^*\#(0+1)^*\#(0+1)^*$
Return head to the left end (right of $\$)$
(In finite memory, carry-bit $c$ initialized to 0)
Repeat
  copy the digit to the left of first $\#$ into finite state, and
  overwrite it with $\#$ (replace old $\#$ by @). If no digit there, accept if carry is 0 & no digits left; else reject.
  copy the digit to the left of second $\#$ into finite state, and
  move $\#$ left (replace old $\#$ by @). If no digit there, reject.
  check if the right most digit is “correct”. Reject if no digit or if it is not correct; else erase digit and update carry.
Move head to the left end (right of $\$)$
Verify finished & Accept

Transition diagram for a formal language problem:

- States: $q_0$, $x=0$, $x=1$, $y=0$, $y=1$
- Transitions:
  - $/$, R
  - $@$, L
  - Shift & Format Check
  - Verify finished
  - Accept

- Initial state: $q_0$
- Accepting states: $x=1$, $y=1$

- Rules:
  - $c=0$
  - $c=1$
What can a TM do?

Can shift by any number $i$, by keeping $2^i$ states to remember what were in the first $i$ places of the tape.

Can do simple arithmetic operations, addition, multiplication etc.
What can a TM do?

$L = \{ 0^i 1^j 0^k \mid i = j = k \}$ is not a CFL!

Can be decided by TM (see notes)
What can a TM do?

A TM can do everything that can be done in a standard programming language (and vice versa)