05. Turing Machines and Spacetime.

- I. Turing Machines & Classical Computability.
- **1. Turing Machines**

Turing Machines
The Halting Problem
Classical (Turing)





Alan Turing (1912-1954)

1

- A Turing machine (TM) consists of (Turing 1936):
 - 1. An unbounded tape. Divided into squares, each square containing a symbol from a finite alphabet $\{q_0, q_1, ..., q_n\}$.
 - 2. A read/write scanner. Programmed with a finite list of states $\{s_0, ..., s_m\}$.
 - 3. A program. Consists of a finite sequence of transition rules. Each rule consists of a 4-tuple (*initial state*, *initial symbol*, *final state*, *action*). For initial state and initial symbol s_i , q_j there are 3 possible actions, afterwhich the final state s_ℓ is entered:
 - (a) Replace initial symbol with q_k . $\langle s_i, q_j, s_l, q_k \rangle$.
 - (b) Move one square left. $\langle s_i, q_j, s_l, \ll \rangle$.
 - (b) Move one square right. $\langle s_i, q_j, s_l, \gg \rangle$.
- A TM halts when no unique transition rule is available to it.

$\underline{Conventions}$

(i) Represent the number n by a block of n+1 "1"s.



(ii) Starting configuration:

- TM starts in lowest-numbered state.
- Scanner starts at leftmost "1" of input block, with "0" to left.
- For computing functions with n arguments, input block consists of n blocks of "1"s separated by a "0", each block encoding an argument.



Starting configuration for TM that computes the two-place sum function 3+4.

(iii) Ending configuration: Scanner ends at leftmost "1" of output block, with "0" to left.

 $\cdots \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ \cdots$

Ending configuration for TM that computes the two-place sum function 3+4.

- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



- Stays in state s_0 and scans right until initial block of "1"s (input) is scanned.
- Replaces "0" at end of input block with "1".
- Enters state s_1 and scans back left to beginning of block.
- When "0" is reached at beginning, enters state s_2 and scans right.
- Halts in standard ending configuration (no rule can be followed in state s_2).



<u>Example 2</u>: TM copier.



Example 2: TM copier.



Example 2: TM copier.



<u>Example 2</u>: TM copier.



Example 2: TM copier.



<u>Example 2</u>: TM copier.



Example 2: TM copier.



Example 2: TM copier.



<u>Example 2</u>: TM copier.



Example 2: TM copier.



<u>Example 2</u>: TM copier.



<u>Example 2</u>: TM copier.



Enumerating TMs

<u>Enumeration Theorem</u>:

All TMs can be listed $T_1, T_2, ..., T_n, ...$ in such a way that each index n completely determines the corresponding TM.

- <u>Idea</u>: A TM is completely determined by its set of transition rules.
- <u>So</u>: A TM corresponds to a (perhaps very long) string of symbols drawn from $\{q_0, q_1, ..., q_n\}$ and $\{s_0, ..., s_m\}$.

$$\begin{array}{l} Successor\ function\ TM = \ s_0 1 s_0 \gg s_0 0 s_1 1 s_1 1 s_1 \ll s_1 0 s_2 \gg \\ Copier\ TM = \ s_0 1 s_0 A s_0 A s_1 \gg s_0 0 s_5 \ll s_1 1 s_1 \gg s_1 0 s_2 \gg s_2 1 s_2 \gg s_2 0 s_3 1 s_3 1 s_3 \ll s_3 0 s_4 \ll s_4 1 s_4 \ll \\ s_4 A s_0 \gg s_5 A s_5 1 s_5 1 s_5 \ll s_5 0 s_6 \gg \end{array}$$

• <u>Now</u>: Encode these symbols as natural numbers...

One way to do this:

<u>symbol</u>	code# for symbol
\gg	3
\ll	5
s_i	7 + 4i
q_i	9+4i

 $\underline{code\# for symbol strings}$ For symbol string $u_1...u_j$ that represents Turing machine T: $code\#(T) = p_1^{code\#(u_1)} \times ... \times p_j^{code\#(u_j)}$ where $p_1, p_2, ..., p_j$ are the first j prime numbers 2, 3, 5,

- <u>So</u>: Each TM T_n corresponds to exactly one natural number $code \#(T_n)$.
- <u>And</u>: Any natural number can be decoded (by its unique prime factorization) to determine if it corresponds to a TM.

2. The Halting Problem

- Is there a TM that can determine whether or not any given TM T_t halts?
- <u>Or</u>: Is there a TM that can compute the halting function h(t, n)?

Halting function h(t, n) $h(t, n) = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if } T_t \text{ halts on input } n. \\ 1 \text{ if } T_t \text{ does not halt on input } n. \end{cases}$

<u>Claim</u>: h(t, n) is not Turing-computable (i.e., no TM can compute it).

• <u>*Proof*</u>: Suppose there's a TM, H, that computes h(t, n). This means:

Halting TM, H

On input $n, t, \begin{cases} H \text{ halts with output 0 if } T_t \text{ halts on input } n. \\ H \text{ halts with output 1 if } T_t \text{ does not halt on input } n. \end{cases}$

Now show that H cannot exist.

Step 1: Construct another TM, H', that computes h(n, n).

- This can be done by attaching the copier TM to the front of H.

H' = H + copierOn input n, $\begin{cases} H' \text{ halts with output 0 if } T_n \text{ halts on input } n. \\ H' \text{ halts with output 1 if } T_n \text{ does not halt on input } n. \end{cases}$

Step 2: Construct a "loop" TM which does the following:

 $\begin{cases} loop \\ \begin{cases} On input 0, loop does not halt. \\ On input 1, loop halts. \end{cases}$

Step 3: Now attach *loop* to the end of H' to produce a TM, M.

M = loop + H + copierOn input n, $\begin{cases} M \text{ does not halt if } T_n \text{ halts on input } n. \\ M \text{ halts if } T_n \text{ does not halt on input } n. \end{cases}$

• This says that M halts if and only if T_n does not halt.

<u>Now</u>: Suppose M occurs as T_{n_0} in the list of all TMs.

• What happens when we feed M its own code number n_0 as input?

$$\begin{split} M &= copier + H + loop, \ given \ input \ n_0 \\ \text{On input } n_0, \left\{ \begin{array}{l} M \ \text{does not halt if} \ T_{n_0} \ \text{halts on input} \ n_0. \\ M \ \text{halts if} \ T_{n_0} \ \text{does not halt on input} \ n_0. \end{array} \right. \end{split}$$

• This says that *M* halts *if and only if M* does not halt!

There can be no such M!

- Since the *copier* and *loop* TMs are possible, this must mean there can be no Halting TM, *H*.
- So the Halting function is not Turing-computable.

Why should this matter?

2. Classical (Turing) Computability

- What does it mean to say something is computable?
 - Suppose the somethings of interest are functions on the natural numbers $\mathbb N.$
 - To say a function on N is computable is (in some sense) to say that there's an "algorithm" which, if followed by a computer would calculate the value of that function, given the appropriate type of input.
 - Can this be made more precise?



• <u>In other words</u>: Turing machines provide us with a precise notion of computability... (for computing functions on ℕ).



- <u>Idea</u>: The computable functions are those that can be recursively generated from a small set of axioms (this can be made mathematically precise).
- <u>Key result</u>: A partial function on N is Turing computable *if and only if* it is a partial recursive function. (So Turing's Thesis is equivalent to Church's Thesis.)
- <u>Moreover</u>: Other models of computability (abacus machines, *etc.*) can be shown to be equivalent to Turing computability.

But I want to compute functions on the real numbers \mathbb{R} , not just \mathbb{N} !



mathematical physicist





logician

(b) The Limits of Turing Computability

Def. A problem is *Turing solvable* if there's a TM that can solve the problem after a finite number of steps.

<u>Turing unsolvable problems</u>:

- (i) *The halting problem.* Problem of deciding, given an arbitrary TM, whether or not it will halt.
- (ii) The decision problem for 1st-order logic. Problem of deciding the validity or invalidity of an arbitrary sentence of 1st-order logic.
 - There's a TM that will halt after finite steps with output "Yes" for any valid 1st-order sentence as input; but there's no TM that will halt after finite steps with output "Yes" for any invalid 1st-order sentence as input.
 - A "Yes" TM for validity is not the same as a "Yes" TM for invalidity!
- (iii) The decision problem for 1st-order arithmetic. Problem of deciding the validity or invalidity of an arbitrary sentence of 1st-order arithmetic.
 - There's no "Yes" TM for validity and no "Yes" TM for invalidity for 1st-order arithmetic (one consequence of Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem).

• Is Fermat's Last "Theorem" really a theorem?

For $n \ge 3$, there are no whole numbers x, y, z such that $x^n + y^n = z^n$.



 $\begin{array}{c} Pierre \ de \ Fermat \\ (1607-1665) \end{array}$



Proven by Andrew Wiles in 1993 after 3 centuries of work.

• Is the Poincaré Conjecture a theorem?





Henri Poincaré (1854-1912)



Proven by Grigori Perelman in 2003 after a century and \$1million prize (declined!).

- Wouldn't it be easier if there were a program that decided which statements were theorems and which weren't?
- <u>But</u>: No TM (hence classical computer) can in principle tell us!