

(Re)Introduction to Turing Machines

November 11, 2010

Computability and Logic

What is a Turing Machine?

- ✓ Named after (not by) Alan M. Turing.
- ✓ Perhaps the most important computational model, from a theoretical viewpoint.
- ✓ Simple, yet apparently universal.

TM Components

$(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{\text{accept}}, q_{\text{reject}})$

✓ Q : finite set of control states

✓ Σ : input alphabet

✓ Γ : tape alphabet ($\Sigma \subseteq \Gamma$ and $\sqcup \in \Gamma \setminus \Sigma$)

✓ δ : transition function

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\}$$

✓ q_0 : initial control state

✓ $q_{\text{accept}}, q_{\text{reject}}$: accepting and rejecting (halting) states

The Setup

- ✓ Write the input at start of an infinite blank tape.
- ✓ Run the TM at the start of the tape.
 - ✓ $\delta : Q \times \Gamma \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\}$
- ✓ TM halts iff we enter states q_{accept} or q_{reject} .
 - ✓ It is possible that the TM might never halt.

TM Configurations

- ✓ A configuration like $011q_201_110$ means
 - ✓ The contents of the tape is 01101_110
(padded with blanks $_$)
 - ✓ The TM is in control state q_2
 - ✓ The TM head is pointing to the second 0.
- ✓ Configurations are always finite. Why?

Transitions in Detail

A machine makes one of the following transitions

$w a q_i b c z \rightarrow w a d q_j c z$ if $\delta(q_i, b) = (q_j, d, R)$

$w a q_i b c z \rightarrow w q_j a d c z$ if $\delta(q_i, b) = (q_j, d, L)$

TM Languages

- ✓ A TM accepts a string if, given the string as input, the TM reaches q_{accept} .
- ✓ A language is recognizable (a.k.a. recursively enumerable) if there is a turing machine that accepts exactly the strings in the language.
- ✓ A language is decidable (a.k.a. recursive) if it is accepted by a TM that always halts (i.e., if the TM always ends up in q_{accept} or q_{reject} .)

Note on Terminology

- ✓ “**recursive**” does *not* mean that the language has some kind of self-referential structure.
- ✓ Terminology comes from “recursive functions” of Godel and Kleene.
 - ✓ These turn out to be exactly the functions on integers that are implementable with Turing machines.

Acceptance vs. Decision

- ✓ One reason the distinction is important is that there are languages that are:
 - ✓ accepted by some TM
 - ✓ not decided by any TM

TM Demo

✓ <http://ironphoenix.org/tril/tm/>

TM Programming Tips

- ✓ Divide the work into different phases (subroutines)
- ✓ Controller has an arbitrarily large “finite memory”.
- ✓ Squares can be “marked” and “unmarked”
 - ✓ In arbitrarily many, but finite, ways.
- ✓ Take advantage of TM extensions (forthcoming)

Terminology

- ✓ A language that is recognized by some TM is called “**recursive**”.
- ✓ A language that is accepted by some TM is called “**recursively enumerable**” (R.E.).
- ✓ So recursive \Rightarrow recursively-enumerable
 - ✓ But the converse doesn't always hold!

More on the Decidable vs. Recognizable Distinction

✓ If a language is decidable, then its complement is decidable.

✓ Why?

✓ If a language is recognizable, and its complement is recognizable, then the language is decidable.

✓ Why?

TMs Computing

- ✓ Rather than accepting a language, we can use a TM to **compute a function**:
 - ✓ The machine starts with some string x on its tape initially.
 - ✓ The machine halts with some string y on its tape finally.
 - ✓ The corresponding function f would have

$$f(x) = y$$

TMs Computing Partial Functions

- ✓ For some initial strings x the TM might **diverge**.
- ✓ More generally, we say the machine computes a **partial function**, and $f(x)$ is undefined for such x .
- ✓ An ordinary function is a special case of a partial function, one which is nowhere undefined. We call such a partial function a **total function** to emphasize the distinction.

TM Variations

- ✓ The following yield no extra power:
 - ✓ Adding the option to stay-in-place rather than moving L/R.
 - ✓ Making the tape infinite in both directions (HW)
 - ✓ Adding an extra "Erase Tape" move.
 - ✓ Multiple tapes with multiple (independent) read/write heads
 - ✓ 2-D infinite tape
 - ✓ Nondeterminism(!)
- ✓ Many attempts to define models of computation; all turn out to be equivalent to Turing Machines.
 - ✓ If you can do it in C++, a TM can do it (slowly, encodedly)
- ✓ Church's Thesis (a.k.a. Church-Turing Thesis)
 - ✓ Any "intuitively computable" procedure can be performed by a TM

Turing Machines as Enumerators

- ✓ Several variant definitions. Each specify a language L
 1. A TM that prints out the members of L , one at a time (but not necessarily in any particular order)
 2. A TM that prints out the members of L , one at a time (but...) with possible repeats in some
 3. A TM that, given an integer n , returns the n th element of a sequence like (1) above.
 4. A TM that, given an integer n , returns the n th element of a sequence like (2) above.
- ✓ For a fixed language, all these are interconvertible.
- ✓ A language is recognizable iff it can be enumerated.

Encoding TMs as Strings

- ✓ We know that a TM can be described fully by a finite list of transition rules, of the form:
 - ✓ $q_0, \sqcup \rightarrow q_1, \sqcup, R$
 - ✓ $q_i, \sqcup \rightarrow q_j, \sqcup, L$
 - ✓ $q_i, x \rightarrow q_k, x, L$
 - ✓ $q_m, a \rightarrow q_n, x, R$ etc.
- ✓ We can devise a way to encode an **arbitrary** set of such rules into a **fixed alphabet**.
- ✓ Although the number of states and tape symbols can be arbitrary
 - ✓ we can **encode** these by using strings of symbols, say $\{0, 1\}$
 - ✓ concatenate the symbols to describe rules
 - ✓ concatenate rules to describe machines.

Encoding TMs as Strings

- ✓ Not **every** string of symbols in the encoding alphabet must correspond to a well-formed TM description.
- ✓ But we can determine algorithmically which are and which aren't.
 - ✓ In fact, a TM can do so!
 - ✓ For those that aren't, assume they describe a default TM that immediately halts and rejects.
- ✓ We thus can enumerate of **all TM's**:
 T_0, T_1, T_2, \dots
- ✓ We can do the same for encodings of **initial tapes**:
 X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots

Universal Turing

- ✓ An encoding of a Turing machine can be viewed as a *program*.
- ✓ A Turing machine that interprets such a program to carry out the actions specified is called a **Universal Turing Machine** (UTM).

Universal Turing

- ✓ UTMs can be shown to exist by constructing them.
- ✓ Think about what would be required.
 - ✓ The tape has to hold the tape of the machine being simulated.
 - ✓ The tape has to hold the program of the machine being simulated.
 - ✓ The program must be laid out in such a way that the necessary markers can be inserted to keep track of the current state, etc.
- ✓ All this is possible, if somewhat laborious to construct.
- ✓ Whether a machine is universal will depend on the particular encoding used.

Specific UTMs

- ✓ The first was constructed by Turing himself.
- ✓ Shannon showed any UTM could be converted either to a 2-symbol machine or to a 2-state machine by augmenting states or symbols, respectively.
- ✓ Minsky (1960) gave a 7-state 6-symbol machine.
- ✓ Watanabe (1961) gave an 8-state 5-symbol machine.
- ✓ Minsky (1962) gave a 7-state 4-symbol machine.
- ✓ Rogozhin (1996) gave a 4-state 6-symbol machine
- ✓ Wolfram and Reed (2002) gave a 2-state 5-symbol machine.
- ✓ Smith and Wolfram (2007) gave a 2-state 3-symbol machine.
- ✓ No 2-state 2-symbol UTM exists.

A Specific Universal Turing Machine

✓ 2-state, 5 symbol UTM published by **Wolfram** in 2002

symbols

states

adapted from Wolfram, S. *A New Kind of Science*.
Wolfram Media, p. 707, 2002.
