Computation Histories and PCP

(not Probabilistically Checkable Proofs)
(also not Angel Dust)

CS 81: Computability and Logic

December 5, 2011

Rice's Theorem

No *functional* and *nontrivial* property of Turing Machines is *decidable*.

That is, no *nontrivial* property of TM languages is *decidable*.

Proof (Sketch) of Rice's Theorem

Setup: we have a nontrivial *functional* property P of TMs. WLOG

- ✓ $\neg P(N)$, where N is a TM that accepts nothing
- ✓ $P(Y)$, for some other TM Y

Plan: find a mapping reduction from A_{TM} to P.

Given $\langle M, w \rangle$, construct M', which does the following:

1. Take input x. Save it on an auxiliary tape.
2. Run M on w.
3. If M accepts w, run Y on x. Otherwise, reject.

If M accepts w, then $L(M') = L(Y)$, so $P(M')$.
If M does not accept w, then $L(M') = L(N)$, so $\neg P(M')$

So, if we had a P-checker, we could decide A_{TM}.

Limitations of Rice's Theorem

- ✓ It must be a functional property (i.e., expressible as a property about *languages*)
- ✓ It must be a nontrivial property among the languages accepted by TMs
- ✓ If so, the property is not *decidable*. But Rice's Theorem tells us nothing about whether the property is *semidecidable* or not.

CS 70 Grader Permanent Employment Theorem

The language

$$EQ_{TM} = \{ \langle M_1, M_2 \rangle \mid L(M_1) = L(M_2) \}$$

is not *decidable*.

The same holds for pairs of programs written in C++, *etc.*

Full Employment Theorem for Compiler Writers

Theorem

There is no perfect size-optimizing compiler.

Proof.

Any program that infinite loops without output could be identified, as it would reduce to a single loop instruction:

```
L1:    jmp L1
```

□

Perfect Garbage Collection is Undecidable

Java, Python, Haskell, Scheme, etc., all rely on garbage collection to deallocate unused memory.

- ✓ At any point during execution, a piece of data is live it it will be used in the future, and otherwise dead or garbage.
- ✓ A garbage collector detects and deallocates garbage.
- ✓ Perfect garbage collection is undecidable.

Computation Histories

- Step-by-step recordings of a TM computation.
- In practice, a “trick” for showing more problems not decidable.

States as Strings

- We can describe the configuration of any TM using a string $C = xqy \in \Gamma^*$.

  $x \in \Gamma^*$ = symbols to the left of head

  $q \in Q$ = current control state

  $y \in \Gamma^*$ = symbols under and to the right of head

- Over the course of a computation, we have

  $\cdots \Rightarrow x_1q_1y_1 \Rightarrow x_2q_2y_2 \Rightarrow x_3q_3y_3 \Rightarrow \cdots$

- If the TM halts, we can represent the whole history of the computation as a single (finite) string!

  Traditionally written $\#C_1\#C_2\#C_3\#\cdots\#C_n\#$

Checking a History

- Checker: a Turing Machine C that, given <M, h>, checks whether h is a history of TM M.

  Consecutive states should be equal, except around the head (where the change corresponds to the transition table of M).

- Can check whether h is a halting (or an accepting) history by looking at the last control state.

Digression: LBAs

- In fact, the CH can be checked for validity by a less-than-general TM called an LBA.
  - LBA = "Linear Bounded Automaton," a TM that can only use the part of the tape containing input.
  - An LBA can have a large tape alphabet and can "mark" tape cells. It just can't grow its tape.
- More powerful than a DFA
  - Number of potential states grows with input size
  - DFA wouldn't be able to check a computation history.

Accepting for LBAs

- A_{LBA} = { <M,w> | M a LBA accepting w } is decidable.
- Proof: When running M on w, there are at most

$$n := |K| \times |\Gamma|^{|w|} \times |w|$$

  distinct "states" during the computation.
- So,
  - Run M on w.
  - If computation takes longer than n steps, its in an infinite loop; M doesn't accept w.

Emptiness for LBAs

- $E_{LBA} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ a LBA, } L(M) = \varnothing \}$ isn't decidable.
- Proof: $A_{TM} \leq E_{LBA}$.

All_{CFG}

$All_{CFG} = \{ \langle G \rangle \mid G \text{ a CFG, } L(G) = \Sigma^* \}$ is undecidable.

Proof: $A_{TM} \leq All_{CFG}$.

- Key: given <M,w> create a PDA/CFG for strings that **aren**'t accepting computation histories!
  - PDA accepts strings that
    - Don't start with $q_0 w$
    - Or, don't end with $xq_{accept}y$
    - Or, two successive configurations don't match properly
  - Hack: need to reverse every other configuration.
- The grammar for this PDA is Σ^* iff M,w has no finite, accepting history.

Eq_{CFG}

$Eq_{CFG} = \{ \langle G_1, G_2 \rangle \mid L(G_1) = L(G_2) \}$ is undecidable.

Proof: $All_{CFG} \leq Eq_{CFG}$.

Post Correspondence Problem

Emil Post

- Named after logician Emil Post (1897-1954)
  - studied fundamental models of computation
  - "scooped" by Gödel, Turing, and Church

Why PCP?

- Trivial problem to state
  - Looks nothing like Turing Machines
  - A child can understand it
  - Superficially, doesn't look that hard
- Can reduce PCP to other problems, showing them undecidable

PCP

- Given a set of "dominos" (pairs of strings), find a finite sequence of dominos, repeats allowed, where the top line and bottom line spell out the same string.





- Theorem: PCP is undecidable.
- Proof: Halting ≤ MPCP ≤ PCP

Modified PCP (MPCP)

- Like PCP, but solution starts with first domino.
- The following **M**PCP instance has no solution.



MPCP ≤ PCP

- Given an instance of MPCP, solve by translating dominos and doing PCP.



Halts ≤ MPCP

- Idea: if a TM halts, it has a computation history
- Given a <M,w>, construct dominos whose solution would yield such a history (on top and bottom); use MPCP-solver to check for a solution.



The Dominos

- First domino: set up the initial state



- Helper dominos: copy unchanged parts of the tape from C_i to C_{i+1}. (optional: expand the tape)



More Dominos

- For each transition $q,x \rightarrow q', y, R$



- For each transition $q,x \rightarrow q', y, L$



Completion Dominos

- Technical "Trick"
  - When we reach a halting state h, we delete the configuration (one symbol at a time) until it disappears
  - For each halting state h, and each symbol x, we need



  - Finally,



Example: w=11



#	1	␣	#	#
#q0 11#	1	␣	#	␣#

q0 1	q0 ␣	1qa	qa 1	qa ##
1q0	1qa	qa	qa	#

The Recursion Theorem

Recursion Theorem (Kleene 1938)

- **Informally**: A program can have access to its own description (code).



Recursion Theorem (Kleene 1938)

- **Formally**:

  If R is a Turing machine computing a binary function R(x, y), then there is a Turing machine S computing a unary function such that:

  $$S(x) = R(x, \langle S \rangle)$$

  where $\langle S \rangle$ is the description of S itself.



Application: Undecidability of A_{TM} (again)

- Suppose A_{TM} were decidable using TM A.

- Define M(x) as follows:
  1. Take input x;
  2. Use A to decide whether M accepts x, i.e., whether
     $\langle M,x \rangle \in A_{TM}$
  3. Do the opposite.

- M can't exist, so A must not exist. QED

Recursion Theorem to the rescue



Self-Printing Machines

- Even if a machine is not given a handle to its own code on its tape at the outset, there are ways for it to construct it.

- Such programs are now called "Quines"



Willard Van Orman Quine 1908-2000

A Java Quine

http://www.knet.ro/lsantha/

```
class Q{public static void main(String[]v){char
c=34;System.out.print(s+c+s+c+';'+'}');}static String
s="class Q{public static void main(String[]v){char
c=34;System.out.print(s+c+s+c+';'+'}');}static String
s=";}
```

- javac Q.java
- java Q

class Q{public static void main(String[]v){char
c=34;System.out.print(s+c+s+c+';'+'}');}static String
s="class Q{public static void main(String[]v){char
c=34;System.out.print(s+c+s+c+';'+'}');}static String
s=";}

C and C++ Quines (authors unknown)

```
char f[] =
"char f[] =%c%c%s%c;%cmain() {printf(f,10,34,f,34,10,10);}%c";
main() {printf(f,10,34,f,34,10,10);}
```

```
#include <iostream>
#define a(b) std::cout<<"#include <iostream>\n#define a(b) "<<#b<<"\nmain(){a("<<#b<<");}"
main(){a(std::cout<<"#include <iostream>\n#define a(b) "<<#b<<"\nmain(){a("<<#b<<");}");}
```

rex Quine
(by a Pomona College Student)

```
a="\\";aa="a";
b="\"";bb="b";
c="=";cc="c";
d="print(

            aa,c,    b,   a,a,b,    f,
           aa,aa,    c,b,aa,b,f,g,bb,c,b,
          a,b,b,f   ,bb,bb,c,b,bb,b,f,g,
         cc,c,b,c   ,b,f,   cc,cc,c,b,cc,
        b,   f,g  ,dd          ,c,b,
       d,    b,f   ,           g,g,
      dd,    dd,               c,b,
     dd,     b,f               ,g,ee
    ,c,b     ,e,               b,f,
   ee,       ee,               c,b,
  ee,b,f,    g,ff,c,           b,f,
 b,f,ff,ff,c,b,ff,b,f,     g,gg,
          c,b,a          ,nn,b,
           f,gg          ,gg,c,b,
           gg,b,f,       g,nn,nn,c
           ,b,nn,b,      f,g,g,d,g);";
```

continued next col.

```
dd="d";
e=")";ee="e";
f=";";ff="f";
g="\n";gg="g";
nn="n";

print(

            aa,c,    b,   a,a,b,    f,
           aa,aa,    c,b,aa,b,f,g,bb,c,b,
          a,b,b,f   ,bb,bb,c,b,bb,b,f,g,
         cc,c,b,c   ,b,f,   cc,cc,c,b,cc,
        b,   f,g  ,dd          ,c,b,
       d,    b,f   ,           g,g,
      dd,    dd,               c,b,
     dd,     b,f               ,g,ee
    ,c,b     ,e,               b,f,
   ee,       ee,               c,b,
  ee,b,f,    g,ff,c,           b,f,
 b,f,ff,ff,c,b,ff,b,f,     g,gg,
          c,b,a          ,nn,b,
           f,gg          ,gg,c,b,
           gg,b,f,       g,nn,nn,c
           ,b,nn,b,      f,g,g,d,g);
```

Applications of Quines

- Entertainment
- Computer viruses
- Artificial life?

Recursion from the Recursion Theorem

- If you have 〈M〉 on the tape, you can run it.
- A machine M can put 〈M〉 on the tape.
- Therefore, a TM can compute "recursively" in the modern sense.



Theorem

- The language MIN = { ⟨M⟩ | M is minimal }
  is not even semidecidable.

Minimal
=
no machine with the same language has
a strictly smaller description.

Proof

- Suppose MIN **were** semidecidable, hence enumerated by some machine E.
- Consider the TM C, whose program is
  1. Take input x.
  2. Start running enumerator E.
  3. Stop when we produce a ⟨D⟩ that is **strictly longer** than ⟨C⟩ (This must happen. Why?)
  4. Simulate D running on x.
- C cannot exist (why?) , so E cannot exist.
- Thus MIN cannot be semidecidable.