

Lecture
Models of Computation
(DIT310, TDA184)

Nils Anders Danielsson

2016-12-05

Today

- ▶ Coding (for χ).
- ▶ Representing inductively defined sets as strings.
- ▶ Turing-computability.
- ▶ Representing Turing machines.
- ▶ A self-interpreter (a universal Turing machine).
- ▶ The halting problem.
- ▶ A Turing machine that is a χ interpreter.

Coding

┌ ─ ┐

One way to give a semantics to $\llbracket _ \rrbracket$:

- ▶ $\llbracket _ \rrbracket$ is a constructor of a variant of Exp :

$$\frac{e \in Exp}{\llbracket e \rrbracket \in \overline{Exp}} \quad \frac{e_1 \in \overline{Exp} \quad e_2 \in \overline{Exp}}{\text{apply } e_1 \ e_2 \in \overline{Exp}} \quad \dots$$

- ▶ This variant is the domain of $\ulcorner _ \urcorner$:

$$\begin{aligned} \ulcorner _ \urcorner \in \overline{Exp} &\rightarrow Exp \\ \ulcorner \llbracket e \rrbracket \urcorner &= e \\ \ulcorner \text{apply } e_1 \ e_2 \urcorner &= \text{Apply}(\ulcorner e_1 \urcorner, \ulcorner e_2 \urcorner) \\ &\vdots \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ Example:

$$\ulcorner eval _ code e \urcorner = \text{Apply}(\ulcorner eval \urcorner, code e)$$

- ▶ Note that you do not have to use $_ _$.

Coding

Probably not what you want:

$$\lambda p. \ulcorner eval\ p \urcorner = \lambda p. \text{Apply}(\ulcorner eval \urcorner, \text{Var}(\ulcorner p \urcorner))$$

If p corresponds to 0:

$$\lambda p. \text{Apply}(\ulcorner eval \urcorner, \text{Var}(\text{Zero}()))$$

A constant function.

Coding

Perhaps more useful:

$$\lambda p. \ulcorner eval _ code p \urcorner = \lambda p. \text{Apply}(\ulcorner eval \urcorner, code p)$$

For any expression e :

$$(\lambda p. \ulcorner eval _ code p \urcorner) \ulcorner e \urcorner \Downarrow \ulcorner eval \ulcorner e \urcorner \urcorner$$

Quiz

What is the result of evaluating

$(\lambda p. \text{eval } \ulcorner \text{eval } _ \text{code } p _ \urcorner) \ulcorner \text{Zero}() \urcorner?$

- ▶ Nothing
- ▶ Zero()
- ▶ $\ulcorner \text{Zero}() \urcorner$
- ▶ $\ulcorner \ulcorner \text{Zero}() \urcorner \urcorner$
- ▶ $\ulcorner \ulcorner \ulcorner \text{Zero}() \urcorner \urcorner \urcorner$
- ▶ $\ulcorner \ulcorner \ulcorner \ulcorner \text{Zero}() \urcorner \urcorner \urcorner \urcorner$

Representing
inductively
defined sets

Natural numbers

One method:

$$\lceil _ \rceil \in \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{List } \{1\}$$

$$\lceil \text{zero} \rceil = []$$

$$\lceil \text{suc } n \rceil = 1 :: \lceil n \rceil$$

Natural numbers

Another method:

$$\ulcorner _ \urcorner \in \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{List } \{0, 1\}$$

$$\ulcorner \text{zero} \urcorner = 0 :: []$$

$$\ulcorner \text{suc } n \urcorner = 1 :: \ulcorner n \urcorner$$

This method is used below.

Lists

Assume that A can be represented using a function $\ulcorner _ \urcorner \in A \rightarrow \text{List } \Sigma$ which satisfies the following properties:

- ▶ It is injective.
- ▶ There is a function

$$\text{split} \in \text{List } \Sigma \rightarrow \text{List } \Sigma \times \text{List } \Sigma$$

such that, for any $x \in A$, $xs \in \text{List } \Sigma$,

$$\text{split} (\ulcorner x \urcorner \# xs) = (\ulcorner x \urcorner, xs).$$

Lists

Assume that A can be represented using a function $\ulcorner _ \urcorner \in A \rightarrow \text{List } \Sigma$ which satisfies the following properties:

- ▶ It is injective.
- ▶ There is a function

$$\text{split} \in \text{List } \Sigma \rightarrow \text{List } \Sigma \times \text{List } \Sigma$$

such that, for any $x \in A$, $xs \in \text{List } \Sigma$,

$$\text{split} (\ulcorner x \urcorner \uparrow\uparrow xs) = (\ulcorner x \urcorner, xs).$$

Note that *split* can only be defined for one of the presented methods for representing natural numbers.

Lists

Representation of *List A*:

$$\ulcorner _ \urcorner \in \text{List } A \rightarrow \text{List } (\Sigma \cup \{0, 1\})$$

$$\ulcorner [] \urcorner = 0 :: []$$

$$\ulcorner x :: xs \urcorner = 1 :: \ulcorner x \urcorner \# \ulcorner xs \urcorner$$

This function also satisfies the given properties.

Quiz

Which list of natural numbers does
11110101110100 stand for?

- ▶ None
- ▶ [3, 0, 2]
- ▶ [3, 0, 2, 0]
- ▶ [3, 2, 0]
- ▶ [4, 1, 3, 1]
- ▶ [4, 1, 3, 1, 0]

Turing- computability

Turing-computable functions

Assume that we have methods for representing members of the sets A and B as elements of $List\ \Sigma$, where Σ is a finite set.

A partial function $f \in A \rightarrow B$ is *Turing-computable* if there is a Turing machine tm such that:

- ▶ $\Sigma_{tm} = \Sigma$.
- ▶ $\forall a \in A. \llbracket tm \rrbracket \ulcorner a \urcorner = \ulcorner f\ a \urcorner$.

Languages

- ▶ A language over an alphabet Σ is a subset of *List* Σ .

Turing-decidable

A language L over Σ is *Turing-decidable* if there is a Turing machine tm (with accepting states) such that:

- ▶ $\Sigma_{tm} = \Sigma$.
- ▶ $\forall xs \in List \Sigma$. if $xs \in L$ then $Accept_{tm} xs$.
- ▶ $\forall xs \in List \Sigma$. if $xs \notin L$ then $Reject_{tm} xs$.

Turing-recognisable

A language L over Σ is *Turing-recognisable* if there is a Turing machine tm (with accepting states) such that:

- ▶ $\Sigma_{tm} = \Sigma$.
- ▶ $\forall xs \in List \Sigma. xs \in L$ iff $Accept_{tm} xs$.

Representing Turing machines

States

Assume that $S = \{s_0, \dots, s_n\}$.

Note that S is always non-empty.

$$\lceil S \rceil = \lceil n \rceil$$

$$\lceil s_k \rceil = \lceil k \rceil$$

Alphabets

Assume that $\Sigma = \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ and
 $\Gamma = \{\sqcup\} \cup \{c_1, \dots, c_{m+n}\}$.

$$\lceil \Sigma \rceil = \lceil m \rceil$$

$$\lceil \Gamma \rceil = \lceil n \rceil$$

$$\lceil \sqcup \rceil = \lceil 0 \rceil$$

$$\lceil c_k \rceil = \lceil k \rceil$$

Directions

$$\lceil L \rceil = [0]$$

$$\lceil R \rceil = [1]$$

The transition function

- ▶ A rule $\delta (s, x) = (s', x', d)$ is represented by

$$\lceil s \rceil \# \lceil x \rceil \# \lceil s' \rceil \# \lceil x' \rceil \# \lceil d \rceil.$$

- ▶ The transition function is represented by the representation of a list containing all of its rules (ordered in some way).

Turing machines and strings

- ▶ A Turing machine $(S, s_0, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta) \in TM$ is represented by

$$\lceil S \rceil \# \lceil s_0 \rceil \# \lceil \Sigma \rceil \# \lceil \Gamma \rceil \# \lceil \delta \rceil.$$

- ▶ A pair consisting of a Turing machine tm and a corresponding input string xs is represented by

$$\lceil tm \rceil \# \lceil xs \rceil.$$

- ▶ Note that this encoding only uses two non-blank symbols, 0 and 1.

Quiz

What Turing machine does

000110010011101010110001110101010001

represent?

- ▶ None
- ▶ $S = \{s_0\}$, $\Sigma = \{0\}$, $\Gamma = \{0, \sqcup\}$,
 $\delta(s_0, 0) = (s_0, 0, L)$
- ▶ $S = \{s_0\}$, $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$, $\Gamma = \{0, 1, \sqcup\}$,
 $\delta(s_0, 0) = (s_0, 1, R)$

Self-
interpreter

Self-interpreter

A self-interpreter or *universal Turing machine* *eval* is a witness to the fact that $\llbracket _ \rrbracket$ is Turing-computable:

$$\Sigma_{eval} = \{0, 1\}$$

$$\forall tm \in TM. \forall xs \in List \Sigma_{tm}.$$

$$\llbracket eval \rrbracket \ulcorner (tm, xs) \urcorner = \ulcorner \llbracket tm \rrbracket xs \urcorner$$

Implementation sketch

Possibly buggy:

- ▶ Let us use three tapes in the implementation.
Can convert to a one-tape machine later.
- ▶ Mark the left end of the input tape.
Convert to a two-symbol machine later.
- ▶ Move the input string to the second tape.
Mark the left end and the head's position.
- ▶ Write the initial state to the third tape.
Mark the left end.

Implementation sketch

- ▶ Simulate the input TM, using the rules on the first tape.
- ▶ If the simulation halts successfully (with the head at the start of its tape), write the result to the first tape and halt successfully.
- ▶ If the simulation halts unsuccessfully, halt unsuccessfully.

The halting problem

The halting problem

$halts \in \{(tm, xs) \mid tm \in TM, xs \in List \Sigma_{tm}\} \rightarrow Bool$
 $halts (tm, xs) =$
 if $\exists ys \in List \Gamma_{tm}. \llbracket tm \rrbracket xs = ys$ **then**
 true
 else
 false

This function is not Turing-computable.

The halting problem

The halting problem can also be viewed as a language:

$$\{ \ulcorner (tm, xs) \urcorner \mid tm \in TM, \\ xs \in List \Sigma_{tm}, \\ ys \in List \Gamma_{tm}, \\ \llbracket tm \rrbracket xs = ys \}$$

This language is Turing-undecidable.

The halting problem (with self-application)

$$\{ \ulcorner tm \urcorner \mid tm \in TM, ys \in List \Gamma_{tm}, \llbracket tm \rrbracket \ulcorner tm \urcorner = ys \}$$

This language is Turing-undecidable. Proof sketch:

- ▶ Assume that the TM *halts* decides it.
- ▶ Define a TM *terminv* in the following way:
 - ▶ Simulate *halts* on the input.
 - ▶ If *halts* accepts, loop forever.
 - ▶ If *halts* rejects, halt with a result.
- ▶ Note that *terminv* applied to $\ulcorner terminv \urcorner$ halts iff it does not halt.

The halting problem is undecidable

$$\{ \ulcorner (tm, xs) \urcorner \mid tm \in TM, xs \in List \Sigma_{tm}, \\ ys \in List \Gamma_{tm}, \llbracket tm \rrbracket xs = ys \}$$

Proof sketch:

- ▶ Assume that the TM *halts* decides it.
- ▶ We can then implement a TM for the halting problem with self-application:
 - ▶ If the input is not $\ulcorner tm \urcorner$ for some $tm \in TM$, reject.
 - ▶ If it is $\ulcorner tm \urcorner$, write ??? on the tape.
 - ▶ Run *halts*.

Quiz

What does ??? stand for?

- ▶ tm
- ▶ $\lceil tm \rceil$
- ▶ $\lceil \lceil tm \rceil \rceil$
- ▶ $tm \uparrow \lceil tm \rceil$
- ▶ $\lceil tm \rceil \uparrow \lceil \lceil tm \rceil \rceil$
- ▶ $tm \uparrow \lceil tm \rceil \uparrow \lceil \lceil tm \rceil \rceil$

X interpreter

A χ interpreter

The χ semantics is Turing-computable:

- ▶ X programs can be represented as strings in some finite alphabet Σ :

$$\ulcorner _ \urcorner^{\text{TM}} \in \text{CExp} \rightarrow \text{List } \Sigma$$

- ▶ There is a TM chi satisfying the following properties:

$$\Sigma_{chi} = \Sigma$$

$$\forall e \in \text{CExp}. \llbracket chi \rrbracket_{\text{TM}} \ulcorner e \urcorner^{\text{TM}} = \ulcorner \llbracket e \rrbracket_{\chi} \urcorner^{\text{TM}}$$

Recursion

- ▶ How can recursion be implemented?
- ▶ One idea: An explicit stack on a separate tape.

Implementation sketch

- ▶ Come up with a small-step semantics for χ .
- ▶ Use small steps also for substitution.
- ▶ Make sure that every small step can be simulated on a TM.
- ▶ The design can be based on some abstract machine for the λ -calculus, perhaps the CEK machine.

Every χ -computable partial function in $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is Turing-computable

Proof sketch:

- ▶ If $f \in \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is χ -computable, then

$$\forall m \in \mathbb{N}. \llbracket e \ulcorner m \urcorner^\chi \rrbracket_\chi = \ulcorner f \ m \urcorner^\chi$$

for some $e \in CExp$.

- ▶ The following TM implements f :
 - ▶ Convert input: $\ulcorner m \urcorner^{\text{TM}} \mapsto \ulcorner e \ulcorner m \urcorner^\chi \urcorner^{\text{TM}}$.
 - ▶ Simulate the χ interpreter.
 - ▶ Convert output: $\ulcorner \ulcorner n \urcorner^\chi \urcorner^{\text{TM}} \mapsto \ulcorner n \urcorner^{\text{TM}}$.

Summary

- ▶ Coding (for χ).
- ▶ Representing inductively defined sets as strings.
- ▶ Turing-computability.
- ▶ Representing Turing machines.
- ▶ A self-interpreter (a universal Turing machine).
- ▶ The halting problem.
- ▶ A Turing machine that is a χ interpreter.