

COT 5310: Theory of Automata and Formal Languages

Lecture 4



Florida State University
Department of Computer Science

Coding Programs by Numbers

For each program \mathcal{P} in language \mathcal{S} , we will devise a method

- ▶ to associate a unique number, $\#(\mathcal{P})$, to the program \mathcal{P} , and
- ▶ to retrieve a program from its number.

In addition, for each number $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we will retrieve from n a program.

Arranging Variables and Labels

- ▶ The variables are arranged in the following order

$$Y, X_1, Z_1, X_2, Z_2, X_3, Z_3, \dots$$

- ▶ The labels are arranged in the following order

$$A_1, B_1, C_1, D_1, E_1, A_2, B_2, C_2, D_2, E_2, A_3, \dots$$

- ▶ $\#(V)$ is the position of variable V in the ordering. So is $\#(L)$ for label L .
- ▶ Thus,
 $\#(X_2) = 4, \#(Z_1) = \#(Z) = 3, \#(E) = 5, \#(B_2) = 7, \dots$

Coding Instructions by Numbers

Let I be an instruction of language \mathcal{S} . We write

$$\#(I) = \langle a, \langle b, c \rangle \rangle$$

where

1. if I is unlabeled, then $a = 0$; if I is labeled L , then $a = \#(L)$;
2. if variable V is mentioned in I , then $c = \#(V) - 1$;
3. if the statement in I is

$$V \leftarrow V \quad \text{or} \quad V \leftarrow V + 1 \quad \text{or} \quad V \leftarrow V - 1$$

then $b = 0$ or 1 or 2 , respectively;

4. if the statement in I is

IF $V \neq 0$ *GOTO* L'

then $b = \#(L') + 2$.

Coding Instructions by Numbers, Examples

- ▶ The number of the unlabeled instruction

$$X \leftarrow X + 1$$

is

$$\langle 0, \langle 1, 1 \rangle \rangle = \langle 0, 5 \rangle = 10.$$

- ▶ The number of the labeled instruction

$$[A] X \leftarrow X + 1$$

is

$$\langle 1, \langle 1, 1 \rangle \rangle = \langle 1, 5 \rangle = 21.$$

Retrieving The Instruction from A Number

For any given number q , there is a unique instruction I with $\#(I) = q$. How?

- ▶ First we compute $I(q)$. If $I(q) = 0$, I is unlabeled; otherwise I has the $I(q)$ th label L in our list.
- ▶ Then we compute $i = r(r(q)) + 1$ to locate the i th variable V in our list as the variable mentioned in I .
- ▶ Then the statement in I will be

$$V \leftarrow V \quad \text{if } I(r(q)) = 0$$

$$V \leftarrow V + 1 \quad \text{if } I(r(q)) = 1$$

$$V \leftarrow V - 1 \quad \text{if } I(r(q)) = 2$$

$$\text{IF } V \neq 0 \text{ GOTO } L' \quad \text{if } j = I(r(q)) - 2 > 0$$

and L' is the j th label in the list.

Coding Programs by Numbers, Finally

Let a program \mathcal{P} consists of the instructions l_1, l_2, \dots, l_k . Then we set

$$\#(\mathcal{P}) = [\#(l_1), \#(l_2), \dots, \#(l_k)] - 1$$

We call $\#(\mathcal{P})$ the number of program \mathcal{P} . Note that the empty program has number 0.

Coding Programs by Numbers, Examples

Consider the following “nowhere defined” program \mathcal{P}

```
[A] X ← X + 1
    IF X ≠ 0 GOTO A
```

Let l_1 and l_2 , respectively, be the first and the second instruction in \mathcal{P} , then

$$\#(l_1) = \langle 1, \langle 1, 1 \rangle \rangle = \langle 1, 5 \rangle = 21$$

$$\#(l_2) = \langle 0, \langle 3, 1 \rangle \rangle = \langle 0, 23 \rangle = 46$$

Therefore

$$\#(\mathcal{P}) = 2^{21} \cdot 3^{46} - 1$$

Coding Programs by Numbers, Examples

What is the program whose number is 199?

We first compute

$$199 + 1 = 200 = 2^3 \cdot 3^0 \cdot 5^2 = [3, 0, 2]$$

Thus, if $\#(\mathcal{P}) = 199$, then \mathcal{P} consists of 3 instructions whose numbers are 3, 0, and 2. As

$$3 = \langle 2, 0 \rangle = \langle 2, \langle 0, 0 \rangle \rangle$$

$$2 = \langle 0, 1 \rangle = \langle 0, \langle 1, 0 \rangle \rangle$$

We conclude that \mathcal{P} is the following program

```
[B] Y ← Y
      Y ← Y
      Y ← Y + 1
```

This is not a very interesting program, as it just computes $f(x) = 1$.

A Problem with Number 0

- ▶ The number of the unlabeled instruction $Y \leftarrow Y$ is

$$\langle 0, \langle 0, 0 \rangle \rangle = \langle 0, 0 \rangle = 0$$

- ▶ By the definition of Gödel number, the number of a program will be unchanged if an unlabeled $Y \leftarrow Y$ is appended to its end. Note that this does not change the output of the program.
- ▶ However, we remove even this ambiguity by requiring that *the final instruction in a program is not permitted to be the unlabeled statement $Y \leftarrow Y$.*
- ▶ Now, each number determines a unique program (just as each program determines a unique number)!

HALT(x, y): A Predicate on Programs and Their Inputs

We define predicate HALT(x, y) such that

HALT(x, y) \Leftrightarrow program number y eventually halts on input x .

Let \mathcal{P} be the program such that $\#(\mathcal{P}) = y$. Then

$$\text{HALT}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \Psi_{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}(x) \text{ is defined,} \\ 0 & \text{if } \Psi_{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}(x) \text{ is undefined.} \end{cases}$$

Note that HALT(x, y) is a total function.

But, is HALT(x, y) computable?

HALT(x, y) Is Not Computable

Theorem 2.1. HALT(x, y) is not a computable predicate.

Proof. Suppose HALT(x, y) were computable. Then we could construct the following program \mathcal{P} :

[A] IF HALT(X, X) GOTO A

It is clear that

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}(x) = \begin{cases} \text{undefined} & \text{if HALT}(x, x) \\ 0 & \text{if } \sim \text{HALT}(x, x). \end{cases}$$

Let $\#(\mathcal{P}) = y_0$. Then, for all x ,

$$\text{HALT}(x, y_0) \Leftrightarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}(x) \text{ is defined} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{P} \text{ halts on } x \Leftrightarrow \sim \text{HALT}(x, x)$$

Let $x = y_0$, we arrive at

$$\text{HALT}(y_0, y_0) \Leftrightarrow \sim \text{HALT}(y_0, y_0)$$

which is a contradiction. □

“HALT(x, y) Is Not Computable.” *What's that?*

Let's be precise on what have be proved.

- ▶ HALT(x, y) is a predicate on programs in language \mathcal{L} . It is a predicate on the computational behavior of the programs, i.e., whether a program y of language \mathcal{L} will halt on input x .
- ▶ It is shown *there exists no program in language \mathcal{L} that computes HALT(x, y)*.
- ▶ As HALT(x, y) is a total function, we now have as an example a total function that cannot be expressed as a program in \mathcal{L} .
- ▶ But can HALT(x, y) be expressed in languages other than \mathcal{L} ? Will HALT(x, y) become “computable” if other (more powerful) formalisms of computation are used?

The Unsolvability of Halting Problem

There is no algorithm that, given a program of \mathcal{S} and an input to the program, can determine whether or not the given program will eventually halt on the given input.

- ▶ In this form, the result is called the *unsolvability of halting problem*.
- ▶ The statement above is stronger than the statement “*there exists no program in language \mathcal{S} that computes $HALT(x, y)$,*” as an algorithm can refer to a method in any formalism of computation.
- ▶ However, language \mathcal{S} can be shown to be as powerful as any known computational formalism. Therefore, we reason that if no program in \mathcal{S} can solve it, no algorithm can.

Church's Thesis

Any algorithm for computing on numbers can be carried out by a program of \mathcal{P} .

- ▶ This assertion is called *Church's Thesis*.
- ▶ As the word *algorithm* has no general definition separated from a particular language, Church's thesis cannot be proved as a mathematical theorem.
- ▶ We will use Church's thesis freely in asserting the nonexistence of algorithms *whenever we have shown that the problem cannot be solved by a program of \mathcal{P} .*

Why The Halting Problem Is So Hard? (Unsolvable!)

- ▶ This shall not be too surprising, as it is easy to construction short programs of \mathcal{P} such that it is very difficult to tell whether they will ever halt.
- ▶ Example: Fermat's last theorem.
- ▶ Example: Goldbach's conjecture.
- ▶ Actually it is always hard to prove whether programs of \mathcal{P} will exhibit specific computational behaviors (which are of sufficient interest).

Fermat's Last Theorem

The equation $x^n + y^n = z^n$ has no solution in positive x, y, z and $n > 2$.

- ▶ It is easy to write a program \mathcal{P} of language \mathcal{S} that will search all positive integers x, y, z and numbers $n > 2$ for a solution to the equation $x^n + y^n = z^n$.
- ▶ Program \mathcal{P} never halts if and only if Fermat's last theorem is true.
- ▶ That is, if we can solve the halting problem, then we can easily prove (or dis-prove) the Fermat's last theorem!
- ▶ (Fermat's last theorem was finally proved in 1995 by Andrew Wiles with help from Richard Taylor.)

Goldbach's Conjecture

Every even number ≥ 4 is the sum of two prime numbers.

- ▶ Check: $4 = 2 + 2$, $6 = 3 + 3$, $8 = 3 + 5$, ...
- ▶ Is there a counterexample?
- ▶ Let's write a program \mathcal{P} in \mathcal{S} to search for a counterexample!
- ▶ Note that the test that a given even number n is an counterexample only requires checking the primitive recursive predicate:

$$\sim (\exists x)_{\leq n} (\exists y)_{\leq n} [\text{Prime}(x) \ \& \ \text{Prime}(y) \ \& \ x + y = n]$$

- ▶ The statement that \mathcal{P} never halts is equivalent to Goldbach's conjecture.
- ▶ The conjecture is still open; nobody knows yet whether \mathcal{P} will eventually halt.

Compute with Numbers of Programs

- ▶ Programs taking programs as input: Compilers, interpreters, evaluators, Web browsers,
- ▶ Can we write a program in language \mathcal{S} to accept the number of another program \mathcal{P} , as well as the input x to \mathcal{P} , then compute $\Psi_{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}(x)$ as output?
- ▶ Yes, we can! The program above is called a universal program.

Universality

For each $n > 0$, we define

$$\Phi^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y) = \Psi_{\mathcal{P}}^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad \text{where } \#(\mathcal{P}) = y.$$

Theorem 3.1. For each $n > 0$, the function $\Phi^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$ is partially computable. \square

We shall prove this theorem by showing how to construct, for each $n > 0$, a program \mathcal{U}_n which computes $\Phi^{(n)}$. That is,

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{U}_n}^{(n+1)}(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}) = \Phi^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}).$$

The programs \mathcal{U}_n are called universal.

“Computer Organization” of \mathcal{U}_n

- ▶ Program \mathcal{U}_n accepts $n + 1$ input variables of which X_{n+1} is a number of a program \mathcal{P} , and X_1, \dots, X_n are provided to \mathcal{P} as input variables.
- ▶ All variables used by \mathcal{P} are arranged in the following order

$$Y, X_1, Z_1, X_2, Z_2, \dots$$

and their state is coded by the Gödel number

$$[y, x_1, z_1, x_2, z_2, \dots].$$

- ▶ Let variable S in program \mathcal{U}_n store the current state of program \mathcal{P} coded in the above manner.
- ▶ Let variable K in program \mathcal{U}_n store the number such that the K th instruction of program \mathcal{P} is about to be executed.
- ▶ Let variable Z in program \mathcal{U}_n store the instruction sequence of program \mathcal{P} coded as a Gödel number.

Setting Up

As program \mathcal{U}_n computes $\Phi^{(n)}(X_1, \dots, X_n, X_{n+1})$, we begin \mathcal{U}_n by setting up the initial environment for program (number) X_{n+1} to execute:

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\leftarrow X_{n+1} + 1 \\ S &\leftarrow \prod_{i=1}^n (p_{2i})^{X_i} \\ K &\leftarrow 1 \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ If $X_{n+1} = \#(\mathcal{P})$, where \mathcal{P} consists of instructions l_1, \dots, l_m , then Z gets the value $[\#(l_1), \dots, \#(l_m)]$.
- ▶ S is initialized as $[0, X_1, 0, X_2, \dots, 0, X_n]$ which gives the first n input variables their appropriate values and gives all other variables the value 0.
- ▶ K , the instruction counter, is given the initial value 1.

Decoding Instruction

We first see if the execution of program \mathcal{P} shall halt. If not, we fetch the K th instruction and decode the instruction.

[C] IF $K = Lt(Z) + 1 \vee K = 0$ GOTO F
 $U \leftarrow r((Z)_k)$
 $P \leftarrow p_{r(U)+1}$

- ▶ If the computation has ended, GOTO F , where the proper value will be output. (The case for $K = 0$ will be explained later.)
- ▶ $(Z)_k = \langle a, \langle b, c \rangle \rangle$ is the number of the K th instruction. Thus $U = \langle b, c \rangle$ is the code of the statement to be executed.
- ▶ The variable mentioned in the statement is the $(r(U) + 1)$ th in our list S , and its current value is stored as the exponent to which P divides S .

Instruction Execution

IF $I(U) = 0$ GOTO N

IF $I(U) = 1$ GOTO A

IF $\sim (P|S)$ GOTO N

IF $I(U) = 2$ GOTO M

- ▶ If $I(U) = 0$, the instruction is a dummy $V \leftarrow V$ and the computation does nothing. Hence, it goes to N (for *Nothing*).
- ▶ If $I(U) = 1$, the instruction is $V \leftarrow V + 1$. The computation goes to A (for *Add*) to add 1 to the exponent on P in the prime power factorization of S .
- ▶ If $I(U) \neq 0, 1$, the instruction is either $V \leftarrow V - 1$, or $\text{IF } V \neq 0 \text{ GOTO } L$. In both cases, if $V = 0$, the computation does nothing so goes to N . This happens when P is not a divisor of S .
- ▶ If $P|S$ and $I(U) = 2$, the computation goes to M (for *Minus*).

Branching

$$K \leftarrow \min_{i \leq Lt(Z)} [I((Z)_i) + 2 = I(U)]$$

GOTO C

- ▶ If $I(U) > 2$ and $P|S$, the current instruction is of the form IF $V \neq 0$ GOTO L where V has a nonzero value and L is the label whose position in our label list is $I(U) - 2$.
- ▶ The next instruction should be the first with this label.
- ▶ That is, K should get as its value the least i for which $I((Z)_i) = I(U) - 2$. If there is no instruction with the appropriate label, K gets the 0 , which will lead to termination the next time through the main loop.
- ▶ Once the instruction counter K is adjusted, the execution enters the main loop by GOTO C .

Subtraction and Addition

[M] $S \leftarrow \lfloor S/P \rfloor$
GOTO N

[A] $S \leftarrow S \cdot P$

[N] $K \leftarrow K + 1$
GOTO C

- ▶ 1 is subtracted from the variable by dividing S by P .
- ▶ 1 is added to the variable by multiplying S by P .
- ▶ The instruction counter is increased by 1 and the computation returns to the main loop to fetch the next instruction.

Finalizing

[F] $Y \leftarrow (S)_1$

- ▶ One termination, the value of Y for the program being simulated is stored at the exponent on p_1 in S .

\mathcal{U}_n , Finally $Z \leftarrow X_{n+1} + 1$ $S \leftarrow \prod_{i=1}^n (p_{2i})^{X_i}$ $K \leftarrow 1$ [C] IF $K = Lt(Z) + 1 \vee K = 0$ GOTO F $U \leftarrow r((Z)_k)$ $P \leftarrow p_{r(U)+1}$ IF $I(U) = 0$ GOTO NIF $I(U) = 1$ GOTO AIF $\sim (P|S)$ GOTO NIF $I(U) = 2$ GOTO M $K \leftarrow \min_{i \leq Lt(Z)} [I((Z)_i) + 2 = I(U)]$

GOTO C

[M] $S \leftarrow \lfloor S/P \rfloor$

GOTO N

[A] $S \leftarrow S \cdot P$ [N] $K \leftarrow K + 1$

GOTO C

[F] $Y \leftarrow (S)_1$

Notations

For each $n > 0$, the sequence

$$\Phi^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n, 0), \Phi^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n, 1), \dots$$

enumerates all partially computable functions of n variables. When we want to emphasize this aspect we write

$$\Phi_y^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \Phi^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$$

It is often convenient to omit the superscript when $n = 1$, writing

$$\Phi_y(x) = \Phi(x, y) = \Phi^{(1)}(x, y).$$