# COL 352 Introduction to Automata and Theory of Computation

Nikhil Balaji

Bharti 420 Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi nbalaji@cse.iitd.ac.in

April 12, 2023

Lecture 30: Rice's Theorem (Part 2)

#### Definition

A property  ${\cal P}$  is simply a subset of Turing recognizable languages.

#### Definition

A property P is simply a subset of Turing recognizable languages. We say that a language L satisfies a property P, if  $L \in P$ .

#### Definition

A property P is simply a subset of Turing recognizable languages. We say that a language L satisfies a property P, if  $L \in P$ .

#### Definition

A property  ${\cal P}$  of Turing recognizable languages is called a non-trivial property if

#### Definition

A property P is simply a subset of Turing recognizable languages. We say that a language L satisfies a property P, if  $L \in P$ .

#### Definition

A property  ${\cal P}$  of Turing recognizable languages is called a non-trivial property if

there exists a TM M such that  $L(M) \in P$ 

#### Definition

A property P is simply a subset of Turing recognizable languages. We say that a language L satisfies a property P, if  $L \in P$ .

#### Definition

A property  ${\cal P}$  of Turing recognizable languages is called a non-trivial property if

there exists a TM M such that  $L(M) \in P$ , and there exists a TM M' such that  $L(M') \notin P$ .

#### Definition

A property P is simply a subset of Turing recognizable languages. We say that a language L satisfies a property P, if  $L \in P$ .

#### Definition

A property  ${\cal P}$  of Turing recognizable languages is called a non-trivial property if

there exists a TM M such that  $L(M) \in P$ , and there exists a TM M' such that  $L(M') \notin P$ .

#### Theorem

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}.$ 

#### Definition

A property P is simply a subset of Turing recognizable languages. We say that a language L satisfies a property P, if  $L \in P$ .

#### Definition

A property  ${\cal P}$  of Turing recognizable languages is called a non-trivial property if

there exists a TM M such that  $L(M) \in P$ , and there exists a TM M' such that  $L(M') \notin P$ .

#### Theorem

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

Applicable, the property is not trivial

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M \rangle \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M \rangle \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

Applicable, the property is not trivial

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M \rangle \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M \rangle \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

Applicable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M \rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

#### Applicable.

If we can simulate any TM with another with less than 10 states, then the property will be trivial.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

#### Applicable.

If we can simulate any TM with another with less than 10 states, then the property will be trivial.

This is doable if we allow for the tape alphabet size to grow.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

#### Applicable.

If we can simulate any TM with another with less than 10 states, then the property will be trivial.

This is doable if we allow for the tape alphabet size to grow.

In that case, the property is trivial.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

#### Applicable.

If we can simulate any TM with another with less than 10 states, then the property will be trivial.

This is doable if we allow for the tape alphabet size to grow.

In that case, the property is trivial.

Textbooks usually consider this property to be not trivial.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M \rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

#### Applicable.

If we can simulate any TM with another with less than 10 states, then the property will be trivial.

This is doable if we allow for the tape alphabet size to grow.

In that case, the property is trivial.

Textbooks usually consider this property to be not trivial.

This is because the usual assumption is that you always fix the tape alphabet.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

#### Applicable.

If we can simulate any TM with another with less than 10 states, then the property will be trivial.

This is doable if we allow for the tape alphabet size to grow.

In that case, the property is trivial.

Textbooks usually consider this property to be not trivial.

This is because the usual assumption is that you always fix the tape alphabet.

In that case, Rice's theorem is applicable and the property is not trivial, therefore undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

#### Applicable.

If we can simulate any TM with another with less than 10 states, then the property will be trivial.

This is doable if we allow for the tape alphabet size to grow.

In that case, the property is trivial.

Textbooks usually consider this property to be not trivial.

This is because the usual assumption is that you always fix the tape alphabet.

In that case, Rice's theorem is applicable and the property is not trivial, therefore undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid M \text{ has at most } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid M \text{ has at most } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

Not applicable, but the language is decidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{\langle M\rangle \mid M \text{ has at most } 10 \text{ states}\}.$ 

Not applicable, but the language is decidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

Applicable, the property is not trivial

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

Applicable, the property is not trivial

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is finite } \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is finite } \}.$ 

Applicable, the property is not trivial

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is finite } \}.$ 

Applicable, the property is not trivial, therefore undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is finite } \}.$ 

Applicable, the property is not trivial, therefore undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) = \Sigma^*\}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid L(M) = \Sigma^*\}.$ 

Applicable, the property is not trivial

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem

$$\{M \mid L(M) = \Sigma^*\}.$$

Applicable, the property is not trivial, therefore undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem

$$\{M \mid L(M) = \Sigma^*\}.$$

Applicable, the property is not trivial, therefore undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{(M,w) \mid M \text{ writes a symbol a on the tape on input } w\}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{(M,w) \mid M \text{ writes a symbol a on the tape on input } w\}.$ 

Not applicable, but the language is in fact undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{(M,w) \mid M \text{ writes a symbol a on the tape on input } w\}.$ 

Not applicable, but the language is in fact undecidable.

Rice's theorem cannot be used to prove the undecidability of this language!

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem

```
\left\{ \begin{array}{c|c} \langle M \rangle & M \text{ tries to write on the left of the cell when it} \\ & \text{is at the leftmost bit of the input} \end{array} \right\}.
```

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c|c} \langle M \rangle & M \text{ tries to write on the left of the cell when it} \\ & \text{is at the leftmost bit of the input} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Not applicable, but the language is in fact undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem

```
\left\{ \begin{array}{c|c} \langle M \rangle & M \text{ tries to write on the left of the cell when it} \\ & \text{is at the leftmost bit of the input} \end{array} \right\}.
```

Not applicable, but the language is in fact undecidable.

Rice's theorem cannot be used to prove the undecidability of this language!

#### Theorem

Let P be a property such that it is not trivial. Recall that

$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{ M \mid L(M) \in P \}.$$

#### Theorem

Let P be a property such that it is not trivial. Recall that  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

### Theorem

Let P be a property such that it is not trivial. Recall that  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

### Proof Idea:

Let P be a non-trivial property.

#### **Theorem**

Let P be a property such that it is not trivial. Recall that  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

### Proof Idea:

Let P be a non-trivial property.

Assume that  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is decidable.

#### **Theorem**

Let P be a property such that it is not trivial. Recall that  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

### Proof Idea:

Let P be a non-trivial property.

Assume that  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is decidable.

Using this assumption prove that HALT is decidable.

### Theorem

Let P be a property such that it is not trivial. Recall that  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

### Proof Idea:

Let P be a non-trivial property.

Assume that  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is decidable.

Using this assumption prove that HALT is decidable.

More specifically:

N

#### **Theorem**

Let P be a property such that it is not trivial. Recall that  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

### Proof Idea:

Let P be a non-trivial property.

Assume that  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is decidable.

Using this assumption prove that HALT is decidable.

### More specifically:

$$(M,w)$$
  $\longrightarrow$   $N$  if  $M$  halts on  $w$   $\longrightarrow$   $\langle N \rangle \in \mathcal{L}_P$ 

#### **Theorem**

Let P be a property such that it is not trivial. Recall that  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

### Proof Idea:

Let P be a non-trivial property.

Assume that  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is decidable.

Using this assumption prove that HALT is decidable.

### More specifically:

$$(M,w) \longrightarrow N$$
 if  $M$  halts on  $w \longrightarrow \langle N \rangle \in \mathcal{L}_P$  if  $M$  does not halt on  $w \longrightarrow \langle N \rangle \notin \mathcal{L}_P$ 

### Theorem

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}.$ 

#### Theorem

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

### Theorem

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

 ${\sf Design} \,\, {\sf of} \,\, N$ 

#### Theorem

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

## Design of N

#### Theorem

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

## Design of N

Since P is non-trivial, there exists a TM  $M_1$  s.t.  $L(M_1)$  has Property P.

we assume that  $\varnothing$  does not have property P

#### Theorem

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

## Design of N

Since P is non-trivial, there exists a TM  $M_1$  s.t.  $L(M_1)$  has Property P.

we assume that  $\varnothing$  does not have property P

#### **Theorem**

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

```
Design of N
```

```
we assume that \varnothing does not have property P^1 on input x {  \{ \qquad \qquad \text{Write down } x \text{ on the tape.} \\ \text{Run } M \text{ on } w \\ \text{if } M \text{ halts on } w \text{, then run } M_1 \text{ on } x \\ \text{and accept if and only if } M_1 \\ \text{accepts } x \}
```

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>We will remove this assumption later.

#### **Theorem**

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

```
Design of N
```

```
we assume that \varnothing does not have property P
```

```
on input x  \{ \qquad \qquad \text{Claim: } M \text{ halts on } w \text{ if and only if } \langle N \rangle \in \mathcal{L}_P  Write down x on the tape.  \text{Run } M \text{ on } w  if M halts on w, then run M_1 on x and accept if and only if M_1 accepts x
```

#### **Theorem**

Let P be a non-trivial property of Turing recognizable languages. Let  $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is undecidable.

```
Design of N
```

```
we assume that \varnothing does not have property P
```

```
on input x  \{ \qquad \qquad \text{Claim: } M \text{ halts on } w \text{ if and only if } \langle N \rangle \in \mathcal{L}_P  Write down x on the tape.  \text{Run } M \text{ on } w  if M halts on w, then run M_1 on x and accept if and only if M_1 accepts x
```

We now show how to get around the assumption.

Suppose  $\emptyset$  has property P.

We now show how to get around the assumption.

Suppose  $\emptyset$  has property P.

Consider  $\overline{P}$ .

We now show how to get around the assumption.

Suppose  $\emptyset$  has property P.

Consider  $\overline{P}$ .

Now  $\varnothing$  does not have property  $\overline{P}$ .

We now show how to get around the assumption.

Suppose  $\emptyset$  has property P.

Consider  $\overline{P}$ .

Now  $\varnothing$  does not have property  $\overline{P}.$ 

Use Rice's theorem on  $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{P}}$  to prove undecidibility.

We now show how to get around the assumption.

Suppose  $\emptyset$  has property P.

Consider  $\overline{P}$ .

Now  $\varnothing$  does not have property  $\overline{P}.$ 

Use Rice's theorem on  $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{P}}$  to prove undecidibility.

Conclude undecidibility of  $\mathcal{L}_P$ .

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid M \text{ has a useless state } \}.$ 

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M\mid M \text{ has a useless state }\}.$ 

Not applicable, but the language is in fact undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid M \text{ has a useless state } \}.$ 

Not applicable, but the language is in fact undecidable.

Rice's theorem cannot be used to prove the undecidability of this language!

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid M \text{ has a useless state } \}.$ 

Not applicable, but the language is in fact undecidable.

Rice's theorem cannot be used to prove the undecidability of this language!

▶ **Observation:** If a machine M does not halt on input w then any final state is "useless".

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem  $\{M \mid M \text{ has a useless state } \}.$ 

Not applicable, but the language is in fact undecidable.

Rice's theorem cannot be used to prove the undecidability of this language!

- ▶ **Observation:** If a machine M does not halt on input w then any final state is "useless".
- Given an input M, x for HALT, construct  $M_x$  that halts on every input (final state is useful!) if and only if M halts on x.

P is monotone if whenever a set has the property, then all supersets of that set have it as well.

P is monotone if whenever a set has the property, then all supersets of that set have it as well. Examples

- L(M) is infinite.
- $L(M) = \Sigma^*$

P is monotone if whenever a set has the property, then all supersets of that set have it as well. Examples

- L(M) is infinite.
- $L(M) = \Sigma^*$

Non-examples:

▶ L(M) is finite and  $L(M) = \emptyset$ 

### Theorem

If P is a nonmonotone property of Turing machines sets, then the set

$$L_P = \{ \langle M \rangle | (L(M) \in P) \}$$

is not Turing recognizable.

P is monotone if whenever a set has the property, then all supersets of that set have it as well. Examples

- L(M) is infinite.
- $L(M) = \Sigma^*$

Non-examples:

▶ L(M) is finite and  $L(M) = \emptyset$ 

### Theorem

If P is a nonmonotone property of Turing machines sets, then the set

$$L_P = \{\langle M \rangle | (L(M) \in P)\}$$

is not Turing recognizable.

## Proof.

Reading exercise! (Kozen Theorem 34.2)

P is monotone if whenever a set has the property, then all supersets of that set have it as well. Examples

- L(M) is infinite.
- $L(M) = \Sigma^*$

Non-examples:

• L(M) is finite and  $L(M) = \emptyset$ 

### Theorem.

If P is a nonmonotone property of Turing machines sets, then the set

$$L_P = \{\langle M \rangle | (L(M) \in P)\}$$

is not Turing recognizable.

## Proof.

Reading exercise! (Kozen Theorem 34.2)

Idea: Reduce  $\overline{HALT}$  to  $L_P$ .



P is monotone if whenever a set has the property, then all supersets of that set have it as well. Examples

- L(M) is infinite.
- $L(M) = \Sigma^*$

Non-examples:

• L(M) is finite and  $L(M) = \emptyset$ 

### Theorem.

If P is a nonmonotone property of Turing machines sets, then the set

$$L_P = \{\langle M \rangle | (L(M) \in P)\}$$

is not Turing recognizable.

## Proof.

Reading exercise! (Kozen Theorem 34.2)

Idea: Reduce  $\overline{HALT}$  to  $L_P$ .

