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 29: Rice's Theorem

The following languages are undecidable.

The following languages are undecidable.

 $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$

The following languages are undecidable.

```
\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.
```

 $\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is context-free}\}.$

The following languages are undecidable.

$$\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

$$\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is context-free}\}.$$

$$\{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

The following languages are undecidable.

$$\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

$$\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is context-free}\}.$$

$$\{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

The following languages are decidable.

 $\{M \mid M \text{ has more than } 10 \text{ states}\}.$

The following languages are undecidable.

$$\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

$$\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is context-free}\}.$$

$$\{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

The following languages are decidable.

 $\{M \mid M \text{ has more than } 10 \text{ states}\}.$

 $\{M \mid M \text{ does not have a left move}\}.$

The following languages are undecidable.

$$\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

$$\{M \mid L(M) \text{ is context-free}\}.$$

$$\{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

The following languages are decidable.

 $\{M \mid M \text{ has more than } 10 \text{ states}\}.$

 $\{M \mid M \text{ does not have a left move}\}.$

Undecidability is the not an exception - it is the rule! Rice's theorem: A systematic way of proving undecidability of languages.

Definition

A property 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 $L \in P$.

Examples

Set of regular languages.

Definition

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

Examples

Set of regular languages. ✓

Definition

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

Examples

Set of regular languages. ✓

Set of context-free languages.

Definition

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

Examples

Set of regular languages. ✓

Set of context-free languages. ✓

Definition

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

Examples

Set of regular languages. ✓

Set of context-free languages. ✓

 $\{\emptyset\}.$

Definition

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

Examples

Set of regular languages. ✓

Set of context-free languages. ✓

{∅}. ✓

Definition

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

Examples

Set of regular languages. ✓

Set of context-free languages. ✓

{∅}. ✓

Definition

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

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 ${\cal P}$ 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 ${\cal P}$ 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 $L(M') \notin P$.

Examples

Set of all TMs whose language is Σ^*

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 $L(M') \notin P$.

Examples

Set of all TMs whose language is Σ^* \checkmark

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 $L(M') \notin P$.

Examples

Set of all TMs whose language is Σ^* \checkmark

Set of all Turing recognizable languages such that a TM recognising it has at least 10 states.

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 $L(M') \notin P$.

Examples

Set of all TMs whose language is Σ^* \checkmark

Set of all Turing recognizable languages such that a TM recognising it has at least $10\ \mathrm{states.}\ \times$

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 $L(M') \notin P$.

Examples

Set of all TMs whose language is Σ^* \checkmark

Set of all Turing recognizable languages such that a TM recognising it has at least $10\ \mathrm{states}.\ \times$

Rice's theorem

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 ${\cal P}$ 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 $L(M') \notin P$.

Examples

Set of all TMs whose language is Σ^* \checkmark

Set of all Turing recognizable languages such that a TM recognising it has at least $10\ \mathrm{states}.\ \times$

Rice's theorem

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.

Definition

A property 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 $L \in P$.

For any property P, 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 $L \in P$.

For any property P, let $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$, i.e. the set of all Turing machine 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 $L \in P$.

For any property P, let $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \in P\}$, i.e. the set of all Turing machine such that $L(M) \in P$.

We say that a property P is trivial if either $\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$ or \mathcal{L}_P is the set of all the Turing recognizable languages.

Examples

1. $\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$

Examples

1.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

 \mathcal{L}_P is collection of TMs M such that L(M) is regular.

Examples

1.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

 \mathcal{L}_P is collection of TMs M such that L(M) is regular.

Is
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$$
?

Examples

1.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

 \mathcal{L}_P is collection of TMs M such that L(M) is regular.

Is
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$$
? No.

Examples

1.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

 \mathcal{L}_P is collection of TMs M such that L(M) is regular.

Is $\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$? No. For example, a TM accepting a^*b^* is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Examples

1.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

 \mathcal{L}_P is collection of TMs M such that L(M) is regular.

Is $\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$? No. For example, a TM accepting a^*b^* is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Is \mathcal{L}_P = all TMs?

Examples

1.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

 \mathcal{L}_P is collection of TMs M such that L(M) is regular.

Is $\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$? No. For example, a TM accepting a^*b^* is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Is \mathcal{L}_P = all TMs? No.

Examples

1.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

 \mathcal{L}_P is collection of TMs M such that L(M) is regular.

Is $\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$? No. For example, a TM accepting a^*b^* is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Is \mathcal{L}_P = all TMs? No. For example, a TM accepting $\{a^nb^n\mid n\geq 0\}$ is not in \mathcal{L}_P .

Examples

1.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

 \mathcal{L}_P is collection of TMs M such that L(M) is regular.

Is \mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset ? No. For example, a TM accepting a^*b^* is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Is \mathcal{L}_P = all TMs? No. For example, a TM accepting $\{a^nb^n\mid n\geq 0\}$ is not in \mathcal{L}_P .

Therefore, P is not trivial.

Examples

2.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

Examples

2.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

Here \mathcal{L}_P is a collection of TMs M such that $L(M) = \emptyset$.

Examples

2.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

Here \mathcal{L}_P is a collection of TMs M such that $L(M) = \emptyset$.

Is
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$$
?

Examples

2.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

Here \mathcal{L}_P is a collection of TMs M such that $L(M) = \emptyset$.

Is
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$$
? No.

Examples

2.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

Here \mathcal{L}_P is a collection of TMs M such that $L(M) = \emptyset$.

Is $\mathcal{L}_P = \emptyset$? No. For example, a TM M that rejects any string is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Examples

2.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

Here \mathcal{L}_P is a collection of TMs M such that $L(M) = \emptyset$.

Is \mathcal{L}_P = \varnothing ? No. For example, a TM M that rejects any string is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Is \mathcal{L}_P = all TMs?

Examples

2.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

Here \mathcal{L}_P is a collection of TMs M such that $L(M) = \emptyset$.

Is \mathcal{L}_P = \varnothing ? No. For example, a TM M that rejects any string is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Is \mathcal{L}_P = all TMs? No.

Examples

2.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

Here \mathcal{L}_P is a collection of TMs M such that $L(M) = \emptyset$.

Is \mathcal{L}_P = \varnothing ? No. For example, a TM M that rejects any string is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Is \mathcal{L}_P = all TMs? No. For example, a TM M that accepts a single string $\{a\}$ is not in \mathcal{L}_P .

Examples

2.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \{M \mid L(M) = \emptyset\}.$$

Here \mathcal{L}_P is a collection of TMs M such that $L(M) = \emptyset$.

Is \mathcal{L}_P = \varnothing ? No. For example, a TM M that rejects any string is in \mathcal{L}_P .

Is \mathcal{L}_P = all TMs? No. For example, a TM M that accepts a single string $\{a\}$ is not in \mathcal{L}_P .

Examples

3.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \left\{ \begin{array}{c|c} M & \text{is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is accepted by} \\ \text{a TM that has even number of states} \end{array} \right\}$$

Examples

3.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \left\{ \begin{array}{c|c} M & \text{is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is accepted by} \\ \text{a TM that has even number of states} \end{array} \right\}$$

Here P is a property of Turing recognizable languages.

Examples

3.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \left\{ \begin{array}{c|c} M & \text{is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is accepted by} \\ \text{a TM that has even number of states} \end{array} \right\}$$

Here P is a property of Turing recognizable languages.

But any TM can be converted into another one that has even number of states.

Examples

3.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \left\{ \begin{array}{c|c} M & \text{is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is accepted by} \\ \text{a TM that has even number of states} \end{array} \right\}$$

Here P is a property of Turing recognizable languages.

But any TM can be converted into another one that has even number of states.

Therefore, any Turing recognizable language has property P.

Examples

3.
$$\mathcal{L}_P = \left\{ \begin{array}{c|c} M & \text{is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is accepted by} \\ \text{a TM that has even number of states} \end{array} \right\}$$

Here P is a property of Turing recognizable languages.

But any TM can be converted into another one that has even number of states.

Therefore, any Turing recognizable language has property P.

Therefore, P is in fact all Turing recognizable languages.

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.

When is the theorem NOT applicable?

When ${\cal P}$ is a property about TMs and not about Turing recognizable languages.

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.

When is the theorem NOT applicable?

When ${\cal P}$ is a property about TMs and not about Turing recognizable languages.

 $\{\langle M\rangle\,|\,M \text{ has at least ten states}\}.$

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.

When is the theorem NOT applicable?

When ${\cal P}$ is a property about TMs and not about Turing recognizable languages.

 $\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ has at least ten states} \}.$

 $\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ never moves left on any input string } \}.$

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.

When is the theorem NOT applicable?

When P is a property about TMs and not about Turing recognizable languages.

```
\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ has at least ten states}\}.
```

 $\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ never moves left on any input string } \}.$

```
\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ has no useless state } \}.
```

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.

When is the theorem NOT applicable?

When P is a property about TMs and not about Turing recognizable languages.

```
\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ has at least ten states}\}.
```

 $\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ never moves left on any input string } \}.$

 $\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ has no useless state } \}.$

To prove non-recognizability of a property of languages.

Rice's theorem cannot be used to prove non-recognizability of languages.

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.

When is the theorem NOT applicable?

When P is a property about TMs and not about Turing recognizable languages.

```
\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ has at least ten states}\}.
```

 $\{\langle M\rangle\,|\,M \text{ never moves left on any input string }\}.$

$$\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ has no useless state } \}.$$

To prove non-recognizability of a property of languages.

Rice's theorem cannot be used to prove non-recognizability of languages.

It is only used to prove undecidability.



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.

When is the theorem NOT applicable?

When P is a property about TMs and not about Turing recognizable languages.

```
\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ has at least ten states}\}.
```

 $\{\langle M\rangle\,|\,M \text{ never moves left on any input string }\}.$

$$\{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ has no useless state } \}.$$

To prove non-recognizability of a property of languages.

Rice's theorem cannot be used to prove non-recognizability of languages.

It is only used to prove undecidability.



We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem $\{\langle M\rangle \mid M \text{ runs for atmost } 10 \text{ steps on } aab\}.$

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem $\{\langle M\rangle \mid M \text{ runs for atmost } 10 \text{ steps on } aab\}.$

Not applicable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem

 $\{\langle M \rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized by a TM with at least } 10 \text{ states} \}.$

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

Applicable, but property is trivial.

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

Applicable, but property is trivial.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem

 $\{\langle M \rangle \mid L(M) \text{ is recognized by a TM with atmost } 10 \text{ states} \}.$

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem

 $\{\langle M\rangle\,|\,L(M) \text{ is recognized by a TM with atmost }10 \text{ states}\}.$

Applicable and property is not trivial, therefore undecidable.

We now learn how to apply Rice's theorem

 $\{\langle M\rangle\,|\,L(M) \text{ is recognized by a TM with atmost }10 \text{ states}\}.$

Applicable and 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 $\{\langle M \rangle \mid L(M) \text{ contains } \langle M \rangle \}.$

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 $\{\langle M\rangle\,|\,L(M) \text{ is recognized a TM with atmost }10 \text{ states}\}.$

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.