

## Not All Languages are Recognizable

$\text{TMCODE} = \{x \mid x \in \{0,1\}^* \text{ is a valid encoding of a 1-tape Turing machine}\}.$

$\mathcal{L}$ : the set of all *languages* over  $\Sigma$ .

$\text{TMCODE}$  is countably infinite (subset of a countably infinite set)

but

$\mathcal{L}$  is uncountably infinite.

## Universal Turing Machines

A TM  $U$  with input:

description  $e(M)$  of a 1-tape DTM  $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_a, q_r)$

description  $e(w)$  of a string  $w \in \Sigma^*$

$U$  **simulates**  $M$  and accepts  $e(M)e(w)$  iff  $M$  accepts its input  $w$ .

## Universal Turing Machines

A universal Turing machine  $U$  takes as input  $e(M)e(w)$ .

$M$  is a 1-tape DTM and  $w$  is a string over  $M$ 's input alphabet.

$U$  simulates  $M$  on input  $w$  using three tapes:

Tape 1:  $e(M)e(w)$ .

Tape 2: Contents of the tape of  $M$ .

Tape 3: Current state of  $M$ .

Copy  $e(w)$  from Tape 1 to Tape 2;

Write  $e(\text{start state})$  of  $M$  on Tape 3;

Simulate  $M$ :

Use the current state of  $M$  (Tape 3) and the current symbol (Tape 2)  
to find the next state  $q$ , symbol  $a$ , and direction  $D$  from Tape 1;

Write the next state  $q$  on Tape 3;

Write the symbol  $a$  on Tape 2;

Move in the direction  $D$  on Tape 2;

Halt and accept if  $M$  accepts;

Halt and reject if  $M$  rejects;

## An Undecidable Language

$$A_{\text{TM}} = \{e(M)e(w) \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine that accepts } w\}.$$

The *Acceptance* problem for TMs.

(Text calls it the Halting problem.)

$A_{\text{TM}}$  is recognizable.

## An Undecidable Language

$A_{\text{TM}}$  is undecidable.

Suppose not. Let  $H$  be a decider for  $A_{\text{TM}}$ .

$H$  on input  $e_H(M, e_M(w))$  :

Accepts  $e_H(M, e_M(w))$  if  $M$  accepts  $w$  .

Rejects  $e_H(M, e_M(w))$  if  $M$  does not accept  $w$ .

Construct a TM  $D$  that on input  $e_D(M)$  ( $M$  is a TM) functions as follows:

Run  $H$  on input  $e_H(M, e_M(M))$ .

Accept  $e_D(M)$  if  $H$  rejects  $e_H(M, e_M(M))$ .

Reject  $e_D(M)$  if  $H$  accepts  $e_H(M, e_M(M))$ .

When does  $D$  accept  $e_D(M)$ ?

If  $H$  rejects  $e_H(M, e_M(M))$  - that is if  $M$  does not accept  $e_M(M)$ .

When does  $D$  reject  $e_D(M)$ ?

If  $H$  accepts  $e_H(M, e_M(M))$  - that is if  $M$  accepts  $e_M(M)$ .

## An Undecidable Language

The decider  $D$  exists since we assumed  $H$  exists.

Now, run  $D$  on  $e_D(D)$ .

$D$  accepts  $e_D(D)$  if  $D$  does not accept  $e_D(D)$ .

$D$  rejects  $e_D(D)$  if  $D$  accepts  $e_D(D)$ .

Contradiction. Therefore, our assumption is wrong:  $H$  doesn't exist.

$A_{\text{TM}}$  is undecidable.

## When is a Recognizable Language Decidable?

If and only if the language and its complement are both recognizable.

One direction follows:

$L$  is decidable  $\Rightarrow \bar{L}$  is decidable.

A decidable language is recognizable.

Suppose  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$  are recognizable. To show that they are decidable.

Let  $M_1$  accept  $L$  and  $M_2$  accept  $\bar{L}$ .

A decider for  $L$  runs  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  in parallel.

On input  $w$ :

1.  $K \leftarrow 1$ ;
2. Run  $M_1$  on  $w$  for  $K$  steps.
3. If  $M_1$  accepts then halt and accept.
4. If  $M_1$  rejects then halt and reject.
5. Run  $M_2$  on  $w$  for  $K$  steps.
6. If  $M_2$  accepts then halt and reject.
7. If  $M_2$  rejects then halt and accept.
8. Increment  $K$  and repeat from step 2.

A decider because  $M_1$  or  $M_2$  will halt on  $w$ .

## A Language that is not Recognizable

The complement  $\overline{A_{\text{TM}}}$  of  $A_{\text{TM}}$ .