Undecidability



Announcements

- HW 7 due next Monday at 10pm
- HW 8 coming
  - Covers Ch 4-5 material (starting with today's lecture)



Warning: AI is Taking Over Soon



There's Hope (If You Pay Attention Today)

Bertrand Russell's Paradox (1901)





Today: A method for creating paradoxes (used by Russell and others)

Grelling's paradox (1908). An adjective is called *autological* if the property denoted by the adjective holds for the adjective itself. An adjective is called *heterological* if the property denoted by the adjective does not apply to the adjective itself. For example, ''polysyllabic'' and ''English'' are autological, whereas ''monosyllabic'' and ''French'' are heterological. Consider the adjective ''heterological.'' If ''heterological'' is heterological, then it is not heterological. If ''heterological'' is not heterological, then it is heterological. In either case, ''heterological'' is both heterological and not heterological.

Berry's paradox (1906). There are only a finite number of symbols (letters, punctuation signs, etc.) in the English language. Hence, there are only a finite number of English expressions that contain fewer than 200 occurrences of symbols (allowing repetitions). There are, therefore, only a finite number of positive integers that are denoted by an English expression containing fewer than 200 occurrences of symbols. Let k be *the least positive integer that is not denoted by an English expression containing fewer than 200 occurrences of symbols*. The italicized English phrase contains fewer than 200 occurrences of symbols and denotes the integer k.

Logicomix

Good book, comic book

Recap: Decidability of Regular and CFLs

- $A_{\text{DFA}} = \{\langle B, w\rangle \mid B \text{ is a DFA that accepts input string } w\}$ Decidable
- $A_{\text{NFA}} = \{\langle B, w\rangle \mid B \text{ is an NFA that accepts input string } w\}$ Decidable
- $A_{\text{REX}} = \{\langle R, w\rangle \mid R \text{ is a regular expression that generates string } w\}$ Decidable
- $E_{\text{DFA}} = \{\langle A\rangle \mid A \text{ is a DFA and } L(A) = \emptyset\}$ Decidable
- $EQ_{\text{DFA}} = \{\langle A, B\rangle \mid A \text{ and } B \text{ are DFAs and } L(A) = L(B)\}$ Decidable
- $A_{\text{CFG}} = \{\langle G, w\rangle \mid G \text{ is a CFG that generates string } w\}$ Decidable
- $E_{\text{CFG}} = \{\langle G\rangle \mid G \text{ is a CFG and } L(G) = \emptyset\}$ Decidable
- $EQ_{\text{CFG}} = \{\langle G, H\rangle \mid G \text{ and } H \text{ are CFGs and } L(G) = L(H)\}$ *Undecidable?*
- $A_{\text{TM}} = \{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ accepts } w\}$ *Undecidable?*

Thm: A_{TM} is Turing-recognizable

$$A_{\mathsf{TM}} = \{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ accepts } w\}$$

U = "On input $\langle M, w\rangle$, where M is a TM and w is a string:

1. Simulate M on input w.
2. If M ever enters its accept state, *accept*; if M ever enters its reject state, *reject*."

- U = "run" function for TMs
  - Computer that can simulate other computers
  - i.e., "The Universal Turing Machine"
  - Problem: U loops when M loops

Thm: A_{TM} is undecidable

$$A_{\mathsf{TM}} = \{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ accepts } w\}$$

- ???

Kinds of Functions

- **Injective**
  - A.k.a., “one-to-one”
  - Every element in DOMAIN has a unique mapping
  - How to remember:
    - DOMAIN is mapped “in” to the RANGE



- **Surjective**
  - A.k.a., “onto”
  - Every element in RANGE is mapped to
  - How to remember:
    - “Sur” = “over” (eg, sur le table); DOMAIN is mapped “over” the RANGE



- **Bijective**
  - A.k.a., “correspondence” or “one-to-one correspondence”
  - Is both injective and surjective
  - Unique pairing of every element in DOMAIN and RANGE



Countability

- A set is “countable” if it is:
  - Finite
  - Or, there exists a bijection between the set and the natural numbers
    - This set is then considered to have the same size as the set of natural numbers
    - This is called “countably infinite” aka denumerable

Exercise: Which set is larger?

- The set of:
  - Natural numbers, or
  - Even numbers?
- They are the **same** size! Both are countably infinite
  - Bijection:

n	$f(n) = 2n$
1	2
2	4
3	6
⋮	⋮

Exercise: Which set is larger?

- The set of:
  - Natural numbers $\mathcal{N}$, or
  - Positive rational numbers? $\mathcal{Q} = \{\frac{m}{n} | \, m, n \in \mathcal{N}\}$
- They are the **same** size! Both are countably infinite



Exercise: Which set is larger?

- The set of:
  - Natural numbers $\mathcal{N}$, or
  - Positive rational numbers? $\mathcal{Q} = \{\frac{m}{n} | \, m, n \in \mathcal{N}\}$
- They are the **same** size! Both are countably infinite

Another mapping:
(is a bijection)



Exercise: Which set is larger?

- The set of:
  - Natural numbers, or $\mathcal{N}$
  - Real numbers? $\mathcal{R}$
- There are **more** real numbers. It is uncountably infinite.

This is called "**diagonalization**"

Proof, by contradiction:

- Assume a bijection between natural and real numbers exists.
  - This means that every real number should get mapped to.
- But we show that in any given mapping, … e.g.:
  - Some real number is not mapped to …
  - E.g., any number that has different digits at each position:
  - This number is cannot included in mapp $x = 0.4641\ldots$
  - Contradiction!

n	$f(n)$
1	3.14159…
2	55.55555…
3	0.12345…
4	0.50000…
⋮	⋮

Georg Cantor



- Invented set theory
- Came up with (discovered?) countable infinity in 1873
- And uncountability:
  - And how to show uncountability with “diagonalization” technique

Diagonalization with Turing Machines

Diagonal: Result of Giving a TM its own Encoding as Input

All TM Encodings

	$\langle M_1 \rangle$	$\langle M_2 \rangle$	$\langle M_3 \rangle$	$\langle M_4 \rangle$	$\cdots$	$\langle D \rangle$	$\cdots$
M_1	*accept*	*reject*	*accept*	*reject*		*accept*	
M_2	*accept*	*accept*	*accept*	*accept*	$\cdots$	*accept*	$\cdots$
M_3	*reject*	*reject*	*reject*	*reject*		*reject*	
M_4	*accept*	*accept*	*reject*	*reject*		*accept*	
$\vdots$			$\vdots$		$\ddots$		
D	*reject*	*reject*	*accept*	*accept*		?	

opposites

All TMs

Try to construct "opposite" TM

TM D can't exist!

What should happen here?



Thm: A_{TM} is undecidable

$$A_{\mathsf{TM}} = \{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ accepts } w\}$$

Proof by contradiction:

- Assume A_{TM} is decidable. Then there exists a decider:

$$H(\langle M, w\rangle) = \begin{cases} accept & \text{if } M \text{ accepts } w \\ reject & \text{if } M \text{ does not accept } w \end{cases}$$

- If H exists, then we can create:

From the previous slide

$D =$ "On input $\langle M\rangle$, where M is a TM:

1. Run H on input $\langle M, \langle M\rangle\rangle$. ← Result of giving a TM itself as input
2. Output the opposite of what H outputs. That is, if H accepts, *reject*; and if H rejects, *accept*."

Thm: A_{TM} is undecidable

$$A_{\mathsf{TM}} = \{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ accepts } w\}$$

Proof by contradiction:

- Assume A_{TM} is decidable. Then there exists a decider:

$$H(\langle M, w\rangle) = \begin{cases} accept & \text{if } M \text{ accepts } w \\ reject & \text{if } M \text{ does not accept } w \end{cases}$$

- If H exists, then we can create:

From the previous slide

$D =$ "On input $\langle M\rangle$, where M is a TM:

1. Run H on input $\langle M, \langle M\rangle\rangle$.
2. Output the opposite of what H outputs. That is, if H accepts, *reject*; and if H rejects, *accept*."

- But D does not exist! Contradiction! So assumption is false.

Turing Unrecognizable?

Is there anything out here?



Thm: Some langs are not Turing-recognizable

Proof: **requires 2 lemmas**

- Lemma 1: The **set of all languages** is *uncountable*
  - Proof: Show there is a bijection with another uncountable set …
    - … The set of all infinite binary sequences
- Lemma 2: The **set of all TMs** is *countable*
- Therefore, some language is not recognized by a TM

Mapping a Language to a Binary Sequence

All Possible Strings

Some Language (subset of above)

Its (unique) Binary Sequence

$$\Sigma^* = \{\ \varepsilon,\ 0,\ 1,\ 00,\ 01,\ 10,\ 11,\ 000,\ 001,\ \cdots\ \}$$

$$A = \{\ \ \ 0,\ \ \ 00,\ 01,\ \ \ \ \ 000,\ 001,\ \cdots\ \}$$

$$\chi_A = \ \ 0\ \ 1\ \ 0\ \ 1\ \ 1\ \ 0\ \ 0\ \ 1\ \ 1\ \ \cdots$$

Each digit represents one possible string:
- 1 if lang has that string,
- 0 otherwise

Thm: Some langs are not Turing-recognizable

Proof: **requires 2 lemmas**

- Lemma 1: The **set of all languages** is *uncountable*
  - Proof: Show there is a bijection with another uncountable set …
    - … The set of all infinite binary sequences
    - ➢ Now just prove set of infinite binary sequences is uncountable (hw8)
- Lemma 2: The **set of all TMs** is *countable*
  - Because every TM M can be encoded as a string $\langle M \rangle$
  - And set of all strings is countable
- Therefore, some language is not recognized by a TM

Co-Turing-Recognizability

- A language is **co-Turing-recognizable** if …
- … it is the complement of a Turing-recognizable language.

Thm: Decidable ⇔ Recognizable & co-Recognizable

=> If a language is decidable, then it is recognizable and co-recognizable

- Decidable => Recognizable:
  - A decider is a recognizer, bc decidable langs are a subset of recognizable langs
- Decidable => Co-Recognizable:
  - To create co-decider (which is also a co-recognizer) from a decider …
  - … switch reject/accept of all inputs

<= If a language is recognizable and co-recognizable, then it is decidable

Thm: Decidable ⇔ Recognizable & co-Recognizable

=> If a language is decidable, then it is recognizable and co-recognizable

- Decidable => Recognizable:
  - A decider is a recognizer, bc decidable langs are a subset of recognizable langs
- Decidable => Co-Recognizable:
  - To create co-decider (which is also a co-recognizer) from a decider …
  - … switch reject/accept of all inputs

<= If a language is recognizable and co-recognizable, then it is decidable

- Let *M1* = recognizer for the language,
- And *M2* = recognizer for its complement
- Decider *M*:
  - Run 1 step on *M1,*
  - Run 1 step on *M2,*
  - Repeat, until one machine accepts. If it's *M1*, accept. If it's *M2*, reject
- One of *M1* or *M2* must accept and halt, so *M* halts and is a decider

A Turing-unrecognizable language

- We've proved:

  A_{TM} is Turing-recognizable

  A_{TM} is undecidable

- So:

  $\overline{A_{\mathsf{TM}}}$ is not Turing-recognizable

- Because: recognizable & co-recognizable implies decidable


Is there anything out here?
$\overline{A_{\text{TM}}}$
A_{TM}
Turing-recognizable
decidable
context-free
regular

Next time: Easier Undecidability Proofs!

- We proved $A_{\mathsf{TM}} = \{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ accepts } w\}$ undecidable …
- … by showing that its decider could be used to implement an impossible decider "D"!
- In other words, we **reduced** A_{TM} to the "D" problem.
  - This was hard (needed to invent diagonalization)



	$\langle M_1\rangle$	$\langle M_2\rangle$	$\langle M_3\rangle$	$\langle M_4\rangle$	$\cdots$	$\langle D\rangle$
M_1	*accept*	*reject*	*accept*	*reject*		*accept*
M_2	*accept*	*accept*	*accept*	*accept*	$\cdots$	*accept*
M_3	*reject*	*reject*	*reject*	*reject*		*reject*
M_4	*accept*	*accept*	*reject*	*reject*		*accept*
$\vdots$			$\vdots$		$\ddots$	
D	*reject*	*reject*	*accept*	*accept*		?

- But now we can also reduce problems to A_{TM}: much easier!

Next time: The Halting Problem

$$HALT_{\text{TM}} = \{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ halts on input } w\}$$

Thm: $HALT_{\text{TM}}$ is undecidable

Proof, by contradiction:

- Assume $HALT_{\text{TM}}$ has *decider* R
- Use it to create decider for A_{TM} :
  - …
- But A_{TM} is undecidable!



What if Alan Turing had been an engineer?

Check-in Quiz

On gradescope