CSC363 Tutorial #4 Halting problem

February 8, 2023

Things covered in this tutorial

- * What's the halting problem?
- * How was I supposed to do Quiz 2?
- * What's the halting problem?

Quiz 2 solutions?



Suppose $A_0, A_1, A_2, ...$ is a countably infinite collection of c.e.¹ sets. Also suppose that there exists a machine M which, when given i as an input, M starts outputting the elements of A_i .

Which of the following is true about the union $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$?

- * *U* is c.e..
- \star *U* is computable.
- * U is not c.e..

¹Recall that c.e. is a synomnym for recognizable.

²For those unfamiliar with this \bigcup notation: $x \in U$ if and only if $x \in A_i$ for some $i \in {0,1,\ldots}$

Suppose $A_0, A_1, A_2, ...$ is a countably infinite collection of c.e.¹ sets. Also suppose that there exists a machine M which, when given i as an input, M starts outputting the elements of A_i .

Which of the following is true about the union $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$?

- * *U* is c.e..
- \star *U* is computable.
- * U is not c.e..

¹Recall that c.e. is a synomnym for recognizable.

²For those unfamiliar with this \bigcup notation: $x \in U$ if and only if $x \in A_i$ for some $i \in {0, 1, \ldots}$

Suppose $A_0, A_1, A_2, ...$ is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that there exists a machine M which, when given i as an input, M starts outputting the elements of A_i . Define $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$. Then U is c.e..

Suppose A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that there exists a machine M which, when given i as an input, M starts outputting the elements of A_i . Define $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$. Then U is c.e..

Proof. Define the recognizer ${\cal T}$ for ${\cal U}$ as follows:

```
T(x):
    i = 0
    while True:
        run M(i)
        if M(i) outputs x:
        accept
    i += 1
```

Question: What is wrong with the above proof?

Suppose $A_0, A_1, A_2, ...$ is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that there exists a machine M which, when given i as an input, M starts outputting the elements of A_i . Define $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$. Then U is c.e..

Suppose A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that there exists a machine M which, when given i as an input, M starts outputting the elements of A_i . Define $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$. Then U is c.e..

Proof 2 (better!). Define the recognizer T for U as follows:

```
T(x):
    i = 0
    while True:
        run M(0), M(1), ..., M(i) for i steps each
        if any of the above output x:
            accept
        i += 1
```

Suppose A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that there exists a machine M which, when given i as an input, M starts outputting the elements of A_i . Define $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$. Then U is c.e..

U might not be computable!

Suppose $A_0, A_1, A_2, ...$ is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that there exists a machine M which, when given i as an input, M starts outputting the elements of A_i . Define $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$. Then U is c.e..

U might not be computable! Take $A_0=A_1=A_2=\ldots=$ The halting problem. Then U= The halting problem as well, which is not computable.

Suppose $A_0, A_1, A_2, ...$ is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that for each i, there exists an enumerator M_i for A_i .

Which of the following is true about the union $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$?

- * *U* is c.e..
- \star *U* is computable.
- * *U* might not be c.e..



Suppose $A_0, A_1, A_2, ...$ is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that for each i, there exists an enumerator M_i for A_i .

Which of the following is true about the union $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$?

- * U is c.e..
- \star *U* is computable.
- \star *U* might not be c.e..



Suppose A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that for each i, there exists an enumerator M_i for A_i . Define $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$. U might not be c.e.. *Proof.* Define

$$A_i = \begin{cases} \{i\} & i \in \mathsf{The halting problem} \\ \emptyset & i \notin \mathsf{The halting problem}. \end{cases}$$

Question: What is $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$?

Suppose A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that for each i, there exists an enumerator M_i for A_i . Define $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$. U might not be c.e.. *Proof.* Define

$$A_i = \begin{cases} \{i\} & i \in \text{The halting problem} \\ \emptyset & i \notin \text{The halting problem}. \end{cases}$$

Question: What is $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$? **Answer:** The halting problem!

Suppose A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots is a countably infinite collection of c.e. sets. Also suppose that for each i, there exists an enumerator M_i for A_i . Define $U = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$. U might not be c.e.. *Proof.* Define

$$A_i = \begin{cases} \{i\} & i \in \mathsf{The halting problem} \\ \emptyset & i \notin \mathsf{The halting problem}. \end{cases}$$

Question: What is $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i$? **Answer:** The halting problem!

Takeaway: You are given that *there exists* an enumerator M_i for each A_i . However, that does not necessarily mean that you can **computably** construct M_i , given i.

It is possible to have a set which is both computable and c.e..

- * True.
- * False.

It is possible to have a set which is both computable and c.e..

- * True.
- * False.

All computable sets are c.e.!

Question: For which input $x \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt?

```
def f(x):
    while x != 0:
        x += 1
    return x
```

Question: For which input $x \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt?

```
def f(x):
    while x != 0:
        x += 1
    return x
```

Answer: f(x) only halts for x = 0.

Question: For which inputs $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt?

```
def f(x, y):
    if x = 0:
        return y + 1
    else if y = 0:
        return f(x - 1, y + 1)
    else:
        return f(x - 1, f(x, y - 1))
```

Question: For which inputs $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt?

```
def f(x, y):
    if x = 0:
        return y + 1
    else if y = 0:
        return f(x - 1, y + 1)
    else:
        return f(x - 1, f(x, y - 1))
```

Answer: This is the **Ackermann function**, which halts for all $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ (but takes a very long time!)

You can try running ackermann.py.

Question: For which inputs $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt?

```
def f(x, y):
    if x = 0:
        return y + 1
    else if y = 0:
        return f(x - 1, y + 1)
    else:
        return f(x - 1, f(x, y - 1))
```

Question: For which inputs $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt?

```
def f(x, y):
    if x = 0:
        return y + 1
    else if y = 0:
        return f(x - 1, y + 1)
    else:
        return f(x - 1, f(x, y - 1))
```

Answer: This is the **Ackermann function**, which halts for all $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ (but takes a very long time!)

You can try running ackermann.py.

n += 1

Question: For which inputs $x,y\in\mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt? def f(x, y): n=100while True: $M_-x=$ the x-th Turing Machine

run $M_-x(y)$ for n steps

if it halted within n steps:

return

```
Question: For which inputs x, y \in \mathbb{N} does the following function halt? def f(x, y):

n = 100

while True:
```

M_x = the x-th Turing Machine
run M_x(y) for n steps
if it halted within n steps:
 return
n += 1

Answer: f halts on inputs $\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : M_x(y) \text{ halts}\}.$

Question: For which inputs $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt?

```
def f(x, y):
    n = 0
    while True:
        M_(x + n) = the (x + n)-th Turing Machine
        run M_(x + n)(y) for n steps
        if it halted within n steps:
            return
        n += 1
```

Question: For which inputs $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt?

```
def f(x, y):
    n = 0
    while True:
        M_(x + n) = the (x + n)-th Turing Machine
        run M_(x + n)(y) for n steps
        if it halted within n steps:
            return
    n += 1
```

Answer: f halts on all inputs $x, y!^3$

³Let $S = \{e : M_e(y) \text{ halts}\}$. S is an infinite set (why?). Thus there is some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $x + n \in S$ (why?).

Question: For which inputs $x \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt? def f(x): while x != 1: if x is odd: x = 3x + 1 else:

x = x / 2

Question: For which inputs $x \in \mathbb{N}$ does the following function halt?

```
def f(x):
    while x != 1:
        if x is odd:
            x = 3x + 1
        else:
            x = x / 2
```

Answer: We don't know... This is the unsolved **Collatz Conjecture** in mathematics. Try running collatz.py!



From lecture:

$$HP = \{x \in \mathbb{N} : M_x(x) \text{ halts}\}\$$

is an undecidable language!

From lecture:

$$HP = \{x \in \mathbb{N} : M_x(x) \text{ halts}\}\$$

is an undecidable language!

There is no algorithm that determines whether a given program ${\cal P}$ halts, when ${\cal P}$ is given its own source code as the input.

Another version of the halting problem:

$$\mathrm{HP}_2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : M_x(y) \text{ halts}\}\$$

is an undecidable language!

Another version of the halting problem:

$$\mathrm{HP}_2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : M_x(y) \text{ halts}\}\$$

is an undecidable language!

Proof 1. Suppose, towards a contradiction, there was a decider D for HP_2 .

Another version of the halting problem:

$$\mathrm{HP}_2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : M_x(y) \text{ halts}\}$$

is an undecidable language!

Proof 1. Suppose, towards a contradiction, there was a decider D for HP_2 . Build a Turing machine M as follows:

```
M(x):
    run D(x, x)
    if D accepts:
        loop
    else:
        accept
```

Suppose M is the e-th Turing machine.

Question: Does M(e) halt or loop?

Another version of the halting problem:

$$\mathrm{HP}_2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : M_x(y) \text{ halts}\}$$

is an undecidable language!

Proof 1. Suppose, towards a contradiction, there was a decider D for HP_2 . Build a Turing machine M as follows:

```
M(x):
    run D(x, x)
    if D accepts:
        loop
    else:
        accept
```

Suppose *M* is the *e*-th Turing machine.

Question: Does M(e) halt or loop? Answer (click me!)

Another version of the halting problem:

$$\mathrm{HP}_2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : M_x(y) \text{ halts}\}\$$

is an undecidable language!

Another version of the halting problem:

$$\mathrm{HP}_2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : M_x(y) \text{ halts}\}\$$

is an undecidable language!

Proof 2. Suppose, towards a contradiction, there was a decider D for HP_2 .

Another version of the halting problem:

$$\mathrm{HP}_2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : M_x(y) \text{ halts}\}\$$

is an undecidable language!

Proof 2. Suppose, towards a contradiction, there was a decider D for HP_2 . Build a Turing machine M as follows:

$$M(x)$$
:
return $D(x, x)$

This contradicts the fact that

$$HP = \{x \in \mathbb{N} : M_x(x) \text{ halts}\}\$$

is an undecidable language.

Another version of the halting problem:

$$\mathrm{HP}_2 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : M_x(y) \text{ halts}\}\$$

is an undecidable language!

Proof 2. Suppose, towards a contradiction, there was a decider D for HP_2 . Build a Turing machine M as follows:

$$M(x)$$
:
return $D(x, x)$

This contradicts the fact that

$$HP = \{x \in \mathbb{N} : M_x(x) \text{ halts}\}$$

is an undecidable language.

Such an argument of "if you can decide one language, then you can decide another language" is called a reduction.