

# Turing Machines

## Part Three

# Second Midterm Graded

- The second midterm has been graded.
  - Graded exams are up on Gradescope.
  - Solutions and statistics are available on the course website.
- Regrade requests for the second midterm are open and close next Monday at 11:59PM.
- Didn't do as well as you'd hoped on the midterm?
  - It's still very much possible to come back from poor performance on the midterms and do well in the course as a whole.
  - We would be happy to sit down and talk through your midterm with you and offer some targeted advice on how to improve in the next two weeks.
  - If that sounds like it would be helpful to you, send us an email at [cs103-win2324-staff@lists.stanford.edu](mailto:cs103-win2324-staff@lists.stanford.edu) and we'll set up some time to chat.

# Outline for Today

- ***Recap from Last Time***
  - Where are we, again?
- ***Why Languages and Strings?***
  - We've been using languages to model problems. Why?
- ***Universal Machines***
  - A single computer that can compute anything computable anywhere.
- ***Self-Referential Software***
  - Programs that compute on themselves.

Recap from Last Time

The ***Church-Turing Thesis*** claims that  
***every feasible method of computation  
is either equivalent to or weaker than  
a Turing machine.***

“This is not a theorem – it is a  
falsifiable scientific hypothesis.  
And it has been thoroughly  
tested!”

- Ryan Williams

Regular  
Languages

**CFLs**

**Problems  
Solvable by  
*Any Feasible  
Computing  
Machine***

**All Languages**



**Regular  
Languages**


**CFLs**

**Problems  
Solvable by  
Turing  
Machines**

**All Languages**

# Very Important Terminology

- Let  $M$  be a Turing machine.
- $M$  **accepts** a string  $w$  if it returns true on  $w$ .
- $M$  **rejects** a string  $w$  if it returns false on  $w$ .
- $M$  **loops infinitely** (or just **loops**) on a string  $w$  if when run on  $w$  it neither returns true nor returns false.
- $M$  **does not accept  $w$**  if it either rejects  $w$  or loops on  $w$ .
- $M$  **does not reject  $w$**  if it either accepts  $w$  or loops on  $w$ .
- $M$  **halts on  $w$**  if it accepts  $w$  or rejects  $w$ .



# Recognizers and Recognizability

- A TM  $M$  is called a **recognizer** for a language  $L$  over  $\Sigma$  if the following statement is true:

$$\forall w \in \Sigma^*. (w \in L \leftrightarrow M \text{ accepts } w)$$

- A language  $L$  is called **recognizable** if there is a recognizer for it.
- If you are absolutely certain that  $w \in L$ , then running a recognizer for  $L$  on  $w$  will (eventually) confirm this.
  - Eventually,  $M$  will accept  $w$ .
- If you don't know whether  $w \in L$ , running  $M$  on  $w$  may never tell you anything.
  - $M$  might loop on  $w$  – but you can't differentiate between “it'll accept if you wait longer” and “it will never come back with an answer.”

# Deciders and Decidability

- A TM  $M$  is called a **decider** for a language  $L$  over  $\Sigma$  if the following statements are true:

$\forall w \in \Sigma^*. M \text{ halts on } w.$

$\forall w \in \Sigma^*. (w \in L \leftrightarrow M \text{ accepts } w)$

- A language  $L$  is called **decidable** if there is a decider for it.
- A decider  $M$  for a language  $L$  accepts all strings in  $L$  and rejects all strings not in  $L$ .
- A decider  $M$  for a language  $L$  is a recognizer for  $L$  that halts on all inputs.
- Intuitively, if you don't know whether  $w \in L$ , running  $M$  on  $w$  will “create new knowledge” by telling you the answer.

# **R** and **RE** Languages


- The class **R** consists of all decidable languages.
- The class **RE** consists of all recognizable languages.
- By definition, we know **R**  $\subseteq$  **RE**.
- **Key Question:** Does **R** = **RE**?

New Stuff!

# Strings, Languages, and Encodings

What **problems** can we solve with a computer?

What is a  
"problem?"



# Decision Problems

- A ***decision problem*** is a type of problem where the goal is to provide a yes or no answer.


- Example: Bin Packing

You're given a list of patients who need to be seen and how much time each one needs to be seen for. You're given a list of doctors and how much free time they have. Is there a way to schedule the patients so that they can all be seen?

- Example: Dominating Set Problem

You're given a transportation grid and a number  $k$ . Is there a way to place emergency supplies in at most  $k$  cities so that every city either has emergency supplies or is adjacent to a city that has emergency supplies?


# A Model for Solving Problems



---

```
bool someFunctionName(string input) {  
    // ... do something ...  
}
```


# A Model for Solving Problems



```
bool isBipartite(Graph G) {  
    // ... do something ...  
}
```

How does this  
match our model?

# A Model for Solving Problems



```
bool containsCat(Picture P) {  
    // ... do something ...  
}
```

How does this  
match our model?

Humbling Thought:

***Everything on your computer is a string over {0, 1}.***

# Strings and Objects

- Think about how my computer encodes the image on the right.
- Internally, it's just a series of zeros and ones sitting on my hard drive.




# Strings and Objects

- A different sequence of 0s and 1s gives rise to the image on the right.
- Every image can be encoded as a sequence of 0s and 1s, though not all sequences of 0s and 1s correspond to images.



# Object Encodings

- If  $Obj$  is some mathematical object that is *discrete* and *finite*, then we'll use the notation  $\langle Obj \rangle$  to refer to some way of encoding that object as a string.
- Think of  $\langle Obj \rangle$  like a file on disk – it encodes some high-level object as a series of characters.



# Object Encodings

- If  $Obj$  is some mathematical object that is *discrete* and *finite*, then we'll use the notation  $\langle Obj \rangle$  to refer to some way of encoding that object as a string.
- Think of  $\langle Obj \rangle$  like a file on disk – it encodes some high-level object as a series of characters.




$\langle \text{Image of a dog wrapped in a blanket} \rangle = 001101010001\dots001$

# Object Encodings

- For the purposes of what we're going to be doing, we aren't going to worry about exactly *how* objects are encoded.
- For example, we can say  $\langle 137 \rangle$  to mean “some encoding of 137” without worrying about how it's encoded.
  - Analogy: do you need to know how numbers are represented in Python to be a Python programmer? That's more of a CS107 question.
- We'll assume, whenever we're dealing with encodings, that some Smart, Attractive, Witty person has figured out an encoding system for us and that we're using that encoding system.


# A Model for Solving Problems



```
bool containsCat(Picture P) {  
    // ... do something ...  
}
```

Internally, this is  
a sequence of  
0s and 1s.

# A Model for Solving Problems




```
bool matchesRegex(string w, Regex R) {  
    // ... do something ...  
}
```

How does this  
match our model?

# Encoding Groups of Objects

- Given a group of objects  $Obj_1, Obj_2, \dots, Obj_n$ , we can create a single string encoding all these objects.
  - ***Intuition 1:*** Think of it like a .zip file, but without the compression.
  - ***Intuition 2:*** Think of it like a tuple or struct.
- We'll denote the encoding of all of these objects as a single string by  ***$\langle Obj_1, \dots, Obj_n \rangle$*** .

# A Model for Solving Problems



```
bool matchesRegex(string w, Regex R) {  
    // ... do something ...  
}
```

These form one large bitstring.

What problems can we solve with a computer?

# Emergent Properties

# Emergent Properties

- An ***emergent property*** of a system is a property that arises out of smaller pieces that doesn't seem to exist in any of the individual pieces.
- Examples:
  - Individual neurons work by firing in response to particular combinations of inputs. Somehow, this leads to consciousness, love, and ennui.
  - Individual atoms obey the laws of quantum mechanics and just interact with other atoms. Somehow, it's possible to combine them together to make iPhones and pumpkin pie.

# Emergent Properties of Computation

- All computing systems equal to Turing machines exhibit several surprising emergent properties.
- If we believe the Church-Turing thesis, these emergent properties are, in a sense, “inherent” to computation. Computation can’t exist without them.
- These emergent properties are what ultimately make computation so interesting and so powerful.
- As we'll see, though, they're also computation's Achilles heel – they're how we find concrete examples of impossible problems.

# Two Emergent Properties

- There are two key emergent properties of computation that we will discuss:
  - **Universality**: There is a single computing device capable of performing any computation.
  - **Self-Reference**: Computing devices can ask questions about their own behavior.
- As you'll see, the combination of these properties leads to simple examples of impossible problems and elegant proofs of impossibility.

# Universal Machines

# An Observation

- Think about how you interact with your physical computer.
  - You have a single, physical computer.
  - That computer then runs multiple programs.
- Contrast that with how we've worked with TMs.
  - We have a TM for  $\{ a^n b^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \}$ . That TM will always perform that calculation and never do anything else.
  - We have a TM for the hailstone sequence. That TM can't compose poetry, write music, etc.
- How do we reconcile this difference?

Can we make a “reprogrammable  
Turing machine?”


# A TM Simulator

- It is possible to program a TM simulator on an unbounded-memory computer.
  - You've seen this in class, and you'll use one on PS8.
- We could imagine it as a method

**bool** simulateTM(TM *M*, string *w*)


with the following behavior:

- If *M* accepts *w*, then simulateTM(*M*, *w*) returns **true**.
- If *M* rejects *w*, then simulateTM(*M*, *w*) returns **false**.
- If *M* loops on *w*, then simulateTM(*M*, *w*) loops infinitely.



# A TM Simulator


- It is known that anything that can be done with an unbounded-memory computer can be done with a TM.
- This means that there must be some TM that has the behavior of this `simulateTM` method.
- What would that look like?



# The Universal Turing Machine

- **Theorem (Turing, 1936):** There is a Turing machine  $U_{TM}$  called the **universal Turing machine** that, when run on an input of the form  $\langle M, w \rangle$ , where  $M$  is a Turing machine and  $w$  is a string, simulates  $M$  running on  $w$  and does whatever  $M$  does on  $w$  (accepts, rejects, or loops).
- The observable behavior of  $U_{TM}$  is the following:
  - If  $M$  accepts  $w$ , then  $U_{TM}$  accepts  $\langle M, w \rangle$ .
  - If  $M$  rejects  $w$ , then  $U_{TM}$  rejects  $\langle M, w \rangle$ .
  - If  $M$  loops on  $w$ , then  $U_{TM}$  loops on  $\langle M, w \rangle$ .

$U_{TM}$  does to  $\langle M, w \rangle$   
what  
 $M$  does to  $w$ .





# The Universal Turing Machine

- ***Intuition:*** Modern computers – laptops, phones, network routers, etc. – are universal Turing machines.
  - Each computer is a single piece of hardware. With rare exceptions, we don't make specific changes to the hardware after we purchase the computer.
  - We load programs into those computers, and those computers then execute the commands in those programs.
- Imagine Turing coming up with this idea in 1936 before any programmable computers had been built!

# The Universal Turing Machine

- Building out  $U_{TM}$  is nontrivial, but the conceptual idea behind it isn't too bad.
- Essentially:
  - $U_{TM}$  splits its tape into two regions: one spot holding the source code of the TM to simulate, and one holding the tape contents for that TM.
  - $U_{TM}$  somehow marks where in the simulated TM's tape the simulated TM's tape head is, perhaps by having a special symbol indicating "tape head here."
  - $U_{TM}$  repeatedly consults the source code of the simulated TM to determine what action to take, then simulates that action.
  - If the simulated TM accepts or rejects, then  $U_{TM}$  also accepts or rejects.



# The Universal Turing Machine

- ***Intuition:***  $U_{TM}$  is the most powerful computational device that can be built.
  - Assuming the Church-Turing thesis, any computation that can be performed by any computing system can be performed by a TM.
  - The universal TM can “run” any TM, so it can perform any computation any TM can do.
  - So  $U_{TM}$  can do any computation that could ever be done by any possible feasible computing system.  
*(Wow!)*
- And yet – it’s just a simulator! All it does is simulate one step of a TM after another.

# $U_{\text{TM}}$ as a Recognizer

- $U_{\text{TM}}$ , when run on a string  $\langle M, w \rangle$ , where  $M$  is a TM and  $w$  is a string, will
  - ... accept  $\langle M, w \rangle$  if  $M$  accepts  $w$ ,
  - ... reject  $\langle M, w \rangle$  if  $M$  rejects  $w$ , and
  - ... loop on  $\langle M, w \rangle$  if  $M$  loops on  $w$ .
- Although we didn't design  $U_{\text{TM}}$  as a recognizer, it does recognize some language.
- Which language is that?

# $U_{\text{TM}}$ as a Recognizer

- $U_{\text{TM}}$ , when run on a string  $\langle M, w \rangle$ , where  $M$  is a TM and  $w$  is a string, will

- ... accept  $\langle M, w \rangle$  if  $M$  accepts  $w$ ,

- ... reject  $\langle M, w \rangle$  if  $M$  rejects  $w$ , and

- ... loop on  $\langle M, w \rangle$  if  $M$  loops on  $w$ .

- Let's let  $A_{\text{TM}}$  be the language recognized by the universal TM  $U_{\text{TM}}$ . This means that

$$\forall M. \forall w \in \Sigma^*. (M \text{ accepts } w \leftrightarrow \langle M, w \rangle \in A_{\text{TM}})$$

- So we have

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

# The Language $A_{\text{TM}}$

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

Let  $M$  be a TM where  $\mathcal{L}(M) = \{ \mathbf{a}^n \mathbf{b}^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \}$ .

Fill in the following blanks:

\_\_\_\_\_ accepts **aabb**  
\_\_\_\_\_ accepts  $\langle M, \mathbf{aabb} \rangle$   
\_\_\_\_\_  $\in A_{\text{TM}}$

Regular Languages

CFLs



$A_{TM}$

RE


All Languages

Uh... so what?

Reason 1: ***It has practical consequences.***


# Why Does This Matter?

- The existence of a universal Turing machine has both theoretical and practical significance.
- For a practical example, let's review this diagram from before.
- Previously we replaced the *computer* with a TM. (This gave us the universal TM.)
- What happens if we replace the *TM* with a computer program?



# Why Does This Matter?

- We now have a computer program that runs other computer programs!
  - An **interpreter** is a program that simulates other programs. Python programs are usually executed by interpreters. Your web browser interprets JavaScript code when it visits websites.
  - A **virtual machine** is a program that simulates an entire operating system. Virtual machines are used in computer security, cloud computing, and even by individual end users.
- It's not a coincidence that this is possible – Turing's 1936 paper says that any general-purpose computing system must be able to do this!



# Why Does This Matter?

- The key idea behind the universal TM is that idea that TMs can be fed as inputs into other TMs and simulated.
  - Similarly, an interpreter is a program that takes other programs as inputs.
  - Similarly, an emulator is a program that takes entire computers as inputs.
- This hits at the core idea that ***computing devices can perform computations on other computing devices.***

Reason 2: *It's philosophically interesting.*

# Can Computers Think?

- On May 15, 1951, Alan Turing delivered **a radio lecture on the BBC** on the topic of whether computers can think.
- He had the following to say about whether a computer can be thought of as an electric brain...

“In fact I think [computers] could be used in such a manner that they could be appropriately described as brains. I should also say that

*‘If any machine can be appropriately described as a brain, then any digital computer can be so described.’*

This last statement needs some explanation. It may appear rather startling, but with some reservations it appears to be an inescapable fact.

It can be shown to follow from a characteristic property of digital computers, which I will call their **universality**. A digital computer is a universal machine in the sense that it can be made to replace any machine of a certain very wide class. It will not replace a bulldozer or a steam-engine or a telescope, but it will replace any rival design of calculating machine, that is to say any machine into which one can feed data and which will later print out results. In order to arrange for our computer to imitate a given machine it is only necessary to programme the the computer to calculate what the machine in question would do under given circumstances, and in particular what answers it would print out. The computer can then be made to print out the same answers.

If now some machine can be described as a brain we have only to programme our digital computer to imitate it and it will also be a brain.”

# Self-Referential Software

# Quines

- A *Quine* is a program that, when run, prints its own source code.
- Quines aren't allowed to just read the file containing their source code and print it out; that's cheating (and technically incorrect if someone changes that file!)
- How would you write such a program?

# Writing a Quine

# Self-Referential Programs

- The fact that we can write Quines is not a coincidence.

***Theorem:*** It is possible to construct TMs that perform arbitrary computations on their own source code.

- In other words, any computing system that's equal to a Turing machine possesses some mechanism for self-reference!
- Want to see how deep the rabbit hole goes? Take CS154!

# Self-Referential Programs

- **Claim:** Going forward, assume that any function has the ability to get access to its own source code.
- This means we can write programs like the ones shown here:

```
bool narcissist(string input) {  
    string me = /* source code of narcissist */;  
  
    return input == me;  
}
```

```
bool acceptLongerStrings(string input) {  
    string me = /* source code of acceptLongerStrings */;  
  
    return input.length() > me.length();  
}
```

# Next Time

- ***Self-Defeating Objects***
  - Objects “too powerful” to exist.
- ***Undecidable Problems***
  - Problems truly beyond the limits of algorithmic problem-solving!
- ***Consequences of Undecidability***
  - Why does any of this matter outside of Theoryland?