Some languages not Turing-recognizable I

- Σ^* is countable
  Simply count w with $|w| = 0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots$
- For example, if $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$, then

$$\{\epsilon, 0, 1, 00, 01, 10, 11, \ldots\}$$

- The set of TMs is countable
- Each machine can be represented as a finite string (think about the formal definition)
- Thus the set of TMs is a subset of $\{0, 1\}^*$
- Let

Some languages not Turing-recognizable II

L: all languages over Σ
B: all infinite binary sequences

- For any

$$A \in L$$

  there is a corresponding element in B
- Example:

$$A : 0\{0,1\}^*$$
$$\Sigma^* = \{\epsilon, 0, 1, 00, 01, 10, 11, 000, 001, \ldots\}$$
$$A = \{0, 00, 01, 000, 001, \ldots\}$$
$$\chi_A = 010110011\ldots$$

Some languages not Turing-recognizable III

- One-to-one correspondence between B and L
- B is uncountable (like real numbers)
  Therefore, L is uncountable
- Each TM $\Rightarrow$ handles one language in L
  Set of TM is countable, but L is not
- Thus some languages cannot be handled by TM

Halting problem undecidable I

- Recall the halting problem is

$$A_{TM} = \{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M : \text{TM, accepts } w\}$$

  We prove it is undecidable by contradiction
- Assume there is an H that is a decider for A_{TM}
  Then H satisfies

$$H(\langle M, w\rangle) = \begin{cases} \text{accept} & \text{if } M \text{ accepts } w \\ \text{reject} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- Construct a new TM D with H as a subroutine

Halting problem undecidable II

- For D, the input is $\langle M \rangle$, where M is a TM
  It runs H on $\langle M, \langle M \rangle \rangle$ and outputs the opposite result of H
- The machine D satisfies

$$D(\langle M \rangle) = \begin{cases} \text{accept} & \text{if } M \text{ rejects } \langle M \rangle \\ \text{reject} & \text{if } M \text{ accepts } \langle M \rangle \end{cases}$$

- But we get a contradiction

$$D(\langle D \rangle) = \begin{cases} \text{accept} & \text{if } D \text{ rejects } \langle D \rangle \\ \text{reject} & \text{if } D \text{ accepts } \langle D \rangle \end{cases}$$

Halting problem undecidable III

- We said earlier that the diagonalization method is used for the proof. Is that the case?
- We show that indeed it is used

Diagonalization in the proof I

- Set of TMs is countable so we can have

	$\langle M_1 \rangle$	$\langle M_2 \rangle$	$\langle M_3 \rangle$
M_1	A		A
M_2	A	A	A
$\vdots$			

  blank entries: unknown if reject or loop

- But H knows the solution as it is a decider

	$\langle M_1 \rangle$	$\langle M_2 \rangle$	$\langle M_3 \rangle$
M_1	A	R	A
M_2	A	A	A
$\vdots$			

Diagonalization in the proof II

- D outputs opposite of diagonal entries

	$\langle M_1 \rangle$	$\langle M_2 \rangle$	$\ldots$	$\langle D \rangle$
M_1	R			
M_2		R		
			$\ddots$	
D				?

co-Turing-recognizable Language I

- Definition: a language is co-Turing-recognizable if its complement is Turing-recognizable
- Theorem 4.22

  Decidable $\Leftrightarrow$ Turing-recognizable and co-Turing-recognizable
- Why not

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Turing-recognizable} \\ \Rightarrow\ & \text{complement Turing-recognizable} \end{aligned}$$

- Note that "recognizable" means any

co-Turing-recognizable Language II

$$w \in \text{language}$$

is accepted by the machine in a finite number of steps

- That is, no infinite loop
- Example:

  A_{TM} Turing-recognizable but not decidable

$$w \in \overline{A_{TM}}$$

$\Rightarrow$ reject or loop

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

co-Turing-recognizable Language III

- What if we swap q_{accept}, q_{reject}?
- If

$$a \notin A \text{ and loop occurs}$$

then

$$a \in \overline{A}\text{, but TM still loops}$$

We cannot reach the new q_{accept} state
- Proof of Theorem 4.22
- "$\Rightarrow$"

Decidable $\Rightarrow$ Turing-recognizable

Complement $\Rightarrow$ decidable $\Rightarrow$ Turing-recognizable

co-Turing-recognizable Language IV

- "$\Leftarrow$" Now $A, \overline{A}$ are Turing-recognizable by two machines M_1, M_2
- Construct a new machine M: for any input w
  1. Run M_1, M_2 in parallel
  2. M_1 accept $\Rightarrow$ accept, M_2 accept $\Rightarrow$ reject
- Never infinity loop
- M accepts all strings in A, reject all not in A
- Thus A is decidable with a decider M