

# Turing Machines

## Part Two

Recap from Last Time


# The Turing Machine

- A Turing machine consists of three parts:
  - A ***finite-state control*** that issues commands,
  - an ***infinite tape*** for input and scratch space, and
  - a ***tape head*** that can read and write a single tape cell.
- At each step, the Turing machine
  - writes a symbol to the tape cell under the tape head,
  - changes state, and
  - moves the tape head to the left or to the right.

# Input and Tape Alphabets

- A Turing machine has two alphabets:
  - An **input alphabet**  $\Sigma$ . All input strings are written in the input alphabet.
  - A **tape alphabet**  $\Gamma$ , where  $\Sigma \subseteq \Gamma$ . The tape alphabet contains all symbols that can be written onto the tape.
- The tape alphabet  $\Gamma$  can contain any number of symbols, but always contains at least one **blank symbol**, denoted  $\square$ . You are guaranteed  $\square \notin \Sigma$ .
- At startup, the Turing machine begins with an infinite tape of  $\square$  symbols with the input written at some location. The tape head is positioned at the start of the input.

# A Simple Turing Machine



This special **accept state** causes the machine to immediately accept.

Each transition of the form


$$\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{D}$$

means "upon reading  $\mathbf{x}$ , replace it with symbol  $\mathbf{y}$  and move the tape head in direction  $\mathbf{D}$  (which is either **L** or **R**).

The symbol  $\square$  represents the **blank symbol**.

This special **reject state** causes the machine to immediately reject.

$\square \rightarrow \square, R$   
 $0 \rightarrow 0, R$





New Stuff!

**Main Question for Today:**

*Just how powerful are Turing machines?*

# A Sample Algorithmic Problem

# Composite Numbers

- A natural number  $n \geq 2$  is **composite** if it is the product of two natural numbers  $p$  and  $q$ , neither of which is  $n$ .
- Example:
  - $6 = 3 \cdot 2$  is composite.
  - $42 = 7 \cdot 6$  is composite
  - 5 is not composite.
- Programming problem: write a method that determines whether a natural number is composite.

```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

***Question:*** Can we build a TM that determines whether a number is composite?


# Back to Languages

- Let  $\Sigma = \{1\}$  and consider the following language  $L$  over  $\Sigma$ :


$$L = \{ 1^n \mid n \text{ is composite} \}$$

- This language is not regular (think about why this is).
- It's also not context-free (don't worry if you don't see why - we didn't discuss this. 😊)
- Can we build a TM for it?



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```




```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```






```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```







```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```






```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```
















```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```






```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```





```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```







```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```



# Reusing our TMs



- What does our TM need to be able to do?
  - Check if  $\text{divisor} = n$
  - Check if  $n$  is a multiple of divisor.
- What TMs did we build last time?
  - One that checks for  $0^n 1^n$
  - One that checks for  $0^n 1^m$ , where  $m$  is a multiple of  $n$ .
- Coincidence? I think not!

# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```



# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```




# A Sketch of the TM




```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM




```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM





```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM




```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM




```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM




... 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 ...

```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```



Somehow, run our TM from last time to see if the string is of the form  $0^n1^n$ .

# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```



# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```


Somehow, run our TM from last time to see if the string is of the form  $0^m1^n$ , where  $n$  is a multiple of  $m$ .

# A Sketch of the TM





```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM




... 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 ...

```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

Somehow, run our TM from last time to see if the string is of the form  $0^n1^n$ .

# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;
```

```
    int divisor = 2;
```

```
    while (divisor ≠ n) {
```

```
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;
```

```
        }
```



```
        divisor++;
```

```
    }
```

```
    return false;
```

```
}
```


# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

Somehow, run our TM from last time to see if the string is of the form  $0^m1^n$ , where  $n$  is a multiple of  $m$ .

# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

# A Sketch of the TM



```
bool isComposite(int n) {  
    if (n ≤ 1) return false;  
  
    int divisor = 2;  
    while (divisor ≠ n) {  
        if (n is a multiple of divisor) {  
            return true;  
        }  
        divisor++;  
    }  
  
    return false;  
}
```

How can we get our new TM  
to run our old TMs?

# Function Call and Return


- Think about actual programming for a minute.
- If you write a function that performs a task, another part of the code can call that function to use the functionality.
- Could we do something like that here in our TM?

# Function Call and Return

Space for `main`

- Internally, the memory for each function call is allocated on the *stack*:
  - Each call allocates more space.
  - Each return cleans up the space.
  - Arguments are copied by value.

# Function Call and Return




- Internally, the memory for each function call is allocated on the ***stack***:
  - Each call allocates more space.
  - Each return cleans up the space.
  - Arguments are copied by value.

# Function Call and Return



- Internally, the memory for each function call is allocated on the ***stack***:
  - Each call allocates more space.
  - Each return cleans up the space.
  - Arguments are copied by value.

# Function Call and Return



- Internally, the memory for each function call is allocated on the ***stack***:
  - Each call allocates more space.
  - Each return cleans up the space.
  - Arguments are copied by value.

# Function Call and Return

Space for `main`

- Internally, the memory for each function call is allocated on the *stack*:
  - Each call allocates more space.
  - Each return cleans up the space.
  - Arguments are copied by value.

# Function Call and Return





- Internally, the memory for each function call is allocated on the ***stack***:
  - Each call allocates more space.
  - Each return cleans up the space.
  - Arguments are copied by value.


# Combining TMs

- ***Claim:*** We can use the TM's tape to simulate function call and return.
- This means that we can build very complex TMs by assembling smaller subroutines and combining them together.
- The details are icky; we'll see them in a second.

# Our TM, in More Depth





# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth



High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .


# Our TM, in More Depth



High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .




# Our TM, in More Depth



High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .




# Our TM, in More Depth



High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .






# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n 1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth



High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n 1^n$ .



# Our TM, in More Depth



High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n 1^n$ .




# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n 1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n 1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth



High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth



High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .



# Our TM, in More Depth



*Some time later...*



High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea: Pass the current string as a “parameter” to the TM for  $0^n1^n$ .

# Our TM, in More Depth



# Our TM, in More Depth





Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth



Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth



Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth



Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth





Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth





Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth





Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, go run the TM for  $0^n 1^n$  by transitioning into its start state. It never takes more than one step off the string in either direction, so it has no idea there's anything else on the tape.

# Our TM, in More Depth




# Our TM, in More Depth




The TM would normally reject here. But we can change that! Suppose we change the TM's reject state into a work state that cleans everything up.

# Our TM, in More Depth




# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth





High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth




High-level idea:  
Clean up the stack  
space to return from  
the function call.

# Our TM, in More Depth



# Our TM, in More Depth




Now, you can imagine that we do the same thing, but for the TM that checks if the number of 1's is a multiple of the number of 0's.

# Subroutines in TMs


- Just as complex programs are often broken down into smaller functions and classes, complex TMs are often broken down into smaller “subroutines.”
- Each subroutine performs some task that helps in the overall task.
- The TM is then described by giving a collection of subroutines and showing how they link up.

# The “Copy” Subroutine

- This subroutine starts with the tape head at the start of a string of 0s and 1s:





- It ends in this configuration:





- We use the copy subroutine to let us run another TM on the current input without breaking it.

# The “Cleanup” Subroutine



- This subroutine starts with the tape head between two ★ characters delimiting TM workspace:







- It ends in this configuration:







- We use the cleanup subroutine to recover from the end of running a sub-TM.


















































































































# TM Subroutines

- To represent a subroutine call inside a TM, just add a state with dashed edges with the name of the subroutine.
- If the subroutine is just a “processing” subroutine, have a single exit arrow.
- If the subroutine may exit along different paths, have multiple exit arrows.

# Defining a Subroutine

- If you want to (or are asked to) design a TM subroutine, design it like a normal TM with one change: have special dashed states representing the exit of the subroutine.



**Time-Out for Announcements!**

# Second Midterm Exam

- The second midterm exam is next **Monday, November 16** from 7PM – 10PM.
- Room assignments divvied up by last (family) name:
  - **Aga – Ven**: Go to Hewlett 200.
  - **Ver – Zhe**: Go to 370-370
- Cumulative exam with a focus on material from Lectures 10 – 18 and PS4 – 6.
  - Main focus is on graphs, the pigeonhole principle, induction, finite automata, regular expressions, and regular languages.
  - Will *not* test the Myhill-Nerode theorem, CFGs, or Turing machines.
  - Since everything builds on itself in this course, the exam may require topics from earlier in the course.
- As before, you get one double-sided, 8.5" × 11" sheet of notes during the exam.

# Exam Practice

- We have a practice midterm ***tonight*** 7PM – 10PM in room 320-105.
  - Can't make it? Don't worry! We'll release electronic copies of the exam this evening.
- We're releasing practice problems throughout the week. Please ping us if you have any specific topics you'd like to request!

# Solution Sets

- Solution sets for the problem sets and practice problems are available for pickup in Gates.
- We're running out of filing cabinet space. We are planning on recycling all unclaimed solutions sets for topics prior to the exam later this week.
- Claim them now or forever hold your peace!

Your Questions!

“I feel like since the midterm was so “easy” (as in the 75th percentile was so high), the exam tested one's carefulness more than one's understanding of and ability to apply ideas from the course (i.e., trivial mistakes were costly). Why am I wrong?”

I read over a bunch of exams (100+) when putting the criteria together and tried to put together a set of criteria that didn't penalize people for minor mistakes. If you feel like we were deducting a lot for trivial mistakes, come talk to me about it – I suspect that you may have had a deeper misunderstanding that looks like a really nitpicky deduction.

I don't think that this test was by any stretch “easy” or just a test of carefulness. This was a hard test. A lot of people did do quite well, but there was a very long tail and a lot of people struggled. Having talked with a lot of people one-on-one about this, my sense is that it pushed people hard on concepts, on manipulating definitions, on nuances of the techniques that we've seen so far, etc.

“We've talked about the Duck Syndrome and other pressures that influence the student culture at Stanford. I was wondering what the culture of being a professor at Stanford is like. How is it similar and different from being a student here?”

My experience as a lecturer is pretty different from the traditional tenure-track professor role.

Other than that, I'm going to save this answer for in class. 😊

“I've done some internship interviews but I struggle technical questions, even if they're stuff I learned in 106B. I'm doing alright in my CS classes, but it just seems like I can't slap what I've learned onto the real world. Tips?”

A lot of this is just practice and repetition. You never realize how much you don't know until you need to do it and realize that there are a bunch of concepts you don't fully understand.

My recommendation is to work through a bunch of practice problems. Whenever you're struggling, try to identify why. Is there some concept you don't fully get? Is there a tool you don't actually really know how to use?

Also, check out “Cracking the Coding Interview” and work through some of the practice problems we've released in CS9

(<http://cs9.stanford.edu>)

Back to CS103!

**Main Question for Today:**


*Just how powerful are Turing machines?*


# How Powerful are TMs?


- Regular languages, intuitively, are as powerful as computers with finite memory.
- TMs by themselves seem like they can do a fair number of tasks, but it's unclear specifically what they can do.
- Let's explore their expressive power.

***Claim 1:*** Computers with unbounded memory can simulate Turing machines.


*“Anything that can be done with a TM can also be done with an unbounded-memory computer.”*







	0	1	$\square$
$q_0$	$q_1$ $\square$ $R$	$q_r$ $\square$ $R$	$q_a$ $\square$ $R$
$q_1$	$q_1$ $0$ $R$	$q_1$ $1$ $R$	$q_2$ $\square$ $L$
$q_2$	$q_r$ $0$ $R$	$q_3$ $\square$ $L$	$q_r$ $\square$ $R$
$q_3$	$q_3$ $0$ $L$	$q_3$ $1$ $L$	$q_0$ $\square$ $R$



The TM's finite-state control can be encoded as a table, making it easy for a computer to look up transitions information.

	0	1		0	1		0	1	
$q_0$	$q_1$	$\square$	<b>R</b>	$q_r$	$\square$	<b>R</b>	$q_a$	$\square$	<b>R</b>
$q_1$	$q_1$	<b>0</b>	<b>R</b>	$q_1$	<b>1</b>	<b>R</b>	$q_2$	$\square$	<b>L</b>
$q_2$	$q_r$	<b>0</b>	<b>R</b>	$q_3$	$\square$	<b>L</b>	$q_r$	$\square$	<b>R</b>
$q_3$	$q_3$	<b>0</b>	<b>L</b>	$q_3$	<b>1</b>	<b>L</b>	$q_0$	$\square$	<b>R</b>

# Simulating a TM

- To simulate a TM, the computer would need to be able to keep track of
  - the finite-state control,
  - the current state,
  - the position of the tape head, and
  - the tape contents.
- The tape contents are infinite, but that's because there are infinitely many blanks on both sides.
- We only need to store the “interesting” part of the tape (the parts that have been read from or written to so far.)

***Claim 2:*** Turing machines can simulate computers with unbounded memory.

*“Anything that can be done with an unbounded-memory computer can be done with a TM.”*

# What We've Seen

- TMs can
  - implement loops (basically, every TM we've seen).
  - make function calls (subroutines).
  - keep track of natural numbers (written in unary on the tape).
  - perform elementary arithmetic (equality testing, multiplication, addition, division, etc.).
  - perform if/else tests (different transitions based on different cases).

# What Else Can TMs Do?

- Maintain variables.
  - Have a dedicated part of the tape where the variables are stored.
  - Each variable can be represented as a name (written one symbol at a time) followed by a value.
- Maintain arrays and linked structures.
  - Divide the tape into different regions corresponding to memory locations.
  - Represent arrays and linked structures by keeping track of the ID of one of those regions.

# A CS107 Perspective

- Internally, computers execute by using basic operations like
  - simple arithmetic,
  - memory reads and writes,
  - branches and jumps,
  - register operations,
  - etc.
- Each of these are simple enough that they could be simulated by a Turing machine.

# A Leap of Faith

- It may require a leap of faith, but anything you can do a computer (excluding randomness and user input) can be performed by a Turing machine.
- The resulting TM might be colossal, or really slow, or both, but it would still faithfully simulate the computer.
- We're going to take this as an article of faith in CS103. If you curious for more details, come talk to me after class.

Just how powerful *are* Turing machines?


# Effective Computation

- An ***effective method of computation*** is a form of computation with the following properties:
  - The computation consists of a set of steps.
  - There are fixed rules governing how one step leads to the next.
  - Any computation that yields an answer does so in finitely many steps.
  - Any computation that yields an answer always yields the correct answer.
- This is not a formal definition. Rather, it's a set of properties we expect out of a computational system.

The *Church-Turing Thesis* claims that every effective 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**




# TMs $\approx$ Computers

- Because Turing machines have the same computational powers as regular computers, we can (essentially) reason about Turing machines by reasoning about actual computer programs.
- Going forward, we're going to switch back and forth between TMs and computer programs based on whatever is most appropriate.
- In fact, our eventual proofs about the existence of impossible problems will involve a good amount of pseudocode. Stay tuned for details!

# Strings, Languages, Encodings, and Problems


What problems can we solve with a computer?

What kind of  
computer?



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

What is a  
"problem?"



# Languages and Problems

- We've been using formal languages as a way of modeling computational problems.
- However, the problems we encounter in The Real World don't look at all like language problems.
- Is this all theoretical nonsense? Or is there a reason for this?

*“In theory, there's no difference between theory and practice. In practice, there is.”*

# Decision Problems

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

- Example: checking arithmetic.

Given  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$ , is  $x+y=z$ ?


- Example: detecting relationships.

Given a family tree  $T$  and people  $x$  and  $y$ ,  
is  $x$  a grandparent of  $y$ ?


- Example: avoiding traffic.

Given a transportation grid  $G$  annotated with traffic information, a start location  $s$ , a destination  $d$ , and a time limit  $t$ , is there a way to get from  $s$  to  $d$  within time  $t$ ?


# Solving Decision Problems




# Solving Decision Problems




# Solving Decision Problems



# Solving Decision Problems



# Solving Decision Problems



# 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.
- All data on my computer can be thought of as (suitably-encoded) strings of 0s and 1s.



# 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.




# Strings and Objects

- Let *Obj* be some discrete, finite object (a string, a video, an image, a text file, etc.)
- Let  $\Sigma$  be some alphabet.
- We'll represent an **encoding of *Obj*** using the characters in  $\Sigma$  by writing  **$\langle Obj \rangle$** . Think of  $\langle Obj \rangle$  like a file on disk – it encodes complex data as a series of characters.
- A few remarks about encodings:
  - We don't care *how* we encode the object, just that we can.
  - The particular choice of alphabet isn't important. Given any alphabet, we can always find a way of encoding things.
  - We'll assume we can perform “reasonable” operations on encoded objects.


# Strings and Objects

- Given a group of objects  $Obj_1, Obj_2, \dots, Obj_n$ , we can create a single string encoding all these objects.
  - Think of it like a .zip file, but without the compression.
- We'll denote the encoding of all of these objects as a single string by  **$\langle Obj_1, \dots, Obj_n \rangle$** .
- This lets us feed multiple inputs into our computational device at the same time.


# Solving Decision Problems




# Solving Decision Problems



# Solving Decision Problems



# Solving Decision Problems



How do we specify  
the behavior we  
want?

# Specifying a Decision Problem

- Consider this decision problem:

**Given  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$ , determine whether  $x+y=z$ .**

- With our computational model, we'll feed some string into a TM, and it then might come back with an answer (yes or no).
- Some strings are accepted, some are rejected, and some cause the machine to loop infinitely.

# Specifying a Decision Problem

- Consider this decision problem:

**Given  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$ , determine whether  $x+y=z$ .**

- If we give the input as  $\langle x, y, z \rangle$ , the set of strings the TM should say YES to is

**$\{ \langle x, y, z \rangle \mid x, y, z \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } x + y = z \}$**

- Notice that this is a language – it's a set of strings!

# Specifying a Decision Problem

- Consider this decision problem:

**Given a graph  $G$ , determine whether  $G$  is a bipartite graph.**

- With our computational model, we'll feed some string into a TM, and it then might come back with an answer (yes or no).
- Some strings are accepted, some are rejected, and some cause the machine to loop infinitely.

# Specifying a Decision Problem

- Consider this decision problem:

**Given a graph  $G$ , determine whether  $G$  is a bipartite graph.**

- If we give the input as  $\langle G \rangle$ , the set of strings the TM should say YES to is

**$\{ \langle G \rangle \mid G \text{ is a bipartite graph} \}$**

- Notice that this is a language – it's a set of strings!

# Problems and Languages

- ***Key intuition:*** Every language corresponds to some decision problem.
- Example:
  - $\{ \langle x, y \rangle \mid x, y \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } x \equiv_3 y \}$  is a language.
  - It corresponds to the following decision problem:

**Given  $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ , do  $x$  and  $y$  leave the same remainder when divided by 3?**

# Problems and Languages

- ***Key intuition:*** Every language corresponds to some decision problem.
- Example:
  - $\{ \langle D \rangle \mid D \text{ is a DFA that accepts } \varepsilon \}$  is a language.
  - It corresponds to the following decision problem:  
**Given a DFA  $D$ , does  $D$  accept  $\varepsilon$ ?**

# Problems and Languages

- ***Key intuition:*** Every language corresponds to some decision problem.
- Example:
  - $\{ \langle G \rangle \mid G \text{ is a planar graph} \}$  is a language.
  - It corresponds to the following decision problem:

**Given a graph  $G$ , is  $G$  planar?**

# Problems and Languages

- **Key intuition:** Every decision problem on finite, discrete objects corresponds to some language.
- If  $\Pi$  is a problem and the inputs to  $\Pi$  are objects  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ , we can form the language  
 **$\{ \langle x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \rangle \mid \text{the answer to problem } \Pi, \text{ given inputs } x_1, \dots, x_n, \text{ is "yes."} \}$**

# What All This Means

- Our goal is to speak of *computers solving problems*.
- We will model this by looking at *TMs recognizing languages*.
- For *decision problems* that we're interested in solving, this precisely captures what we're interested in capturing.