

**Computability** A function  $f$  with domain  $D$  is *computable* if there exists some TM  $M$  such that  $M$  computes  $f$  for all values in its domain.

**Decidability** A problem is *decidable* if there exists a TM that can answer yes or no to every statement in the domain of the problem.

### The Halting Problem

Domain: set of all TMs and all strings  $w$ .

Question: Given coding of  $M$  and  $w$ , does  $M$  halt on  $w$ ? (yes or no)

**Theorem** The halting problem is undecidable.

**Proof:** (by contradiction)

- Assume there is a TM  $H$  (or algorithm) that solves this problem.  
TM  $H$  has 2 final states,  $q_y$  represents yes and  $q_n$  represents no.  
TM  $H$  has input the coding of TM  $M$  (denoted  $w_M$ ) and input string  $w$  and ends in state  $q_y$  (yes) if  $M$  halts on  $w$  and ends in state  $q_n$  (no) if  $M$  doesn't halt on  $w$ .

Construct TM  $H'$  from  $H$  such that  $H'$  halts if  $H$  ends in state  $q_n$  and  $H'$  doesn't halt if  $H$  ends in state  $q_y$ .

Construct TM  $\hat{H}$  from  $H'$  such that  $\hat{H}$  makes a copy of  $w_M$  and then behaves like  $H'$ . (simulates TM  $M$  on the input string that is the encoding of TM  $M$ , applies  $M_w$  to  $M_w$ ).

So  $\hat{H}(w_M)$  runs  $H'(w_M, w_M)$

**Theorem** If the halting problem were decidable, then every recursively enumerable language would be recursive. Thus, the halting problem is undecidable.

- **Proof:** Let  $L$  be an RE language over  $\Sigma$ .  
Let  $M$  be the TM such that  $L=L(M)$ .  
Let  $H$  be the TM that solves the halting problem.

A problem A is *reduced* to problem B if the decidability of B follows from the decidability of A. Then if we know B is undecidable, then A must be undecidable.

**State-entry problem** Given TM  $M=(K, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, \square, F)$ , state  $q \in K$ , and string  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , is state  $q$  ever entered when M is applied to  $w$ ?

This is an undecidable problem!

- **Proof:** We will reduce this problem to the halting problem.

Suppose we have a TM E to solve the state-entry problem.

TM E takes as input the coding of a TM M (denoted by  $w_M$ ), a string  $w$  and a state  $q$ . TM E answers *yes* if state  $q$  is entered and *no* if state  $q$  is not entered.

Construct TM E' which does the following. On input  $w_M$  and  $w$  E' first examines the transition functions of M. Whenever  $\delta$  is not defined for some state  $q_i$  and symbol  $a$  add the transition  $\delta(q_i, a) = (q, a, R)$ . Let this new state  $q$  be the only final state. Let M' be the modified TM. Next, simulate TM E on input  $w_{M'}$ ,  $w$  and  $q$ .

TM E' determines if M halts on  $w$ . If M halts on  $w$  then TM E' will enter state  $q$  in M' and answer *yes*. If M doesn't halt on  $w$  then TM E' will not enter state  $q$ , so it will answer *no*. Since the state-entry problem is decidable, E always gives an answer yes or no.

But the halting problem is undecidable. Contradiction! Thus, the state-entry problem must be undecidable. QED.

There are some more examples of undecidability in section 5.4.