



Turing Complete Computational Models

Wolfgang Schreiner
Wolfgang.Schreiner@risc.jku.at



Research Institute for Symbolic Computation (RISC)
Johannes Kepler University, Linz, Austria
<http://www.risc.jku.at>






-
- 1. Random Access Machines**
 2. Loop and While Programs
 3. Primitive Recursive and μ -recursive Functions
 4. Further Turing Complete Models
 5. The Chomsky Hierarchy
 6. Real Computers

A Random Access Machine



A model closer to a real computer.


A Random Access Machine



- A **random access machine (RAM)**:
 - an infinite input tape I (whose cells can hold natural numbers of arbitrary size) with a read head position $i \in \mathbb{N}$,
 - an infinite output tape O (whose cells can hold natural numbers of arbitrary size) with a write head position $o \in \mathbb{N}$,
 - an accumulator A which can hold a natural number of arbitrary size,
 - a program counter C which can hold an arbitrary natural number,
 - a program consisting of a finite number of instructions $P[1], \dots, P[m]$,
 - a memory consisting of a countably infinite sequence of registers $R[1], R[2], \dots$, each of which can hold an arbitrary natural number.
- **Execution**:
 - Initially, $i = 0$, $o = 0$, $A = 0$, $C = 1$, $R[1] = R[2] = \dots = 0$.
 - In every step, the RAM reads $P[C]$, increments C by 1, and then performs the action indicated by the instruction.
 - Execution terminates when $C = 0$.

Program is a sequence of machine instructions.


RAM Instructions



Instruction	Description	Action
IN	Read value from input tape into accumulator	$A := I[i]; i := i + 1$
OUT	Write value from accumulator to output tape	$O[o] := A; o := o + 1$
LOAD # n	Load constant n into accumulator	$A := n$
LOAD n	Load content of register n into accumulator	$A := R[n]$
LOAD (n)	Load content of register referenced by reg. n	$A := R[R[n]]$
STORE n	Store content of accumulator into register n	$R[n] := A$
STORE (n)	Store content into register referenced by reg. n	$R[R[n]] := A$
ADD # n	Increment content of accumulator by constant	$A := A + n$
SUB # n	Decrement content of accumulator by constant	$A := \max\{0, A - n\}$
JUMP n	Unconditional jump to instruction n	$C := n$
BEQ i, n	Conditional jump to instruction n	if $A = i$ then $C := n$


Immediate addressing, direct addressing, indirect addressing.

Example



```
START:  LOAD #1      A := 1
        STORE 1     R[1] := A
READ:   LOAD 1      A := R[1]
        ADD #1      A := A + 1
        STORE 1     R[1] := A
        IN          A := I[i]; i := i + 1
        BEQ 0,WRITE if A = 0 then C := WRITE
        STORE (1)   R[R[1]] := A
        JUMP READ   C := READ
WRITE:  LOAD 1      A := R[1]
        SUB #1      A := A - 1
        STORE 1     R[1] := A
        BEQ 1,HALT  if A = 1 then C := HALT
        LOAD (1)   A := R[R[1]]
        OUT        O[o] := A; o := o + 1
        JUMP WRITE  C := WRITE
HALT:   JUMP 0      C := 0
```

Reads $x_1, \dots, x_n, 0$ and writes x_n, \dots, x_1 using stack $R[2], \dots, R[n+1]$.




RAMs versus Turing Machines

Theorem: Every Turing machine can be simulated by a RAM.

- RAM uses registers $R[1], \dots, R[c-1]$ for its own purposes,
- stores in $R[c]$ the position of the tape head of the Turing machine,
- uses $R[c+1], R[c+2], \dots$ as a virtual Turing machine tape.
 - Using “indirect addressing” operations $\text{LOAD}(n)$ and $\text{STORE}(n)$.
- RAM copies the input from the input tape into its virtual tape, then it mimics the execution of the Turing machine on the virtual tape.
- When the simulated Turing machine terminates, the content of the virtual tape is copied to the output tape.

RAMs represent a Turing complete computational model.

RAMs versus Turing Machines




Theorem: Every RAM can be simulated by a Turing machine.

- The Turing machine uses 5 tapes to simulate the RAM:
 - Tape 1 represents the input tape of the RAM.
 - Tape 2 represents the output tape of the RAM.
 - Tape 3 holds a representation of that part of the memory that has been written by the simulation of the RAM.
 - Tape 4 holds a representation of the accumulator of the RAM.
 - Tape 5 serves as a working tape.
- Tape 3 holds a sequence of (address,contents) pairs that represent those registers of the RAM that have been written during the simulation (the contents of all other registers hold 0).
- Every instruction of the RAM is simulated by a sequence of steps of the Turing machine which reads respectively writes Tape 1 and 2 and updates on Tape 3 and 4 the tape representations of the contents of the memory and the accumulator.

RAMs are not more powerful than Turing machines.


Random Access Stored Program Machine




The program of a RAM is “read-only”.

- **Random Access Stored Program Machine (RASP).**
 - A RAM variant where the program is stored in memory R (there is no separate program store P).
- **Every RASP can be simulated by a RAM.**
 - RAM is interpreter for RASP instructions (like a *microprogram* in a processor interprets machine instructions).
- **Every RAM can be simulated by a RASP.**
 - Even if indirect addressing is removed from RASP.
 - RAM instructions $\text{LOAD}(n)$ and $\text{STORE}(n)$ can be interpreted by self-modifying RASP code.

Self modifying programs do not add computational power to a RAM.



-
1. Random Access Machines
 - 2. Loop and While Programs**
 3. Primitive Recursive and μ -recursive Functions
 4. Further Turing Complete Models
 5. The Chomsky Hierarchy
 6. Real Computers




Loop Programs

- Loop Program P :

$$P ::= x_i := 0 \mid x_i := x_j + 1 \mid x_i := x_j - 1 \mid P; P \\ \mid \text{loop } x_i \text{ do } P \text{ end.}$$

- Set $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ of program variables.
- Initial value of x_i determines the number of loop iterations.
- Loop must eventually terminate.

Programs with bounded iteration that necessarily terminate.




- **Semantics** $\llbracket P \rrbracket(m)$ maps the start memory $m : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ to the final memory after the termination of P :

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket x_i := 0 \rrbracket(m) &:= m[i \leftarrow 0] \\ \llbracket x_i := x_j + 1 \rrbracket(m) &:= m[i \leftarrow m(j) + 1] \\ \llbracket x_i := x_j - 1 \rrbracket(m) &:= m[i \leftarrow \max\{0, m(j) - 1\}] \\ \llbracket P_1; P_2 \rrbracket(m) &:= \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket(\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket(m)) \\ \llbracket \mathbf{loop} \ x_i \ \mathbf{do} \ P \ \mathbf{end} \rrbracket(m) &:= \llbracket P \rrbracket^{m(i)}(m)\end{aligned}$$

- $m[i \leftarrow n]$: memory m after updating the value x_i by value n .
- $\llbracket P \rrbracket^n(m)$: memory m after n times executing P :

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket P \rrbracket^0(m) &:= m \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket^{n+1}(m) &:= \llbracket P \rrbracket(\llbracket P \rrbracket^n(m))\end{aligned}$$

A loop program denotes a function over memories.



Syntactic Abbreviations

- $x_i := x_j$

```
 $x_i := x_j + 1; x_i := x_j - 1$ 
```

- $x_i := n$


```
 $x_i := 0; x_i := x_i + 1; x_i := x_i + 1; \dots; x_i := x_i + 1$ 
```

- **if** $x_i = 0$ **then** P_t **else** P_e **end**

```
 $x_t := 1; \text{loop } x_i \text{ do } x_t := 0; \text{end};$   
 $x_e := 1; \text{loop } x_t \text{ do } x_e := 0; \text{end};$   
loop  $x_t$  do  $P_t$  end; loop  $x_e$  do  $P_e$  end;
```

The usual programming language constructs (except for unbounded iteration) can be represented.

Loop Computability



We consider the computability of functions over the natural numbers.

$f : \mathbb{N}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is **loop computable**, if there exists a loop program P such that for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and memory $m : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined as


$$m(i) := \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\llbracket P \rrbracket(m)(0) = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

When started in a state where x_1, \dots, x_n contain the arguments of f , the program terminates in a state where x_0 holds the result of f .

Example



- Addition is computable by the program $x_0 := x_1 + x_2$:

```
x0 := x1;  
loop x2 do  
  x0 := x0 + 1  
end
```

- Multiplication is computable by the program $x_0 := x_1 \cdot x_2$:


```
x0 := 0;  
loop x2 do  
  x0 := x0 + x1  
end
```

- Exponentiation is computable by the program $x_0 := x_1^{x_2}$:

```
x0 := 1;  
loop x2 do  
  x0 := x0 · x1  
end
```

Natural number arithmetic is loop computable.

Arithmetic



- $x_0 := x_1 \cdot x_2$:


```
x0 := 0;  
loop x2 do  
  x0 := x0 + x1  
end
```

\rightsquigarrow

```
x0 := 0;  
loop x2 do  
  x0 := x0;  
  loop x1 do  
    x0 := x0 + 1  
  end  
end
```

Higher arithmetic needs multiply nested loops.


Beyond Exponentiation



$$a \uparrow^n b := \begin{cases} a^b & \text{if } n = 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } b = 0 \\ a \uparrow^{n-1} (a \uparrow^n (b-1)) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

- $a \uparrow^1 b = a^b$
 $a \uparrow^1 b = a \cdot a \cdot \dots \cdot a$ (b times)
- $a \uparrow^2 b = a^{a^{\dots^a}}$ (b times)
 $a \uparrow^2 b = a \uparrow^1 a \uparrow^1 \dots \uparrow^1 a$ (b times)
- $a \uparrow^3 b$:
 $a \uparrow^3 b = a \uparrow^2 a \uparrow^2 \dots \uparrow^2 a$ (b times)

The notation allows to define arbitrary “complex” arithmetic functions.



Limits of Loop Computability

- **Theorem:** for every $n > 0$ and $f(a, b) := a \uparrow^n b$
 - f is loop computable, and
 - every loop program computing f requires at least $n + 2$ nested loops.
- **Theorem:** $g : \mathbb{N}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, g(a, b, n) := a \uparrow^{n+1} b$ is not loop computable.
 - Assume g can be computed by a program P with n loops.
 - Then the computation of $g(a, b, n) = a \uparrow^{n+1} b$ requires $n + 3$ loops.
 - Thus P cannot compute g .
- Also the **Ackermann Function** is not loop computable:

$$ack(0, m) := m + 1$$


$$ack(n, 0) := ack(n - 1, 1)$$

$$ack(n, m) := ack(n - 1, ack(n, m - 1)), \text{ if } n > 0 \wedge m > 0$$

- $ack(n, m) = 2 \uparrow^{n-2} (m + 3) - 3$
- $ack(4, 2)$ has 20,000 digits.

Some arithmetic functions grow “too fast” to be loop computable.

While Programs




- While Program P :

$P ::= \dots$ (as for loop programs)
| **while** x_i **do** P **end.**

- Set $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ of program variables.
- Loop is repeated as long as $x_i \neq 0$.
- If $x_i \neq 0$ forever, loop does not terminate.

Programs with unbounded iteration that may not terminate.



- **Semantics** $\llbracket P \rrbracket(m)$ maps start memory $m : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$
 - to the final memory, if P terminates, and
 - to the special value \perp (bottom), if P does not terminate.
- Semantics generalizes that of loop programs:

$$\llbracket P \rrbracket(m) := \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } m = \perp \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket'(m) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$\llbracket \dots \rrbracket'(m) := \dots \text{ (as for loop programs)}$$


- Semantics of unbounded iteration:

$$\llbracket \mathbf{while} \ x_i \ \mathbf{do} \ P \ \mathbf{end} \rrbracket'(m) := \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } L_i(P, m) \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket^{T_i(P, m)}(m) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$L_i(P, m) := \Leftrightarrow \forall k \in \mathbb{N} : \llbracket P \rrbracket^k(m)(i) \neq 0$$

$$T_i(P, m) := \min \{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \llbracket P \rrbracket^k(m)(i) = 0 \}$$

A while program denotes a function whose result is either a memory or \perp .




Syntactic Abbreviations

- **while** $x_i < x_j$ **do** P **end**

```
 $x_k := x_j - x_i;$   
while  $x_k$  do  $P; x_k := x_j - x_i;$  end
```

Analogous constructions possible for other termination conditions.

While Computability



$f : \mathbb{N}^n \rightarrow_p \mathbb{N}$ is **while computable**, if there exists a while program P such that for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and memory $m : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined as

$$m(i) := \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

the following holds:

- If $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \text{domain}(f)$, then $\llbracket P \rrbracket(m) : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and


$$\llbracket P \rrbracket(m)(0) = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

- If $x_1, \dots, x_n \notin \text{domain}(f)$, then

$$\llbracket P \rrbracket(m) = \perp$$

For a defined value of $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, P terminates with this value in variable x_0 . If $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is undefined, the program does not terminate.

Example




The Ackermann function is while computable with the help of a stack.

```
function ack(n, m):  
  if n = 0 then  
    return m + 1  
  else if m = 0 then  
    return ack(n - 1, 1)  
  end if  
  return ack(n - 1, ack(n, m - 1))  
end function
```

```
function ack(x1, x2):  
  push(x1); push(x2)  
  while size() > 1 do  
    x2 ← pop(); x1 ← pop()  
    if x1 = 0 then  
      push(x2 + 1)  
    else if x2 = 0 then  
      push(x1 - 1); push(1);  
    else  
      push(x1 - 1);  
      push(x1); push(x2 - 1)  
    end if  
  end while  
  return pop()  
end function
```

While programs are computationally more powerful than loop programs.

Normal Form of a While Program




Kleene's Normal Form Theorem: every while computable function can be computed by a while program in Kleene's normal form:

```
 $x_c := 1;$   
while  $x_c$  do  
  if  $x_c = 1$  then  $P_1$   
  else if  $x_c = 2$  then  $P_2$   
  ...  
  else if  $x_c = n$  then  $P_n$   
  end if  
end while
```

- P_1, \dots, P_n do *not* contain while loops.
- Control variable x_c determines which P_i to execute next.

A single while loop is all that is needed.



Normal Form of a While Program

We sketch the proof of Kleene's Normal Form Theorem.

- A while program can be translated into a goto program:

```
while  $x_i$  do  $P$  end
```

\rightsquigarrow

```
 $L_i$  :   if  $x_i = 0$  goto  $L_{i+1}$   
         $P$ ;  
        goto  $L_i$   
 $L_{i+1}$  : ...
```

- Gotos can be translated to control variable assignments:

```
goto  $L_j$ 
```

\rightsquigarrow

```
 $x_c := j$ 
```

- The resulting program can be translated into normal form:


```
 $L_1$  :  $P_1$   
 $L_2$  :  $P_2$   
...  
 $L_n$  :  $P_n$ 
```

\rightsquigarrow

```
 $x_c := 1$ ;  
while  $x_c$  do  
  if  $x_c = 1$  then  $x_c := 2$ ;  $P_1$   
  else if  $x_c = 2$  then  $x_c := 3$ ;  $P_2$   
  ...  
  else if  $x_c = n$  then  $x_c := 0$ ;  $P_n$   
  end if  
end while
```

In essence, the execution loop of a processor.

Turing Machines and While Programs




- **Theorem:** Every Turing machine can be simulated by a while program and vice versa.
 - Consequence: every Turing computable function is while computable and vice versa.

Proof \Rightarrow : construct P to simulate M .

- x_0 holds initial tape content.
 - Determines initial configuration.
- Machine configuration (x_l, x_q, x_r) :
 - x_q : the current state.
 - x_l : the tape left to the tape head,
 - x_r : the tape under/right to head.
- State x_q and symbol x_a under head determine the state transition.
 - If none is possible, final tape content is written to x_0 .


```
( $x_l, x_q, x_r$ ) := input( $x_0$ )
 $x_a$  := head( $x_r$ )
while transition( $x_q, x_a$ ) do
  if  $x_q = q_1 \wedge x_a = a_1$  then
     $P_1$ 
  else if  $x_q = q_2 \wedge x_a = a_2$  then
     $P_2$ 
  else if ... then
    ...
  else if  $x_q = q_n \wedge x_a = a_n$  then
     $P_n$ 
  end
   $x_a$  := head( $x_r$ )
end
 $x_0$  := output( $x_l, x_q, x_r$ )
```




Turing Machines and While Programs

Proof \Leftarrow : construct M to simulate P (given in normal form).


- Each program fragment P_i is translated into a corresponding fragment of the transition function of M with sequence of states c_i, p_i, \dots, c_0 .





-
1. Random Access Machines
 2. Loop and While Programs
 - 3. Primitive Recursive and μ -recursive Functions**
 4. Further Turing Complete Models
 5. The Chomsky Hierarchy
 6. Real Computers

Primitive Recursive Functions



The following functions over the natural numbers are **primitive recursive**:

- The **constant null** function $0 \in \mathbb{N}$.
- The **successor** function $s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, s(x) := x + 1$.
- The **projection** functions $p_i^n : \mathbb{N}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, p_i^n(x_1, \dots, x_n) := x_i$.
- Every function $h : \mathbb{N}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by **composition**

$$h(x_1, \dots, x_n) := f(g_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, g_k(x_1, \dots, x_n))$$

from primitive recursive $f : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $g_1, \dots, g_k : \mathbb{N}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.


- Every function $h : \mathbb{N}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by **primitive recursion**

$$h(y, x_1 \dots x_n) := \begin{cases} f(x_1, \dots, x_n) & \text{if } y = 0 \\ g(y-1, h(y-1, x_1, \dots, x_n), x_1, \dots, x_n) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

from primitive recursive $f : \mathbb{N}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $g : \mathbb{N}^{n+2} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

Starting with the base functions, by composition and primitive recursion new primitive recursive functions can be defined.

Understanding Primitive Recursion



- Primitive recursion can be defined by a **pattern matching equation**:

$$h(0, x_1 \dots, x_n) := f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

$$h(y + 1, x_1 \dots, x_n) := g(y, h(y, x_1, \dots, x_n), x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

- Primitive recursion can be defined by a **pattern matching construct**:

$$h(y, x_1 \dots x_n) :=$$

case y of

$$0: \quad f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

$$z + 1: \quad g(z, h(z, x_1, \dots, x_n), x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

- $h(y, x)$ denotes the $(y - 1)$ -times application of g starting with $f(x)$:

$$h(0, x) = f(x)$$


$$h(1, x) = g(0, h(0, x), x) = g(0, f(x), x)$$

$$h(2, x) = g(1, h(1, x), x) = g(1, g(0, f(x), x), x)$$

$$h(3, x) = g(2, h(2, x), x) = g(2, g(1, g(0, f(x), x), x), x)$$

...

$$h(y, x) = g(y - 1, h(y - 1, x), x) = g(y - 1, g(y - 2, \dots, g(0, f(x), x), \dots, x), x)$$



Example

We consider arithmetic on natural numbers.

- Addition $y + x$ is primitive recursive:

$$0 + x := x$$

$$(y + 1) + x := (y + x) + 1$$

- Multiplication $y \cdot x$ is primitive recursive:

$$0 \cdot x := 0$$

$$(y + 1) \cdot x := y \cdot x + x$$


- Exponentiation x^y is primitive recursive:

$$x^0 := 1$$

$$x^{y+1} := x^y \cdot x$$

Natural number arithmetic is primitive recursive.

Primitive Recursion and Loop Computability



Both the execution of a loop program and the evaluation of a primitive recursive function are bounded; are they equally expressive?

Example: Compute in x_0 the smallest $n < x_1$ for which $p(n) = 1$ holds (respectively $x_0 = x_1$, if $p(n) \neq 1$ for all $n < x_1$).

$x_0 := x_1$

$x_2 := 0$

loop x_1 **do**

if $x_0 = x_1 \wedge p(x_2) = 1$ **then**

$x_0 := x_2$

end

$x_2 := x_2 + 1$


end

Assume $n = 3$:

x_0	x_1	x_2
5	5	0
5	5	1
5	5	2
5	5	3
3	5	4
3	5	5

We will construct a primitive recursive function computing the same value.

Primitive Recursion and Loop Computability



We mimic the execution of the **loop** by a primitive recursive function *loop* whose recursion parameter denotes the number of loop iterations.


$$\mathit{min}(x_1) := \mathit{loop}(x_1, x_1)$$

$$\mathit{loop}(x_2, x_1) := \begin{cases} x_1 & \text{if } x_2 = 0 \\ \mathit{if}(x_2 - 1, \mathit{loop}(x_2 - 1, x_1), x_1) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathit{if}(x_2, x_0, x_1) := \begin{cases} x_2 & \text{if } x_0 = x_1 \wedge p(x_2) = 1 \\ x_0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

- $\mathit{min}(x_1) := \mathit{loop}(x_1, x_1)$ computes the value assigned to x_0 for input x_1 (2nd argument) after x_1 iterations of the **loop** (1st argument).
- $\mathit{loop}(x_2, x_1)$ computes the value assigned to x_0 for input x_1 after x_2 iterations of the **loop**.
- $\mathit{if}(x_2, x_0, x_1)$ computes the new value assigned to x_0 from the old value of x_0 for input x_1 after x_2 iterations by the **if** statement.

Primitive Recursion and Loop Computability



Evaluation of $min(5) = loop(5,5)$.

$$loop(0,5) = 5$$

$$loop(1,5) = if(0, loop(0,5), 5) = if(0, 5, 5) = 5$$

$$loop(2,5) = if(1, loop(1,5), 5) = if(1, 5, 5) = 5$$

$$loop(3,5) = if(2, loop(2,5), 5) = if(2, 5, 5) = 5$$


$$loop(4,5) = if(3, loop(3,5), 5) = if(3, 5, 5) = 3$$

$$loop(5,5) = if(4, loop(4,5), 5) = if(4, 3, 5) = 3$$

x_0	x_1	x_2
5	5	0
5	5	1
5	5	2
5	5	3
3	5	4
3	5	5

In sequence of evaluations of $loop(x_2, x_1) = x_0$ the values (x_0, x_1, x_2) correspond to the program trace of the loop program.

Primitive Recursion and Loop Computability



Theorem: every prim. recursive function is loop computable and vice versa.

Proof \Rightarrow : we show that primitive recursive function h is loop computable.


- If h is one of the basic functions, it is clearly loop computable.
- Case $h(x_1, \dots, x_n) := f(g_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, g_k(x_1, \dots, x_n))$

```
y1 := g1(x1, ..., xn);  
y2 := g2(x1, ..., xn);  
...  
yk := gk(x1, ..., xn);  
x0 := f(y1, ..., yk)
```

- Case $h(y, x_1 \dots x_n) := \begin{cases} f(x_1, \dots, x_n) & \text{if } y = 0 \\ g(y - 1, h(y, x_1, \dots, x_n), x_1, \dots, x_n) & \text{else} \end{cases}$

```
x0 := f(x1, ..., xn); xy := 0;  
loop y do  
  x0 := g(xy, x0, x1, ..., xn);  
  xy := xy + 1  
end
```

Primitive Recursion and Loop Computability



Proof \Leftarrow : let h be computable by loop program P . Let $f_P : \mathbb{N}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$ be the function that maps the initial values of the variables used by P to their final values. We show by induction on P that f_P is primitive recursive.

- Case $x_i := k$:

$$f_P(x_0, \dots, x_n) := (x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}, k, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

- Case $x_i := x_j \pm 1$:

$$f_P(x_0, \dots, x_n) := (x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_j \pm 1, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

- Case $P_1; P_2$:

$$f_P(x_0, \dots, x_n) := f_{P_2}(f_{P_1}(x_0, \dots, x_n))$$

- Case **loop** x_i **do** P' **end** :


$$f_P(x_0, \dots, x_n) := g(x_i, x_0, \dots, x_n)$$

$$g(0, x_0, \dots, x_n) := (x_0, \dots, x_n)$$

$$g(m+1, x_0, \dots, x_n) := f_{P'}(g(m, x_0, \dots, x_n))$$

Thus the Ackermann function is also not primitive recursive.

μ -Recursive Functions



A partial function over the natural numbers is **μ -recursive**, if it

- is the constant null, successor, or a projection function,
- can be constructed from other μ -recursive functions by composition or primitive recursion, or
- is a function $h : \mathbb{N}^n \rightarrow_p \mathbb{N}$ defined as



$$h(x_1, \dots, x_n) := (\mu f)(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

with μ -recursive $f : \mathbb{N}^{n+1} \rightarrow_p \mathbb{N}$ and $(\mu f) : \mathbb{N}^n \rightarrow_p \mathbb{N}$ defined as

$$(\mu f)(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \min \left\{ y \in \mathbb{N} \mid \begin{array}{l} f(y, x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0 \wedge \\ \forall z \leq y : (z, x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{domain}(f) \end{array} \right\}$$


$(\mu f)(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is the smallest y such that $f(y, x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ (and f is defined for all $z \leq y$); the result of h is undefined, if no such y exists.

μ -Recursive Functions



Every primitive recursive function is a total μ -recursive function; a μ -recursive function may or may not be total.

μ -Recursion and While Computability



Theorem: every μ -recursive function is while computable and vice versa.


Proof \Rightarrow : we show that μ -recursive h is while computable.

- If h is one of the basic functions or defined by composition or primitive recursion, it is clearly while computable.
- Case $h(x_1, \dots, x_n) := (\mu f)(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

```
x0 := 0;  
y := f(x0, x1, ..., xn);  
while y do  
  x0 := x0 + 1;  
  y := f(x0, x1, ..., xn)  
end
```

μ -recursion denotes unbounded iterative search.

μ -Recursion and While Computability



Proof \Leftarrow : let $h : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow_{\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{N}$ be computable by while program P with variables x_0, \dots, x_n . Then $h(x_1, \dots, x_k) := \text{var}_0(f_P(0, x_1, \dots, x_k, 0, \dots, 0))$ where $\text{var}_i(x_0, \dots, x_n) := x_i$. We show that $f_P : \mathbb{N}^{n+1} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$ is μ -recursive by induction on P .

- If P is an assignment, a sequence, or a bounded loop, then f_P is clearly μ -recursive.
- Case **while x_i do P' end** :

$$f_P(x_0, \dots, x_n) := g((\mu g_i)(x_0, \dots, x_n), x_0, \dots, x_n)$$

$$g_i : \mathbb{N}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

$$g_i(m, x_0, \dots, x_n) := \text{var}_i(g(m, x_0, \dots, x_n))$$


$$g(0, x_0, \dots, x_n) := (x_0, \dots, x_n)$$

$$g(m+1, x_0, \dots, x_n) := f_{P'}(g(m, x_0, \dots, x_n))$$

- $g_i(m, x_0, \dots, x_n)$: the value of program variable i after m iterations
- $g(m, x_0, \dots, x_n)$: the values of all variables after m iterations.

Thus the Ackermann function is also μ -recursive.

Normal Form of a μ -Recursive Function




Kleene's Normal Form Theorem: every μ -recursive function h can be defined in Kleene's normal form:

$$h(x_1, \dots, x_k) := f_2(x_1, \dots, x_k, (\mu g)(f_1(x_1, \dots, x_k)))$$

- f_1, f_2, g are **primitive** recursive functions.

A single application of μ is all that is needed.

Normal Form of a μ -Recursive Function



We sketch the proof of Kleene's Normal Form Theorem.

Since h is μ -recursive, it is computable by a while program in normal form

```
 $x_c := 1$ ; while  $x_c$  do ... end
```

with memory function

$$f_P(x_0, \dots, x_n) := g((\mu g_c)(\text{init}(x_0, \dots, x_n)), \text{init}(x_0, \dots, x_n))$$


with primitive recursive g and g_c and $\text{init}(x_0, \dots, x_c, \dots, x_n) := (x_0, \dots, 1, \dots, x_n)$.

Thus we can define

$$\begin{aligned} h(x_1, \dots, x_k) &:= \text{var}_0(f_P(0, x_1, \dots, x_k, 0, \dots, 0)) \\ &= \text{var}_0(g((\mu g_c)(\text{init}(0, x_1, \dots, x_k, 0, \dots, 0)), \text{init}(0, x_1, \dots, x_k, 0, \dots, 0))) \\ &= f_2(x_1, \dots, x_k, (\mu g_c)(f_1(x_1, \dots, x_k))) \end{aligned}$$



with primitive recursive

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x_1, \dots, x_k) &:= \text{init}(0, x_1, \dots, x_k, 0, \dots, 0) \\ f_2(x_1, \dots, x_k, r) &:= \text{var}_0(g(r, \text{init}(0, x_1, \dots, x_k, 0, \dots, 0))) \end{aligned}$$




-
1. Random Access Machines
 2. Loop and While Programs
 3. Primitive Recursive and μ -recursive Functions
 - 4. Further Turing Complete Models**
 5. The Chomsky Hierarchy
 6. Real Computers

The Big Picture So Far



We are going to sketch some more Turing complete models.

Goto Programs



- A **goto program** has form

$$L_1 : P_1; L_2 : P_2; \dots; P_n : A_n$$

where L_k denotes a label and P_k an action:


$$P ::= x_i := 0 \mid x_i := x_j + 1 \mid x_i := x_j - 1 \mid \text{if } x_i \text{ goto } L_j$$

- **Semantics** $\llbracket P \rrbracket(k, m)$:

- A partial function which maps the initial state (k, m) of P , consisting of program counter $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and memory $m : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, to its final state (unless the program does not terminate).

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket P \rrbracket(0, m) &:= m \\ \llbracket P = \dots; P_k : x_i := 0; \dots \rrbracket(k, m) &:= \llbracket P \rrbracket(k + 1, m[i \leftarrow 0]) \\ \llbracket P = \dots; P_k : x_i := x_j + 1; \dots \rrbracket(k, m) &:= \llbracket P \rrbracket(k + 1, m[i \leftarrow m[j] + 1]) \\ \llbracket P = \dots; P_k : x_i := x_j - 1; \dots \rrbracket(k, m) &:= \llbracket P \rrbracket(k + 1, m[i \leftarrow \max\{0, m[j] - 1\}]) \\ \llbracket P = \dots; P_k : \text{if } x_i \text{ goto } L_j; \dots \rrbracket(k, m) &:= \begin{cases} \llbracket P \rrbracket(k + 1, m), & \text{if } m(i) = 0 \\ \llbracket P \rrbracket(j, m), & \text{if } m(i) \neq 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We have already seen how goto programs can be translated to while programs and vice versa; goto programs are therefore Turing complete.



- A λ -term T :


$$T ::= x_i \mid (T T) \mid (\lambda x_i. T)$$

- x_i : a variable.
 - $(T T)$: an **application**.
 - $(\lambda x_i. T)$: an **abstraction**.
- **Reduction relation** \rightarrow :

$$((\lambda x_i. T_1) T_2) \rightarrow (T_1[x_i \leftarrow T_2])$$

- The result of the application of a function to an argument.
- **Reduction sequence** $T_1 \rightarrow^* T_2$
 $T_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_2$
 - T_2 is in **normal form**, if no further reduction is possible.
- **Church-Rosser Theorem**: If $T_1 \rightarrow^* T_2$ and $T_1 \rightarrow^* T_2'$ such that both T_2 and T_2' are in normal form, then $T_2 = T_2'$.

Every computable function can be represented by a λ -term.



λ -Calculus

How can we represent unbounded iteration (recursion)?

- Can define **fixpoint operator** Y :

$$(YF) \rightarrow^* (F(YF))$$

- $Y := (\lambda f.(\lambda x.(f(xx)))(\lambda x.(f(xx))))$
- Can translate **recursive function definition to λ -term**:

$$f(x) := \dots f(g(x)) \dots \rightsquigarrow f := YF$$


$$F := \lambda h.\lambda x.\dots h(g(x)) \dots$$

- λ -term **behaves like recursive function**.

$$fa = (YF)a \rightarrow^* F(YF)a \rightarrow^* \dots (YF)(g(a)) \dots = \dots f(g(a)) \dots$$

Formal basis of functional programming languages.

Rewriting Systems




- A **term rewriting system** is a set of rules of form

$$L \rightarrow R$$

- L, R : terms such that L is not a variable and every variable that appears in R must also appear in L .
- **Rewriting Step** $T \rightarrow T'$:
 - There is some rule $L \rightarrow R$ and a substitution σ (a mapping of variables to terms) such that
 - some subterm U of T matches the left hand side L of the rule under the substitution σ , i.e., $U = L\sigma$,
 - T' is derived from T by replacing U with $R\sigma$, i.e with the right hand side of the rule after applying the variable replacement.
- **Rewriting Sequence** $T_1 \rightarrow^* T_2$
 $T_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow T_2$
 - T_2 is in **normal form**, if no further reduction is possible.

Every computable function can be represented by a term rewriting system.

Rewriting Systems



- Term rewriting system:

$$f(x, f(y, z)) \rightarrow f(f(x, y), z)$$

$$f(x, e) \rightarrow x$$


$$f(x, i(x)) \rightarrow e$$

- Rewriting sequence:

$$f(a, f(i(a), e)) \rightarrow f(f(a, i(a)), e) \rightarrow f(e, e) \rightarrow e$$


$$f(a, f(i(a), e)) \rightarrow f(a, i(a)) \rightarrow e$$

Rewriting systems can be also defined over strings and graphs; the later form the basis of tools for model driven architectures.



-
1. Random Access Machines
 2. Loop and While Programs
 3. Primitive Recursive and μ -recursive Functions
 4. Further Turing Complete Models
 - 5. The Chomsky Hierarchy**
 6. Real Computers

Languages and Machines




- **Regular languages:**
 - Representable by regular expressions.
 - Recognizable by finite state machines.
- **Recursively enumerable languages:**
 - Representable by ... ?
 - Recognizable by Turing machines.
- **Relationship:**
 - Every regular language is recursively enumerable.
 - Every finite state machine can be simulated by a Turing machine.

But not vice versa.

Are there any other interesting classes of languages and associated machine models and how do they relate to those above?

Grammars



Grammar $G = (N, \Sigma, P, S)$:


- N : a finite set of **nonterminal symbols**,
- Σ : a finite set of **terminal symbols** disjoint from N .
 $N \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$
- P : a finite set of **production rules** of form $l \rightarrow r$ such that
 $l \in (N \cup \Sigma)^* \circ N \circ (N \cup \Sigma)^*$
 $r \in (N \cup \Sigma)^*$
 - l and r consist of nonterminal and/or terminal symbols.
 - l must contain at least one nonterminal symbol.
 - Multiple rules $l \rightarrow r_1, l \rightarrow r_2, \dots, l \rightarrow r_n$ can be abbreviated:

$$l \rightarrow r_1 \mid r_2 \mid \dots \mid r_n$$

- S : the **start symbol**.

$$S \in N$$

Grammar G describes a language over alphabet Σ .



The Language of a Grammar

Grammar $G = (N, \Sigma, P, S)$, words $w, w_1, w_2 \in (N \cup \Sigma)^*$.

- **Direct derivation** $w_1 \Rightarrow w_2$ in G :

$$w_1 = ulv \text{ and } w_2 = urv$$

$$\text{for } u, v \in (N \cup \Sigma)^* \text{ and } (l \rightarrow r) \in P$$

- **Derivation** $w_1 \Rightarrow^* w_2$ in G :

$$w_1 \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow w_2 \text{ in } G.$$

- w is a **sentential form** in G :

$$S \Rightarrow^* w$$

- w is a **sentence** in G :


- w is a sentential form in G and $w \in \Sigma^*$.

- **Language** $L(G)$ of G :

$$L(G) := \{w \text{ is a sentence in } G\}$$

The language of a grammar is the set of all words that consist only of terminal symbols and that are derivable from the start symbol.

Example



- Grammar $G = (N, \Sigma, P, S)$:

$$N = \{S, A, B\}$$

$$\Sigma = \{a, b, c\}$$

$$P = \{S \rightarrow Ac, A \rightarrow aB, A \rightarrow BBb, B \rightarrow b, B \rightarrow ab\}$$

- Derivations:

$$S \Rightarrow Ac \Rightarrow aBc \Rightarrow abc$$


$$S \Rightarrow Ac \Rightarrow BBbc \Rightarrow abBbc \Rightarrow ababbc$$

- Language:

$$L(G) = \{abc, aabc, bbbc, babbc, abbbc, ababbc\}$$


This grammar defines a finite language.

Right-Linear Grammars and Regular Lang.



- Grammar $G = (N, \Sigma, P, S)$ is **right linear** if each rule in P has form
 - $A \rightarrow \varepsilon$, $A \rightarrow a$, $A \rightarrow aB$with nonterminal symbols $A, B \in N$ and terminal symbol $a \in \Sigma$.
- **Theorem:** The languages of right linear grammars are exactly the regular languages.
 - For every right linear grammar G , there exists a FSM M with $L(M) = L(G)$ and vice versa.
 - Proof \Rightarrow : we construct from right linear grammar G a NFSM M . The states are the nonterminal symbols extended by a final state q_f ; the start state is the start symbol.
 - For every rule $A \rightarrow \varepsilon$, the state A becomes final.
 - For every rule $A \rightarrow a$, we add a transition $\delta(A, a) = q_f$.
 - For every rule $A \rightarrow aB$, we add a transition $\delta(A, a) = B$.
 - Proof \Leftarrow : we construct from DFSM M right linear grammar G . The nonterminal symbols are the states; the start symbol is the start state.
 - For every transition $\delta(q, a) = q'$ we add a production rule $q \rightarrow aq'$.
 - For every final state q , we add a production rule $q \rightarrow \varepsilon$.

Grammars and Recursively Enum. Lang.



Theorem: The languages of (unrestricted) grammars are exactly the recursively enumerable languages.

- Proof \Rightarrow : construct 2-tape nondeterministic M with $L(M) = L(G)$.

M uses the second tape to construct some sentence of $L(G)$: it starts by writing S on the tape and then nondeterministically chooses some rule $l \rightarrow r$ and applies it to some occurrence of l on the tape, replacing it by r . Then M checks whether the result equals the word on the first tape. If yes, M accepts the word, otherwise, it continues with another production rule.


- Proof \Leftarrow : construct grammar G with $L(G) = L(M)$.

Sentential forms encode pairs (w, c) of input w and configuration c of M ; every form contains a non-terminal symbol such that by a rule application the current configuration is replaced by the successor configuration. The rules ensure that

- from the start symbol, every matching pair (w, c) of M can be derived;
- for every transition that moves c to c' , a rule is constructed that allows a derivation $(w, c) \Rightarrow (w, c')$;
- if configuration c describes a final state from which no further transition is possible, the derivation $(w, c) \Rightarrow w$ is possible.

Unrestricted grammars represent another Turing complete model.

The Chomsky Hierarchy



Noam Chomsky, 1959.


Type i	Grammar $G(i)$	Language $L(i)$	Machine $M(i)$
0	unrestricted	recursively enumerable	Turing machine
1	context-sensitive	context-sensitive	linear bounded automaton
2	context-free	context-free	push down automaton
3	right linear	regular	finite state machine

$L(i)$ is the set of languages of grammars $G(i)$ and machines $M(i)$.

- For $i > 0$, the set of languages of type $L(i)$ is a proper subset of the set of languages $L(i-1)$, i.e. $L(i) \subset L(i-1)$.
- For $i > 0$, every machine in $M(i)$ can be simulated by a machine in $M(i-1)$ (but not vice versa).

Grammars correspond to machine models.


Context-Free Languages (Type 2)



- **Context-free grammar G :** every rule has form $A \rightarrow r$ with $A \in N$.
 - Independent of the context, any occurrence of A can be replaced.
- **Example:** $L := \{a^i b^i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$
 - $S \rightarrow \varepsilon \mid aSb$
 - $S \Rightarrow aSb \Rightarrow aaSbb \Rightarrow aaaSbbb \Rightarrow aaabbb$
- **Pushdown automaton M :** nondeterministic FSM with unbounded stack of symbols as “working memory”:
 - in every transition $\delta(q, a, b) = (q', w)$,
 - M reads the next input symbol a (a may be ε , i.e., M may not read a symbol) and the symbol b on the top of the stack, and
 - replaces b by a (possibly empty) sequence w of symbols.

Most languages in computer science are context-free.

Generation of Syntax Analyzers



“Compiler generators” for the generation of syntax analyzers (parsers).


- Input: a (deterministic) context free grammar.

```
statement: assignment | conditional | whileloop | ... ;
whileloop: 'while' '(' valexp ')' statement ;
```

- Output: a (deterministic) push down automaton (as a program)

```
public final LoopStatement whileloop() throws ... {
    ...
    pushFollow(FOLLOW_valexp_in_whileloop1457);
    valexp();
    state._fsp--;
    if (state.failed) return value;
    ...
    pushFollow(FOLLOW_statement_in_whileloop1484);
    statement();
    state._fsp--;
    if (state.failed) return value;
    ...
}
```

Context-Sensitive Languages (Type 1)



■ Context-sensitive grammar G :

- in every rule $l \rightarrow r$, we have $|l| \leq |r|$, i.e., the length of left side l is less than or equal the length of right side r ,
- the rule $S \rightarrow \varepsilon$ is only allowed, if the start symbol S does not appear on the right hand side of any rule.

■ Example: $L := \{a^i b^i c^i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$

$S \rightarrow \varepsilon \mid T, T \rightarrow ABC \mid TABC$


$BA \rightarrow AB, CB \rightarrow BC, CA \rightarrow AC$

$AB \rightarrow ab, bC \rightarrow bc, Aa \rightarrow aa, bB \rightarrow bb, cC \rightarrow cc$

$\underline{S} \Rightarrow \underline{T} \Rightarrow \underline{T}ABC \Rightarrow \underline{A}BC\underline{A}BC \Rightarrow \underline{A}B\underline{A}CBC \Rightarrow \underline{A}A\underline{B}C\underline{B}C \Rightarrow \underline{A}A\underline{B}B\underline{C}C$
 $\Rightarrow \underline{A}a\underline{b}B\underline{C}C \Rightarrow a\underline{a}b\underline{B}C\underline{C}C \Rightarrow a\underline{a}b\underline{b}C\underline{C}C \Rightarrow a\underline{a}b\underline{b}c\underline{C}C \Rightarrow a\underline{a}b\underline{b}c\underline{c}C \Rightarrow a\underline{a}b\underline{b}c\underline{c}c$

- Linear bounded automaton M : nondeterministic Turing machine with k tapes (for some k).
 - For input of length n , only the first n cells of each tape are used.
 - The “space” used is a fixed multiple of the length of the input word.

Less practical importance.




Summary

We have seen examples of each type of language.


- **Type 3:** $\{(ab)^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$
 - Language is regular.
- **Type 2:** $\{a^n b^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$
 - Language is context-free.
- **Type 1:** $\{a^n b^n c^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$
 - Language is context-sensitive.
- **Type 0:** $\{a^i b^j c^k \mid k = \text{ack}(i, j)\}$
 - Language is recursively enumerable (also recursive).

None of these languages of type i is also of type $i + 1$.



-
1. Random Access Machines
 2. Loop and While Programs
 3. Primitive Recursive and μ -recursive Functions
 4. Further Turing Complete Models
 5. The Chomsky Hierarchy
 - 6. Real Computers**

Real Computers



Are real computers Turing complete?

- **Hardware view:**

- Finite number of digital elements and thus a finite number of states.
- Cannot simulate the infinite Turing machine tape.
- Cannot perform unbounded arithmetic.
- A computer is thus a **finite state machine** (i.e., not Turing complete).

View taken by model checkers.

- **Algorithm theory view:**

- On demand, arbitrary much (e.g., virtual) memory may be added.
- Can thus simulate arbitrary large portion of the Turing machine tape.
- Can thus perform unbounded arithmetic.
- A computer is **Turing complete**.

View taken by algorithm design.

A matter of the point of view respectively the goal of the modeling.