

Lecture #14: Oracle Reductions

Lecture Presentation

Consider the language $\text{LOOP}_{\text{TM}} \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{TM}}^*$, including encodings of Turing machines M and input strings ω for M such that M **loops** on ω .

At this point in the course several similar languages have been considered:

- The language $\text{TM+I} \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{TM}}^*$ of encodings of Turing machines M and input strings ω for M . This language is **decidable** and it follows from the definitions of these languages that $\text{LOOP}_{\text{TM}} \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{TM}}$.
- The language $\text{A}_{\text{TM}} \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{TM}}^*$ of encodings of Turing machines M and input strings ω for M such that M accepts ω .

This language is **recognizable**: A multi-tape Turing machine with language A_{TM} (called a “universal Turing machine”) was described in Lecture #12 — and it follows, by results about multi-tape Turing machines included in Lecture #10, that there must also exist a standard (single tape) Turing machine, $M_{\text{A}_{\text{TM}}}$, whose language is A_{TM} , as well.

On the other hand it was proved in Lecture #13, that the language A_{TM} is **undecidable**.

The goal of this lecture presentation will be to use an **oracle reduction** — along with the above information — to prove that the language LOOP_{TM} is also **undecidable**.

Which Reduction Should We Use? Why?

An Algorithm That Uses a Subroutine

Adding Implementation-Level Details

How One Would Finish (If We Had Time and Wanted To Do Everything)

Conclusion