Advanced Topics in Theoretical Computer Science

Part 2: Register machines (2)

14.11.2018

Viorica Sofronie-Stokkermans

Universität Koblenz-Landau

e-mail: sofronie@uni-koblenz.de

Contents

2. Register Machines

- Register machines (Random access machines)
- LOOP Programs
- WHILE Programs
- GOTO Programs
- Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO
- Relationships between register machines and Turing machines

Last time: Register Machines

The register machine gets its name from its one or more "registers":

In place of a Turing machine's tape and head (or tapes and heads) the model uses multiple, uniquely-addressed registers, each of which holds a single positive integer.

In comparison to Turing machines:

- equally powerful fundament for computability theory
- **Advantage:** Programs are easier to understand

similar to ...

the imperative kernel of programming languages

pseudo-code

Last time: Register Machines

Definition

A register machine is a machine consisting of the following elements:

- A finite (but unbounded) number of registers $x_1, x_2, x_3 \dots, x_n$; each register contains a natural number.
- A LOOP-, WHILE- or GOTO-program.

Last time: Register Machines – State

Definition (State of a register machine)
The state s of a register machine is a map: $s : \{x_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \to \mathbb{N}$
which associates with every register a natural number as value.

Definition (Initial state; Input)
Let $m_1, \dots, m_k \in \mathbb{N}$ be given as input to a register machine.
In the input state s_0 we have

- $s_0(x_i) = m_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$
- $s_0(x_i) = 0$ for all $i > k$

Definition (Output)
If a register machine started with the input $m_1, \dots, m_k \in \mathbb{N}$ halts in a state s_{term}
then: $s_{\text{term}}(x_{k+1})$ is the output of the machine.

Last time: Register Machines – Semantics

Definition (The semantics of a register machine)

The semantics $\Delta(P)$ of a register machine P is a (binary) relation

$$\Delta(P) \subseteq S \times S$$

on the set S of all states of the machine.

$(s_1, s_2) \in \Delta(P)$ means that if P is executed in state s_1 then it halts in state s_2.

Last time: Computed function

Definition (Computed function)

A register machine P computes a function $f : \mathbb{N}^k \to \mathbb{N}$
if and only if for all $m_1, \ldots, m_k \in \mathbb{N}$ the following holds:

If we start P with initial state with the input $m_1, \ldots, m_k$ then:

- P terminates if and only if $f(m_1, \ldots, m_k)$ is defined
- If P terminates, then the output of P is $f(m_1, \ldots, m_k)$
- Additional condition
  We additionally require that when a register machine halts, all the registers (with the exception of the output register) contain again the values they had in the initial state.
  - Input registers $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ contain the initial values
  - The registers x_i with $i > k + 1$ contain value 0

Consequence: A machine which does not fulfill the additional condition (even only for some inputs) does not compute a function at all.

Last time: Computed function

Example:

The program:

$$P := \text{loop } x_2 \text{ do } x_2 := x_2 - 1 \text{ end}; \; x_2 := x_2 + 1;$$
$$\text{loop } x_1 \text{ do } x_1 := x_1 - 1 \text{ end}$$

does not compute a function: At the end, P has value 0 in x_1 and 1 in x_2.

Last time: Computable function

Definition. A function f is

- LOOP computable if there exists a register machine with a LOOP program, which computes f
- WHILE computable if there exists a register machine with a WHILE program, which computes f
- GOTO computable if there exists a register machine with a GOTO program, which computes f
- TM computableif there exists a Turing machine which computes f

Last time: Computable function

LOOP	$=$	Set of all total LOOP computable functions
WHILE	$=$	Set of all total WHILE computable functions
GOTO	$=$	Set of all total GOTO computable functions
TM	$=$	Set of all total TM computable functions

$\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}}$	$=$	Set of all total or partial WHILE computable functions
$\text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$	$=$	Set of all total or partial GOTO computable functions
TM^{part}	$=$	Set of all total or partial TM computable functions

Register Machines: Overview

- Register machines (Random access machines)
- LOOP Programs
- WHILE Programs
- GOTO Programs
- Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO
- Relationships between register machines and Turing machines

Last time: LOOP Programs - Syntax

Definition

(1) **Atomic programs:** For each register x_i:

- $x_i := x_i + 1$
- $x_i := x_i - 1$

are LOOP instructions and also LOOP programs.

(2) If P_1, P_2 are LOOP programs then

- $P_1; P_2$ is a LOOP program

(3) If P is a LOOP program then

- loop x_i do P end is a LOOP instruction and a LOOP program.

The set of all LOOP programs is the smallest set with the properties (1),(2),(3).

Last time: LOOP Programs - Semantics

Definition (Semantics of LOOP programs)

Let P be a LOOP program. $\Delta(P)$ is inductively defined as follows:

(1) On atomic programs:

- $\Delta(x_i := x_i + 1)(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if:
  - $s_2(x_i) = s_1(x_i) + 1$
  - $s_2(x_j) = s_1(x_j)$ for all $j \neq i$
- $\Delta(x_i := x_i - 1)(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if:
  - $s_2(x_i) = \begin{cases} s_1(x_i) - 1 & \text{if } s_1(x_i) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } s_1(x_i) = 0 \end{cases}$
  - $s_2(x_j) = s_1(x_j)$ for all $j \neq i$

Last time: LOOP Programs - Semantics

Definition (Semantics of LOOP programs)

Let P be a LOOP program. $\Delta(P)$ is inductively defined as follows:

(2) Sequential composition:

- $\Delta(P_1; P_2)(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if there exists s' such that:
  - $\Delta(P_1)(s_1, s')$
  - $\Delta(P_2)(s', s_2)$

(3) Loop programs

- $\Delta(\text{loop } x_i \text{ do } P \text{ end})(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if there exist states $s'_0, s'_1, \dots, s'_n$ with:
  - $s_1(x_i) = n$
  - $s_1 = s'_0$
  - $s_2 = s'_n$
  - $\Delta(P)(s'_k, s'_{k+1})$ for $0 \leq k < n$

Remark: The number of steps in the loop is the value of x_i at the beginning of the loop. Changes to x_i during the loop are not relevant.

Last time: LOOP programs - Semantics

Program end: If there is no next program line, then the program execution terminates.

We say that a LOOP program terminates on an input $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ if its execution on this input terminates (in the sense above) after a finite number of steps.

Theorem. Every LOOP program terminates for every input.

Consequence: All LOOP computable functions are total.

LOOP Programs

Additional instructions

- $x_i := 0$

  loop x_i do $x_i := x_i - 1$ end

- $x_i := c$ for $c \in \mathbb{N}$

  $$\left.\begin{array}{l} x_i := 0; \\ x_i := x_i + 1; \\ \ldots \\ x_i := x_i + 1 \end{array}\right\} \quad c \text{ times}$$

- $x_i := x_j$

  $x_i := 0;$
  loop x_j do $x_i := x_i + 1$ end

LOOP Programs

Additional instructions

- $x_i := x_j + x_k$

  $x_i := x_j;$
  loop x_k do $x_i := x_i + 1$ end

- $x_i := x_j - x_k$

  $x_i := x_j;$
  loop x_k do $x_i := x_i - 1$ end

- $x_i := x_j * x_k$

  $x_i := 0;$
  loop x_k do $x_i := x_i + x_j$ end

LOOP Programs

Additional instructions

In what follows, $x_n, x_{n+1}, \ldots$ denote new registers (not used before).

- $x_i := e_1 + e_2$ (e_1, e_2 arithmetical expressions)
  $x_i := e_1;$
  $x_n := e_2;$
  loop x_n do $x_i := x_i + 1$ end; $x_n := 0$
- $x_i := e_1 - e_2$ (e_1, e_2 arithmetical expressions)
  $x_i := e_1;$
  $x_n := e_2;$
  loop x_n do $x_i := x_i - 1$ end; $x_n := 0$
- $x_i := e_1 * e_2$ (e_1, e_2 arithmetical expressions)
  $x_i := 0;$
  $x_n := e_1;$
  loop x_n do $x_i := x_i + e_2$ end; $x_n := 0$

LOOP Programs

Additional instructions

- if $x_i = 0$ then P_1 else P_2 end

  $x_n := 1 - x_i;$

  $x_{n+1} := 1 - x_n;$

  loop x_n do P_1 end;

  loop x_{n+1} do P_2 end;

  $x_n := 0; x_{n+1} := 0$

- if $x_i \leq x_j$ then P_1 else P_2 end

  $x_n := x_i - x_j;$

  if $x_n = 0$ then P_1 else P_2 end

  $x_n := 0$

Register Machines: Overview

- Register machines (Random access machines)
- LOOP Programs
- WHILE Programs
- GOTO Programs
- Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO
- Relationships between register machines and Turing machines

WHILE Programs: Syntax

Definition

- **Atomic programs:** For each register x_i:
  - $x_i := x_i + 1$
  - $x_i := x_i - 1$

  are WHILE instructions and WHILE programs.
- If P_1, P_2 are WHILE programs then
  - $P_1; P_2$ is a WHILE program
- If P is a WHILE program then
  - while $x_i \neq 0$ do P end is a WHILE instruction and a WHILE program.

The family of all WHILE programs is the smallest set with properties (1),(2),(3)

WHILE Programs: Semantics

Definition (Semantics of WHILE programs)

Let P be a WHILE program. $\Delta(P)$ is inductively defined as follows:

(1) On atomic programs:

- $\Delta(x_i := x_i + 1)(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if:
  - $s_2(x_i) = s_1(x_i) + 1$
  - $s_2(x_j) = s_1(x_j)$ for all $j \neq i$
- $\Delta(x_i := x_i - 1)(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if:
  - $s_2(x_i) = \begin{cases} s_1(x_i) - 1 & \text{if } s_1(x_i) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } s_1(x_i) = 0 \end{cases}$
  - $s_2(x_j) = s_1(x_j)$ for all $j \neq i$

WHILE Programs: Semantics

Definition (Semantics of WHILE programs)

Let P be a WHILE program. $\Delta(P)$ is inductively defined as follows:

(2) Sequential composition:

- $\Delta(P_1; P_2)(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if there exists s' such that:
  - $\Delta(P_1)(s_1, s')$
  - $\Delta(P_2)(s', s_2)$

WHILE Programs: Semantics

Definition (Semantics of WHILE programs ctd.)

Let P be a WHILE program. $\Delta(P)$ is inductively defined as follows:

(3) While programs

- $\Delta(\text{while } x_i \neq 0 \text{ do } P \text{ end})(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and there exist states $s'_0, s'_1, \ldots, s'_n$ with:
  - $s_1 = s'_0$
  - $s_2 = s'_n$
  - $\Delta(P)(s'_k, s'_{k+1})$ for $0 \leq k < n$
  - $s'_k(x_i) \neq 0$ for $0 \leq k < n$
  - $s'_n(x_i) = 0$

WHILE Programs: Semantics

Definition (Semantics of WHILE programs ctd.)

Let P be a WHILE program. $\Delta(P)$ is inductively defined as follows:

(3) While programs

- $\Delta(\text{while } x_i \neq 0 \text{ do } P \text{ end})(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and there exist states $s'_0, s'_1, \ldots, s'_n$ with:
  - $s_1 = s'_0$
  - $s_2 = s'_n$
  - $\Delta(P)(s'_k, s'_{k+1})$ for $0 \leq k < n$
  - $s'_k(x_i) \neq 0$ for $0 \leq k < n$
  - $s'_n(x_i) = 0$

Remark: The number of loop iterations is not fixed at the beginning. The contents of P may influence the number of iterations. Infinite loop are possible.

WHILE and LOOP

Theorem. LOOP $\subseteq$ WHILE
i.e., every LOOP computable function is also WHILE computable

Proof (Idea) We first show that the LOOP instruction "loop x_i do P end" can be simulated by the following WHILE program P_{while}:

```
while  x_i ≠ 0  do                                  ** simulate x_n := x_i **
   x_n := x_n + 1; x_{n+1} := x_{n+1} + 1; x_i := x_i − 1
end;

while  x_{n+1} ≠ 0  do                              ** restore x_i **
   x_i := x_i + 1; x_{n+1} := x_{n+1} − 1
end;

while  x_n ≠ 0  do                                  ** simulate the loop instruction **
   P; x_n := x_n − 1
end
```

Here x_n, x_{n+1} are new registers (in which at the beginning 0 is stored; not used in P).

WHILE and LOOP

It is easy to see that the new WHILE program P_{while} “simulates” loop x_i do P end , i.e.

$$(s, s') \in \Delta(\text{loop } x_i \text{ do } P \text{ end}) \text{ iff } (s, s') \in \Delta(P_{\text{while}})$$

Using this, it can be proved (by structural induction) that every LOOP program can be simulated by a WHILE program.

WHILE and LOOP

Theorem. LOOP $\subseteq$ WHILE (every LOOP computable function is WHILE computable)

Proof: Structural induction

Induction basis: We show that the property is true for all atomic LOOP programs, i.e. for programs of the form $x_i := x_i + 1$ and of the form $x_i := x_i - 1$.
(Obviously true, because these programs are also WHILE programs).

WHILE and LOOP

Theorem. LOOP $\subseteq$ WHILE (every LOOP computable function is WHILE computable)

Proof: Structural induction

Induction basis: We show that the property is true for all atomic LOOP programs, i.e. for programs of the form $x_i := x_i + 1$ and of the form $x_i := x_i - 1$.
(Obviously true, because these programs are also WHILE programs).

Let P be a non-atomic LOOP program.
Induction hypothesis: We assume that the property holds for all "subprograms" of P.
Induction step: We show that then it also holds for P. Proof depends on form of P.

WHILE and LOOP

Theorem. LOOP $\subseteq$ WHILE (every LOOP computable function is WHILE computable)

Proof: Structural induction

Induction basis: We show that the property is true for all atomic LOOP programs, i.e. for programs of the form $x_i := x_i + 1$ and of the form $x_i := x_i - 1$.
(Obviously true, because these programs are also WHILE programs).

Let P be a non-atomic LOOP program.
Induction hypothesis: We assume that the property holds for all "subprograms" of P.
Induction step: We show that then it also holds for P. Proof depends on form of P.

Case 1: $P = P_1; P_2$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist WHILE programs P_1', P_2' with $\Delta(P_i) = \Delta(P_i')$. Let $P' = P_1'; P_2'$ (a WHILE program).

$\Delta(P')(s_1, s_2)$ iff there exists s with $\Delta(P_1')(s_1, s)$ and $\Delta(P_2')(s, s_2)$
iff there exists s with $\Delta(P_1)(s_1, s)$ and $\Delta(P_2)(s, s_2)$ iff $\Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$

WHILE and LOOP

Theorem. LOOP $\subseteq$ WHILE (every LOOP computable function is WHILE computable)

Proof: Structural induction

Induction basis: We show that the property is true for all atomic LOOP programs, i.e. for programs of the form $x_i := x_i + 1$ and of the form $x_i := x_i - 1$.
(Obviously true, because these programs are also WHILE programs).

Let P be a non-atomic LOOP program.
Induction hypothesis: We assume that the property holds for all "subprograms" of P.
Induction step: We show that then it also holds for P. Proof depends on form of P.

Case 1: $P = P_1; P_2$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist WHILE programs P'_1, P'_2 with $\Delta(P_i) = \Delta(P'_i)$. Let $P' = P'_1; P'_2$ (a WHILE program).

$\Delta(P')(s_1, s_2)$ iff there exists s with $\Delta(P'_1)(s_1, s)$ and $\Delta(P'_2)(s, s_2)$
iff there exists s with $\Delta(P_1)(s_1, s)$ and $\Delta(P_2)(s, s_2)$ iff $\Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$

Case 2: $P =$ **loop** x_i **do** P_1. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a WHILE program P'_1 with $\Delta(P_1) = \Delta(P'_1)$. Let P' be the following WHILE program:

$P' =$ while $x_i \neq 0$ do $x_n := x_n + 1; x_{n+1} := x_{n+1} + 1; x_i := x_i - 1$ end;
while $x_{n+1} \neq 0$ do $x_i := x_i + 1; x_{n+1} := x_{n+1} - 1$ end; while $x_n \neq 0$ do $P'_1; x_n := x_n - 1$ end

$\Delta(P')(s_1, s_2) = \Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$ (show that P and P' change values of registers in the same way).

LOOP $\subseteq$ WHILE

Consequences of the proof:

Corollary

The instructions defined in the context of LOOP programs:

$x_i := c \qquad x_i := x_j \qquad x_i := x_j + c \qquad x_i := x_j + x_k \qquad x_i = x_j * x_k$,

if $x_i = 0$ then P_i else P_j if $x_i \leq x_j$ then P_i else P_j

can also be used in WHILE programs.

Partial WHILE computable functions

Non-termination

WHILE programs can contain infinite loops. Therefore:

- WHILE programs do not always terminate
- WHILE computable functions can be undefined for some inputs (are partial functions)

Partial WHILE computable functions

Non-termination

WHILE programs can contain infinite loops. Therefore:

- WHILE programs do not always terminate
- WHILE computable functions can be undefined for some inputs (are partial functions)

Example: $P := \text{while} \;\; x_1 \neq 0 \;\; \text{do} \;\; x_1 := x_1 + 1 \;\; \text{end}$

computes $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ with:

$$f(n) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 0 \\ \text{undefined} & \text{if } n \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

Partial WHILE computable functions

Non-termination

WHILE programs can contain infinite loops. Therefore:

- WHILE programs do not always terminate
- WHILE computable functions can be undefined for some inputs (are partial functions)

Notation

- WHILE $=$ The set of all total WHILE computable functions
- $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}}$ $=$ The set of all WHILE computable functions (including the partial ones)

Partial WHILE computable functions

Notation

- WHILE $=$ The set of all total WHILE computable functions
- $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}}$ $=$ The set of all WHILE computable functions (including the partial ones)

Question:

Are all total WHILE computable functions LOOP computable or LOOP $\subset$ WHILE?

Partial WHILE computable functions

Notation

- WHILE $=$ The set of all total WHILE computable functions
- $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}}$ $=$ The set of all WHILE computable functions (including the partial ones)

Question:

Are all total WHILE computable functions LOOP computable or LOOP $\subset$ WHILE?

Later we will show that:

- one can construct a total TM computable function which cannot be computed with a LOOP program
- WHILE computable $=$ TM computable

Overview

- Register machines (Random access machines)
- LOOP programs
- WHILE programs
- GOTO programs
- Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO
- Relationships between register machines and Turing machines

GOTO Programs: Syntax

Definition: An index (line number) is a natural number $j \geq 0$.

GOTO Programs: Syntax

Definition: An index (line number) is a natural number $j \geq 0$.

Definition

- **Atomic programs:**
  $x_i := x_i + 1$
  $x_i := x_i - 1$
  are GOTO instructions for each register x_i.
- If x_i is a register and j is an index then
  if $x_i = 0$ goto j is a GOTO instruction.
- If $I_1, \ldots, I_k$ are GOTO instructions and $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ are indices then
  $j_1 : I_1; \ldots; j_k : I_k$ is a GOTO program

Differences between WHILE and GOTO

Different structure:

- WHILE programs contain WHILE programs
  Recursive definition of syntax and semantics.
- GOTO programs are a list of GOTO instructions
  Non recursive definition of syntax and semantics.

GOTO Programs: Semantics

Let P be a GOTO program of the form:

$$P = j_1 : I_1;\ j_2 : I_2;\ \ \dots;\ j_k : I_k$$

Let j_{k+1} be an index which does not occur in P (program end).

Definition. $\Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$ holds if and only if for every $n \geq 0$ there exist:

- states $s'_0, \dots, s'_n$
- indices $z_0, \dots, z_n$

such that the following hold:

(1a) $s'_0 = s_1$

(1b) $s'_n = s_2$

(1c) $z_0 = j_1$

(1d) $z_n = j_{k+1}$

and .... (continuation on next page)

GOTO Programs: Semantics

Let P be a GOTO program of the form:

$$P = j_1 : I_1; \ j_2 : I_2; \ \dots; \ j_k : I_k$$

Let j_{k+1} be an index which does not occur in P (program end).

Definition (ctd.). $\Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$ holds if and only if for every $n \geq 0$ there exist:

- states $s'_0, \dots, s'_n$
- indices $z_0, \dots, z_n$

such that the following hold:

(2) For $0 \leq l \leq n$, if $j_s : I_s$ is the line in P with $j_s = z_l$:

(2a) if I_s is $x_i := x_i + 1$ then: $s'_{i+1}(x_i) = s'_i(x_i) + 1$

$s'_{i+1}(x_j) = s'_i(x_j)$ for $j \neq i$

$z_{i+1} = j_{s+1}$

and .... (continuation on next page)

GOTO Programs: Semantics

Let P be a GOTO program of the form:

$$P = j_1 : I_1;\ j_2 : I_2;\ \ \dots;\ j_k : I_k$$

Let j_{k+1} be an index which does not occur in P (program end).

Definition (ctd.). $\Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$ holds if and only if for every $n \geq 0$ there exist:

- states $s'_0, \dots, s'_n$
- indices $z_0, \dots, z_n$

such that the following hold:

(2) For $0 \leq l \leq n$, if $j_s : I_s$ is the line in P with $j_s = z_l$:

(2b) if I_s is $x_i := x_i - 1$ then: $s'_{i+1}(x_i) = \begin{cases} s'_i(x_i) - 1 & \text{if } s'_i(x_i) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } s'_i(x_i) = 0 \end{cases}$

$s'_{i+1}(x_j) = s'_i(x_j)$ for $j \neq i$

$z_{i+1} = j_{s+1}$

and .... (continuation on next page)

GOTO Programs: Semantics

Let P be a GOTO program of the form:

$$P = j_1 : I_1;\ j_2 : I_2;\ \ \ldots;\ j_k : I_k$$

Let j_{k+1} be an index which does not occur in P (program end).

Definition (ctd.). $\Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$ holds if and only if for every $n \geq 0$ there exist:

- states $s'_0, \ldots, s'_n$
- indices $z_0, \ldots, z_n$

such that the following hold:

(2) For $0 \leq l \leq n$, if $j_s : I_s$ is the line in P with $j_s = z_l$:

(2c) if I_s is if $x_i = 0$ goto j_{goto} then:

$$s'_{i+1} = s'_i$$

$$z_{i+1} = \begin{cases} j_{\text{goto}} & \text{if } x_i = 0 \\ j_{s+1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

GOTO Programs: Semantics

Remark

The number of line changes (iterations) is not fixed at the beginning.
Infinite loops are possible.

GOTO Programs: Semantics

Remark

The number of line changes (iterations) is not fixed at the beginning.
Infinite loops are possible.

Notation

- GOTO $=$ The set of all total GOTO computable functions
- $\text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$ $=$ The set of all GOTO computable functions
  (including the partial ones)

WHILE and GOTO

Theorem.

(1) $\mathsf{WHILE} = \mathsf{GOTO}$

(2) $\mathsf{WHILE}^{\mathsf{part}} = \mathsf{GOTO}^{\mathsf{part}}$

WHILE and GOTO

Theorem.
(1) WHILE = GOTO
(2) $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}} = \text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$

Proof:

To show:

I. WHILE $\subseteq$ GOTO and $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}} \subseteq \text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$

II. GOTO $\subseteq$ WHILE and $\text{GOTO}^{\text{part}} \subseteq \text{WHILE}^{\text{part}}$

WHILE and GOTO

Theorem.
(1) WHILE = GOTO
(2) $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}} = \text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$

Proof:

I. WHILE $\subseteq$ GOTO and $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}} \subseteq \text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$

It is sufficient to prove that while $x_i \neq 0$ do P end can be simulated with GOTO instructions.

We can assume without loss of generality that P does not contain any while (we can replace the occurrences of "while" from inside out).

WHILE and GOTO

Proof (ctd.)

while $x_i \neq 0$ do P end

is replaced by:

$j_1 :$ if $x_i = 0$ goto j_3;
P';
$j_2 :$ if $x_n = 0$ goto j_1; ** Since $x_n = 0$ unconditional jump **
$j_3 :$ $x_n := x_n - 1$

where:

- x_n is a new register, which was not used before.
- P' is obtained from P by possibly renaming the indices.

WHILE and GOTO

Proof (ctd.)

while $x_i \neq 0$ do P end

is replaced by:

j_1 : if $x_i = 0$ goto j_3;
P';
j_2 : if $x_n = 0$ goto j_1; ** Since $x_n = 0$ unconditional jump **
j_3 : $x_n := x_n - 1$

where:

- x_n is a new register, which was not used before.
- P' is obtained from P by possibly renaming the indices.

Remark: Totality is preserved by this transformation. Semantics is the same.

WHILE and GOTO

Proof (ctd.)

Using the fact that while $x_i \neq 0$ do P end can be simulated by a GOTO program we can show (by structural induction) that every WHILE program can be simulated by a GOTO program.

Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO

Theorem. WHILE = GOTO; WHILE$^{\text{part}}$ = GOTO$^{\text{part}}$

Proof: I. WHILE $\subseteq$ GOTO; WHILE$^{\text{part}}$ $\subseteq$ GOTO$^{\text{part}}$ (WHILE programs expressible as GOTO programs). Proof by structural induction.

Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO

Theorem. WHILE = GOTO; $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}} = \text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$

Proof: I. WHILE $\subseteq$ GOTO; $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}} \subseteq \text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$ (WHILE programs expressible as GOTO programs). Proof by structural induction.

Induction basis: We show that the property is true for all atomic WHILE programs, i.e. for programs of the form $x_i := x_i \pm 1$ (expressible as $j : x_i := x_i \pm 1$).

Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO

Theorem. WHILE = GOTO; $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}} = \text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$

Proof: I. WHILE $\subseteq$ GOTO; $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}} \subseteq \text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$ (WHILE programs expressible as GOTO programs). Proof by structural induction.

Induction basis: We show that the property is true for all atomic WHILE programs, i.e. for programs of the form $x_i := x_i \pm 1$ (expressible as $j : x_i := x_i \pm 1$).

Let P be a non-atomic WHILE program.
Induction hypothesis: We assume that the property holds for all "subprograms" of P.
Induction step: We show that then it also holds for P. Proof depends on form of P.

Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO

Theorem. WHILE = GOTO; WHILE^{part} = GOTO^{part}

Proof: I. WHILE $\subseteq$ GOTO; WHILE^{part} $\subseteq$ GOTO^{part} (WHILE programs expressible as GOTO programs). Proof by structural induction.

Induction basis: We show that the property is true for all atomic WHILE programs, i.e. for programs of the form $x_i := x_i \pm 1$ (expressible as $j : x_i := x_i \pm 1$).

Let P be a non-atomic WHILE program.
Induction hypothesis: We assume that the property holds for all "subprograms" of P.
Induction step: We show that then it also holds for P. Proof depends on form of P.

Case 1: $P = P_1; P_2$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist GOTO programs P_1', P_2' with $\Delta(P_i) = \Delta(P_i')$. We can assume w.l.o.g. that the indices used for labelling the instructions are disjoint. Let $P' = P_1'; P_2'$ (a GOTO program). We can show that $\Delta(P')(s_1, s_2)$ iff $\Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$ as before.

Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO

Theorem. WHILE = GOTO; WHILE$^{\text{part}}$ = GOTO$^{\text{part}}$

Proof: I. WHILE $\subseteq$ GOTO; WHILE$^{\text{part}}$ $\subseteq$ GOTO$^{\text{part}}$ (WHILE programs expressible as GOTO programs). Proof by structural induction.

Induction basis: We show that the property is true for all atomic WHILE programs, i.e. for programs of the form $x_i := x_i \pm 1$ (expressible as $j : x_i := x_i \pm 1$).

Let P be a non-atomic WHILE program.
Induction hypothesis: We assume that the property holds for all "subprograms" of P.
Induction step: We show that then it also holds for P. Proof depends on form of P.

Case 1: $P = P_1; P_2$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist GOTO programs P_1', P_2' with $\Delta(P_i) = \Delta(P_i')$. We can assume w.l.o.g. that the indices used for labelling the instructions are disjoint. Let $P' = P_1'; P_2'$ (a GOTO program). We can show that $\Delta(P')(s_1, s_2)$ iff $\Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$ as before.

Case 2: $P =$ **while** $x_i \neq 0$ **do** P_1 **end** . By the induction hypothesis, there exists a GOTO program P_1' such that $\Delta(P_1) = \Delta(P_1')$. Let P' be the following GOTO program: j_1 : if $x_i = 0$ goto j_3; P'; j_2 : if $x_n = 0$ goto j_1; j_3 : $x_n := x_n - 1$

It can be checked that $\Delta(P')(s_1, s_2)$ iff $\Delta(P)(s_1, s_2)$.

WHILE and GOTO

Theorem.
(1) WHILE $=$ GOTO
(2) $\text{WHILE}^{\text{part}} = \text{GOTO}^{\text{part}}$

Proof:

II. GOTO $\subseteq$ WHILE and $\text{GOTO}^{\text{part}} \subseteq \text{WHILE}^{\text{part}}$

It is sufficient to prove that every GOTO program can be simulated with WHILE instructions.

WHILE and GOTO

Proof (ctd.)

$j_1 : I_1; j_2 : I_2; \ldots; j_k : I_k$

is replaced by the following while program:

$x_{\text{index}} := j_1;$
while $x_{\text{index}} \neq 0$ do
    if $x_{\text{index}} = j_1$ then I'_1 end;
    if $x_{\text{index}} = j_2$ then I'_2 end;
    $\ldots$
    if $x_{\text{index}} = j_k$ then I'_k end
end

WHILE and GOTO

Proof (ctd.)

$$j_1 : I_1; j_2 : I_2; \ldots; j_k : I_k$$

is replaced by the following while program:

$x_{\text{index}} := j_1;$
while $x_{\text{index}} \neq 0$ do
    if $x_{\text{index}} = j_1$ then I'_1 end;
    if $x_{\text{index}} = j_2$ then I'_2 end;
    $\ldots$
    if $x_{\text{index}} = j_k$ then I'_k end
end

For $1 \leq i < k$:

If I_i is $x_i := x_i \pm 1$:

$$I'_i \text{ is } x_i := x_i \pm 1; x_{\text{index}} := j_{i+1}$$

If I_i is if $x_i = 0$ goto j_{goto}:

I'_i is if $x_i = 0$ then $x_{\text{index}} := j_{\text{goto}}$
else $x_{\text{index}} := j_{i+1}$ end

In addition, $j_{k+1} = 0$

GOTO and WHILE are equally powerful

Consequences of the proof:

Corollary 1

The instructions defined in the context of LOOP programs:

$x_i := c \qquad x_i := x_j \qquad x_i := x_j + c \qquad x_i := x_j + x_k \qquad x_i = x_j * x_k,$

if $x_i = 0$ then P_i else P_j $\qquad$ if $x_i \leq x_j$ then P_i else P_j

can also be used in GOTO programs.

GOTO and WHILE are equally powerful

Consequences of the proof:

Corollary 2
Every WHILE computable function can be computed by a **WHILE+IF** program with **one while loop only**.

GOTO and WHILE are equally powerful

Consequences of the proof:

Corollary 2
Every WHILE computable function can be computed by a **WHILE+IF** program with **one while loop only**.

Proof: We showed that:

(i) every WHILE program can be simulated by a GOTO program

(ii) every GOTO program can be simulated by a WHILE program with only one loop, containing also some if instructions (WHILE-IF program).

Let P be a WHILE program. P can be simulated by a GOTO program P'. P' can be simulated by a WHILE-IF program with one WHILE loop only.

GOTO and WHILE are equally powerful

Consequence of the proof:

Every WHILE computable function can be computed by a **WHILE+IF** program with **one while loop only**.

Other consequences

- GOTO programming is not more powerful than WHILE programming

GOTO and WHILE are equally powerful

Consequence of the proof:

Every WHILE computable function can be computed by a **WHILE+IF** program with **one while loop only**.

Other consequences

- GOTO programming is not more powerful than WHILE programming

“Spaghetti-Code” (GOTO) ist not more powerful than “structured code” (WHILE)

Register Machines: Overview

- Register machines (Random access machines)
- LOOP programs
- WHILE programs
- GOTO programs
- Relationships between LOOP, WHILE, GOTO
- Relationships between register machines and Turing machines

Relationships

Already shown:

$$\mathsf{LOOP} \subseteq \mathsf{WHILE} = \mathsf{GOTO} \subsetneq \mathsf{WHILE}^{\mathsf{part}} = \mathsf{GOTO}^{\mathsf{part}}$$

Relationships

Already shown:

$$\mathsf{LOOP} \subseteq \mathsf{WHILE} = \mathsf{GOTO} \subsetneq \mathsf{WHILE}^{\mathsf{part}} = \mathsf{GOTO}^{\mathsf{part}}$$

To be proved:

- $\mathsf{LOOP} \neq \mathsf{WHILE}$
- $\mathsf{WHILE} = \mathsf{TM}$ and $\mathsf{WHILE}^{\mathsf{part}} = \mathsf{TM}^{\mathsf{part}}$