

Theoretical Computer Science 168 (1996) 241-255

Theoretical Computer Science

Small deterministic Turing machines

Manfred Kudlek*

Universität Hamburg, Fachbereich Informatik, Vogt-Kölln-Straße 30, D-22527 Hamburg, Germany

1. Introduction

In this paper small deterministic Turing machines with one bi-infinite tape and one scanning head are considered. Let DTM(m,n) denote the class of all such machines with m tape symbols (including the blank) and n states (excluding the halting state). It is known that there exist universal Turing machines in DTM(5,6) [10] and in DTM(4,7) [4]. It is also known that the halting problem for all machines from DTM(1,n) and DTM(m,1) is decidable. The first fact is trivial whereas the second one has been shown in [2]. In [4, 5] it is mentioned that the halting problem for DTM(2,2) is decidable too; however without giving any proof and stating only [5] that this result is unpublished and unpublishable. In such a state it remained since 1961 or 1972, respectively, until 1988. By a reduction to few cases it was possible to solve the problem and bring it into a publishable form. A first version can be found in [1]. At that time the results from 1975 [6] stating the halting problem to be decidable for DTM(2,2) and DTM(2,3) have not been known to the authors. In that paper a completely different method was used. Neither were known the results by [7] stating that there are universal Turing machines in DTM(2,24), DTM(3,11), DTM(5,5), DTM(6,4), DTM(10,3), and DTM(21,2). All these results were only little known in Western countries before 1991.

It is also shown that the sets accepted by machines from DTM(2,1) are regular, and that those accepted by machines from DTM(3,1) are regular too, except one case giving a deterministic linear context-free language which is essentially the nonregular language $L = \{a^n b^n | 1 \le n\}$.

The languages accepted by machines from DTM(2,2) are also regular, except one case (up to symmetries) giving essentially the same language as in the exceptional case of DTM(3,1), namely a deterministic linear context-free language. Thus, the halting problem is decidable for DTM(2,2). To obtain this result several symmetries are used to reduce the number of machines to consider. Finally, also a machine from DTM(4,4) is presented accepting a context-sensitive language, essentially $L = \{a^k | k = 2^n, 0 \le n\}$.

^{*} E-mail: kudlek@informatik.uni-hamburg.de.

Possibly, similar methods can be applied also to DTM(3,2), DTM(2,3), and perhaps to DTM(3,3). But for the last case, probably the aid of an automatic system should be used.

2. Definitions

Let T be any Turing machine with one bi-infinite tape, one scanning head, an alphabet V of m symbols including the blank, and a set S of n states (excluding the halting state H). The set of movements is given by $\{L, M, R\}$, standing for movement to the left, no movement, and movement to the right, respectively. The set of instructions, or program P of T, is denoted by $P \subseteq S \times V \times V \times \{L, M, R\} \times S$, with its elements (p, x, y, I, q) written in the form pxyIq. For shortness, y, I, q if y = x, I = M, q = p, is omitted, respectively. If the halting state H appears, this is always understood as pxH, i.e. pxxMH. If T is a deterministic Turing machine P represents a (total) function.

The class of all such deterministic Turing machines will be denoted by DTM(m,n). Only such machines will be considered here.

As usual, V^* denotes the free monoid generated by V, λ its neutral element (the empty word), lg(w) the length of a word $w \in V^*$, are rev(w) its reversal (mirror image).

Let ${}^{\infty}V$ and V^{∞} stand for the set of all left-infinite and right-infinite words over V, respectively.

A configuration of T is any bi-infinite word $\alpha {\binom{x}{p}} \beta \in {}^{\infty}V \cdot (V \times S) \cdot V^{\infty}$ denoting the fact that the head is scanning x and T is in state p. As usually, $\alpha {\binom{x}{p}} \beta \xrightarrow{*} \gamma {\binom{y}{q}} \delta$ means that there exists a finite sequence of Turing steps from $\alpha {\binom{x}{p}} \beta$ to $\gamma {\binom{y}{q}} \delta$, including 0 steps and q = H. It is assumed that there is no continuation of any configuration $\gamma {\binom{y}{H}} \delta$.

Finally, let \mathbb{N}_k denote the set $\mathbb{N}_k := \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid 0 \leq i \leq k\}.$

As for acceptance, there exist several possibilities to define sets of words accepted by Turing machines. The first one just gives the set of all such bi-infinite words being configurations which lead to acceptance.

Definition 1. $L_{\infty}(T,p) := \{ \alpha {x \choose p} \beta \in {}^{\infty}V \cdot (V \times S) \cdot V^{\infty} \mid \exists \gamma \in {}^{\infty}V \exists \delta \in V^{\infty} \exists \gamma \in V : \alpha {x \choose p} \beta$ $\xrightarrow{*} \gamma {y \choose H} \delta \}.$

A second possibility is the use of the work space for acceptance. Note, that by this definition one gets only context-sensitive languages.

Definition 2.

$$L_{s}(T,p) := \begin{cases} u \binom{x}{p} v \in V^{*} \cdot (V \times S) \cdot V^{*} \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N} \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_{k} \exists u_{i}, v_{i} \in V^{*} \exists x_{i} \in V \exists p_{i} \in S : \\ u_{0} = u \wedge v_{0} = v \wedge x_{0} = x \wedge p_{0} = p \wedge p_{k} = H \wedge lg(u_{i}v_{i}) = lg(uv) \end{cases}$$

M. Kudlek / Theoretical Computer Science 168 (1996) 241-255

$$\wedge \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_k - \{k\} : \left(p_i \neq H \land u_i \binom{x_i}{p_i} v_i \rightarrow u_{i+1} \binom{x_{i+1}}{p_{i+1}} v_{i+1} \right) \\ \wedge \exists j \in \mathbb{N}_k : u_j = \lambda \land \exists l \in \mathbb{N}_k : v_l = \lambda \right\}.$$

Thus, lg(uv) + 1 is exactly the work space for accepting $u\binom{x}{p}v$, and this word is the relevant part of the initial configuration being scanned by the head.

From this definition trivially follows that

Lemma 1. $L_{\infty}(T,p) = {}^{\infty}V \cdot L_s(T,p) \cdot V^{\infty}.$

A third possibility is not to look onto the relevant part of one initial configuration only but to consider them in some global sense, namely that if w is a word of the set then no proper subword of it is also contained in the set.

Definition 3.

$$L_{c}(T,p) := \left\{ u\binom{x}{p} v \in V^{*} \cdot (V \times S) \cdot V^{*} \mid \forall \alpha \in {}^{\infty}V \forall \beta \in V^{\infty} : \\ \alpha u\binom{x}{p} v\beta \in L_{\infty}(T,p) \land (u = yu' \Rightarrow \exists y' \in V : y'u' \notin L_{c}(T,p)) \\ \land (v = v'z \Rightarrow \exists z' \in V : v'z' \notin L_{c}(T,p)) \right\}.$$

This set is called the *core* of $L_{\infty}(T, p)$. Trivially again, it follows that

Lemma 2. $L_{\infty}(T,p) = {}^{\infty}V \cdot L_{c}(T,p) \cdot V^{\infty}.$

Finally, the normal definition of an accepted set can be defined by cutting off all 0's at left and right ends from words in $L_s(T, p)$.

Definition 4. $L_0(T,p) = \{0\}^* \setminus L_s(T,p)/\{0\}^*$

In the sequel it is assumed that $V = \mathbb{N}_k - \{k\}$, and that 0 represents the blank. It is easy to establish the following lemmas.

Lemma 3. If there is no occurrence of pxH in the set of instructions of a Turing machine T, then $L_{\infty}(T,p) = L_s(T,p) = L_c(T,p) = L_0(T,p) = \emptyset$.

Lemma 4. For deterministic Turing machines it suffices that there is at most 1 occurrence of halting qxH in the set of instructions.

Proof. Among all occurrences of halting in P choose one, e.g. qxH. Replace all other pyH by pyxMq. Then it is trivial to see that the accepted languages remain the same. \Box

243

Definition 5. Let T = (S, V, P) be any deterministic Turing machine. Let $\pi : S \to S$ be any permutation of the set of states $S, \sigma : V \to V$ be any permutation of the alphabet V, and $\mu : \{L, M, R\} \to \{L, M, R\}$ be defined by $\mu(L) = R$, $\mu(M) = M$, $\mu(R) = L$.

Then define also $\pi(T) := (S, V, \pi(P))$ with $\pi(p)xyI\pi(q) \in \pi(P) \Leftrightarrow pxyIq \in P$, $\sigma(T) := (S, V, \sigma(PP) \text{ with } p\sigma(x)\sigma(y)Iq \in \sigma(P) \Leftrightarrow pxyIq \in P$, and $\mu(T) := (S, V, \mu(P))$ with $pxy\mu(I)q \in \mu(P) \Leftrightarrow pxyIq \in P$.

By the next lemma all Turing machines with movements of the head in one direction only can be eliminated from further consideration.

Lemma 5. Let T be any DTM with movements only $\{M,R\}$ or $\{L,M\}$ in the set of instructions, respectively. Then $L_s(T,p)$ is regular.

Proof. Let the movements be $\{M, R\}$, and the initial configuration $\alpha {x \choose p} \beta$. Then, from T, a finite automaton is constructed : $F_x := (V, S \times V; \{{x \choose p}\}, \{{y \choose q} \mid qyH \in P\}, R)$ with $R \subseteq (S \times V) \times (V \cup \{\lambda\}) \times (S \times V)$ given by $({y \choose p}, \lambda, {z \choose q}) \in R$ if $pyzMq \in P$, and $({y \choose p}, z, {z \choose q}) \in R$ if $pyzRq \in P$. By this construction it is obvious that $L_s(T, p) = {x \choose p} L(F_x)$.

Trivially, in the case of $\{L, M\}$ one gets $L_s(T, p) = rev(L(F_x)) \cdot {\binom{x}{p}}$. \Box

A stronger lemma is the following one.

Lemma 6. If either

$$\forall x \in V \forall p \in S \exists m, n \in \mathbb{N} \forall u_1 \in V^m \forall u_2 \in V^n \exists y \in V \exists q \in S \cup \{H\} \exists v \in V^{m+n}:$$
$$u_1 \binom{x}{p} u_2 \xrightarrow{*} v \binom{y}{q}$$

or

$$\forall x \in V \forall p \in S \exists m, n \in \mathbb{N} \forall u_1 \in V^m \forall u_2 \in V^n \exists y \in V \exists q \in S \cup \{H\} \exists v \in V^{m+n}:$$
$$u_1 \binom{x}{p} u_2 \xrightarrow{*} \binom{y}{q} v$$

where during the computation the head never leaves the workspace of length m+n+1, then $L_s(T, p)$ is regular.

Proof. By constructing a finite automaton with $\binom{x}{p}, u_2, \binom{y}{q} \in R$ or $\binom{x}{p}, \overline{u_1}, \binom{y}{q} \in R$ and final states $\binom{z}{H}$ where $\overline{v} = rev(v)$, respecting the initial part in front of or behind $\binom{x}{p}$ for the initial configuration. \Box

Although there exist deterministic Turing machines with all accepted sets $L_s(T,p)$, $L_c(T,p)$, $L_0(T,P)$ being different, only the first possibility will be considered in the sequel.

3. DTM(1, n)

Any Turing machine T from DTM(1, n) can be considered as a finite directed graph with n + 1 nodes from $S \cup \{H\}$. For each $p \in S$ it is decidable whether there exists a directed path from p to H, and this path has a length of at most n. Thus one gets

Theorem 1. All sets accepted by Turing machines from DTM(1,n) are finite, and the halting problem for DTM(1,n) is decidable.

4. DTM(2, 1)

Generally, it has been shown by Herman [2] that the halting problem of arbitrary 1 state DTMs with 1 head and 1 k-dimensional tape is decidable. He also proved that there exist accepted sets which are not regular.

Let $S = \{p\}$ and $V = \{0, 1\}$. Then

Theorem 2. All sets accepted by machines from DTM(2,1) are regular, and the halting problem for DTM(2,1) is decidable.

Proof. Let σ be the symmetry defined by $\sigma(0) = 1$, $\sigma(1) = 0$, and μ that one defined by $\mu(L) = R$, $\mu(M) = M$, $\mu(R) = L$. By Lemma 4 it suffices to have at most 1 possibility of halting in the program. Let there be exactly one. It also suffices that this is p1H for if it is p0H then this may be treated using the symmetry σ . The case p0L may be ruled out using the symmetry μ . Thus, only 2 cases remain:



The first one gives a regular set, the second one finite sets. \Box

5. DTM(3, 1)

Let $S = \{p\}$, $V = \{0, 1, 2\}$, and $f(p, x) \in V$, $g(p, x) \in \{L, M, R\}$, $h(p, x) \in S \cup \{H\}$ denote the new symbol, the head movement, and the new state, respectively, if T is in state p and x the scanned symbol.

By Lemma 5, and using the symmetry μ , similarly to DTM(2,1), it suffices to consider only the case



In the case f(p,0) = f(p,1) = 0 one gets as accepted set

$$L_{s}(T,p) = 2(0 \cup 1)^{*} {\binom{0}{p}} \cup {\binom{1}{p}} 1^{*}2 \cup 2(0 \cup 1)^{*} {\binom{1}{p}} 1^{*}0 \cup {\binom{2}{p}},$$

in the case f(p,0) = 0, f(p,1) = 1

$$L_s(T,p) = 20*\binom{0}{p} \cup \binom{1}{p} 1*2 \cup \binom{2}{p}$$

in the case f(p, 0) = f(p, 1) = 1

$$L_{s}(T,p) = 20^{*} {\binom{0}{p}} \cup 10^{*} {\binom{0}{p}} (0 \cup 1)^{*} 2 \cup {\binom{1}{p}} (0 \cup 1)^{*} 2 \cup {\binom{2}{p}},$$

and in the last case f(p,0) = 1, f(p,1) = 0 the following accepted set:

$$L_{s}(T,p) = \left\{ 10^{m_{k}} 1 \cdots 10^{m_{1}} \binom{0}{p} 1^{n_{1}} 0 \cdots 01^{n_{k}} 2, \\ 20^{m_{k+1}} 10^{m_{k}} 1 \cdots 10^{m_{1}} \binom{0}{p} 1^{n_{1}} 0 \cdots 01^{n_{k}} 0, \\ 20^{m_{k}} 1 \cdots 10^{m_{1}} \binom{1}{p} 1^{n_{1}} 0 \cdots 01^{n_{k}} 0, \\ 10^{m_{k}} 1 \cdots 10^{m_{1}} \binom{1}{p} 1^{n_{1}} 0 \cdots 01^{n_{k}} 01^{n_{k+1}} 2| \\ k \ge 0, m_{i} \in \mathbb{N}, n_{i} \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \\ \cup \binom{2}{p}.$$

Clearly, this is a linear deterministic context-free language not being regular. Thus:

Theorem 3. All sets accepted by machines from DTM(3,1) are regular except one case (up to symmetries) yielding a linear deterministic context-free language. The halting problem for DTM(3,1) is decidable.

6. DTM(2, 2)

At first some methods reducing the number of machines to be treated are considered. Let $S = \{p,q\}$ and $V = \{0,1\}$. In the program of a Turing machine T let $f(s,x) \in V$, $g(s,x) \in \{L,M,R\}$, $h(s,x) \in S \cup \{H\}$ denote the new symbol to be written, the movement of the head, and the new state, respectively, if T is in state s and the head is scanning x. By Lemma 4 let there be exactly 1 possibility of H. Thus, from originally $13^4 = 28561$ only $4 \cdot 12^3 = 6912$ machines are left. Using Lemma 5, this number can be reduced to 3072.

246

Using the symmetries σ and μ from DTM(2, 1) and π defined by $\pi(p) = q, \pi(q) = p$, the following reductions decrease the number of Turing machines to be considered.

Lemma 7. It suffices to have only h(q, 1) = H as halting.

Proof. By using the symmetries σ, π , and $\sigma \pi = \pi \sigma$. \Box

By the next lemma g(q, 0) = L is eliminated.

Lemma 8. It suffices to have only g(q,0) = M or g(q,0) = R.

Proof. By using the symmetry μ . \Box

The following one fixes p as initial state.

Lemma 9. It suffices to have p as initial state.

Proof. Let q be initial state. Then there are 2 cases to be considered, namely h(q,0) = q and h(q,0) = p. The first case yields machines from DTM(2,1) which have been considered already. Let therefore h(q,0) = p with f(q,0) = z.

If g(q,0) = M then let γ be the deterministic *gsm*-mapping defined by the finite automaton

$$\left(V \cup (V \times S), \{A, B\}, \{A\}, \{B\}, \left\{AxxA, A\binom{z}{p}\binom{0}{q}B, BxxB \mid x \in V\right\}\right)$$

with initial state A and final state B. Then

$$L_s(T,q) = \gamma \left(L_s(T,p) \cap V^* {\binom{z}{p}} V^* \right) \cup {\binom{1}{q}}$$

If g(q,0) = R then let δ and ε be deterministic *gsm*-mappings defined by the finite automata

$$\left(V \cup (V \times S), \{A, B, C\}, \{A\}, \{C\}, \left\{AxxA, A\binom{x}{p}xB, Bz\binom{0}{q}C, CxxC \mid x \in V\right\}\right)$$

with initial state A and final state C, and

$$\left(V \cup (V \times \{p\}), \{A, B\}, \{A\}, \{B\}, \{A\}, \{B\}, \{A \begin{pmatrix} x \\ p \end{pmatrix} x B, B x x B \mid x \in V \right\}\right)$$

with initial state A and final state B. Then

$$L_{s}(T,q) = \binom{0}{q} \in (L_{s}(T,p) \cap (V \times \{p\}) \cdot V^{*})$$
$$\cup rev\left(\delta(rev\left(L_{s}(T,p) \cap V^{*}z(V \times \{p\})V^{*}\right)\right)\right) \cup \binom{1}{q}$$

where rev denotes the mirror image. \Box

Thus, the following cases remain to be considered: h(q,0) = p with g(q,0) = M or g(q,0) = R, and with h(p,0) = h(p,1) = q or h(p,0) = p, h(p,1) = q or h(p,0) = q, h(p,1) = p. h(p,0) = h(p,1) = p trivially can be ruled out.

The next reduction eliminates h(q, 0) = q.

Lemma 10. It suffices to have h(q, 0) = p only.

Proof. If h(q, 0) = q then, starting with p, all configurations ending in q yield regular sets since this is effectively a machine from DTM(2, 1). After reaching q this is again such a machine yielding regular sets only. \Box

Thus, after eliminating the case g(p,0) = R, g(p,1) = L, g(q,0) = M by the symmetry μ , the following cases remain (omitting f and h):

	p	q
0	$\cdot L \cdot$	$\cdot Mp$
1	·R·	H

	p	q			p	q		p	q		p	q		p	q
0	$\cdot L \cdot$	·Rp		0	$\cdot L \cdot$	·Rp	0	$\cdot L \cdot$	$\cdot Rp$	0	·M·	·Rp	0	$\cdot \overline{R} \cdot$	·Rp
1	·L·	Η	i	1	·M·	H	1	·R·	H	1	$\cdot L \cdot$	Η	1	·L·	Η

with the possibilities for h(p,0) and h(p,1) mentioned above. This leaves $6 \cdot 3 \cdot 4 \cdot 2 = 144$ machines from originally $4 \cdot 12^3 = 6912$.

The first case to consider is

Case 1: g(q,0) = M by the possibilities for h(p,0) and h(p,1). Case 1.1: h(p,0) = h(p,1) = q. Then

$$\begin{split} 0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} &\to \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ q \end{pmatrix} f(p,0) \to \begin{pmatrix} f(q,0) \\ p \end{pmatrix} f(p,0), \\ 1 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} &\to \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q \end{pmatrix} f(p,0) \to H, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} 0 \to f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ q \end{pmatrix} \to f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} f(q,0) \\ p \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} 1 \to f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q \end{pmatrix} \to H. \end{split}$$

Case 1.1.1: f(q, 0) = 0. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} &\stackrel{*}{\to} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} f(p, 0), \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} 0 &\stackrel{*}{\to} f(p, 1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} &\stackrel{*}{\to} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} f(p, 0) & \text{if } f(p, 1) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

M. Kudlek / Theoretical Computer Science 168 (1996) 241-255

$$\binom{1}{p} 0 \xrightarrow{*} f(p,1) \binom{0}{p} \xrightarrow{*} H \quad \text{if } f(p,1) = 1.$$

which shows no effective movement to the right, thus yielding a regular set.

Case 1.1.2: f(q, 0) = 1. Then

$$0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{*}{\to} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} f(p,0) \stackrel{*}{\to} f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} \text{ if } f(p,0) = 0,$$

$$0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{*}{\to} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} f(p,0) \stackrel{*}{\to} H \text{ if } f(p,0) = 1,$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} 0 \stackrel{*}{\to} f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix}.$$

which shows no effective movement to the left, thus also yielding a regular set. Case 1.2: h(p,0) = q, h(p,1) = p. Then

$$\begin{split} 0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} &\to \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ q \end{pmatrix} f(p,0) \to \begin{pmatrix} f(q,0) \\ p \end{pmatrix} f(p,0), \\ 1 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} &\to \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q \end{pmatrix} f(p,0) \to H, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} 0 \to f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} 1 \to f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix}. \end{split}$$

Case 1.2.1: f(q, 0) = 0. Then

$$0\binom{0}{p} \xrightarrow{*} \binom{0}{p} f(p,0)$$

and

$$L_{s}(T, p) = 10^{*} {\binom{0}{p}} \cup 10^{*} {\binom{1}{p}} 1^{*}0 \text{ if } f(p, 1) = 0,$$
$$L_{s}(T, p) = 10^{*} {\binom{0}{p}} \cup {\binom{1}{p}} 1^{*}0 \text{ if } f(p, 1) = 1.$$

Case 1.2.2: f(q, 0) = 1. Then

$$0\binom{0}{p} \xrightarrow{*} \binom{1}{p} f(p,0) \to f(p,1)\binom{f(p,0)}{p}$$

and the machine has no effective movement to the left, thus yielding a regular set.

Case 1.3: h(p,0) = p, h(p,1) = q. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} &\to \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} f(p,0), \\ 1 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p \end{pmatrix} &\to \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} f(p,0), \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} 0 &\to f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ q \end{pmatrix} &\to f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} f(q,0) \\ p \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} 1 &\to f(p,1) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q \end{pmatrix} &\to H. \end{aligned}$$

Case 1.3.1: f(q, 0) = 0. Then

$$\binom{1}{p} 0 \xrightarrow{*} f(p,1) \binom{0}{p} \to \binom{f(p,1)}{p} f(p,0).$$

This gives no effective movement to the right, thus yielding regular sets.

Case 1.3.2: f(q, 0) = 1. Then

$$\binom{1}{p} 0 \xrightarrow{*} f(p,1) \binom{1}{p}$$

and

$$L_{s}(T,p) = 10^{*} {\binom{0}{p}} 0^{*} 1 \cup {\binom{1}{p}} 0^{*} 1 \text{ if } f(p,0) = 0,$$
$$L_{s}(T,p) = 10^{*} {\binom{0}{p}} \cup {\binom{1}{p}} 0^{*} 1 \text{ if } f(p,0) = 1.$$

Now the 120 remaining machines are considered with Case 2: g(q,0) = R.

Case 2.1: g(p,0) = g(p,1) = L. Case 2.1.1: h(p,0) = h(p,1) = p:

$$x\binom{y}{p} \to \binom{x}{p}f(p,y)$$

yielding no halt at all.

Case 2.1.2: h(p,0) = p, h(p,1) = q or h(p,0) = q, h(p,1) = p. Let $m \in \{0,1\}$ and n = 1 - m such that h(p,m) = p and h(p,n) = q. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x\binom{m}{p} &\to \binom{x}{p} f(p,m), \\ 0\binom{n}{p} &\to \binom{0}{q} f(p,n) \to f(q,0)\binom{f(p,n)}{p}, \end{aligned}$$

M. Kudlek / Theoretical Computer Science 168 (1996) 241-255

$$\binom{n}{p} \to \binom{1}{q} f(p,n) \to H$$

giving no effective movement to the right, and thus only regular sets.

Case 2.1.3: h(p,0) = h(p,1) = q:

$$0 \begin{pmatrix} y \\ p \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ q \end{pmatrix} f(p, y) \to f(q, 0) \begin{pmatrix} f(p, y) \\ p \end{pmatrix},$$
$$1 \begin{pmatrix} y \\ p \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q \end{pmatrix} f(p, y) \to H$$

giving no effective movement at all, and thus only regular sets.

For the remaining 2 subcases the following considerations give a further reduction of the number of cases.

Let $j \in \{0,1\}$ be such that g(p,j) = L and k = 1 - j. If h(p,j) = q then there is no effective movement to the left since

$$\begin{aligned} x \binom{j}{p} &\to \binom{x}{q} f(p,j) \to f(q,x) \binom{f(p,j)}{p}, \\ \binom{k}{p} &\to \binom{f(p,k)}{h(p,k)} \quad \text{if } g(p,k) = M, \\ \binom{k}{p} y \to f(p,k) \binom{y}{h(p,k)} \quad \text{if } g(p,k) = R, \end{aligned}$$

thus giving only regular sets. Therefore, h(p, j) = p has to be considered only.

If h(p,k) = p then the machine will never halt. Thus assume h(p,k) = q. Case 2.2: g(p,k) = M. Then

$$\begin{split} j\binom{j}{p} &\to \binom{j}{p} f(p,j), \\ k\binom{j}{p} &\to \binom{k}{p} f(p,j) \to \binom{0}{q} f(p,j) \to f(q,0) \binom{f(p,j)}{p} \quad \text{if } f(p,k) = 0, \\ \binom{k}{p} y \to \binom{0}{q} y \to f(q,0) \binom{y}{p}, \\ k\binom{j}{p} &\to \binom{k}{p} f(p,j) \to \binom{1}{q} f(p,j) \to H \quad \text{if } f(p,k) = 1, \\ \binom{k}{p} y \to \binom{1}{q} y \to H \end{split}$$

yielding effectively a machine from DTM(2,1) with only regular sets.

Thus

Case 2.3: g(p,k) = R may be assumed such that the following cases remain: g(p,j) = L, h(p,j) = p, g(p,k) = R, h(p,k) = q, g(q,0) = R, h(q,0) = p with $j, f(p,j), f(p,k), f(q,0) \in \{0,1\}$ and $k \neq j$. This leaves 16 Turing machines to consider. At first

Case 2.3.1: f(p, j) = 1 one has

$$j\binom{j}{p} \rightarrow \binom{j}{p} 1,$$

$$k\binom{j}{p} \rightarrow \binom{k}{p} 1 \rightarrow f(p,k)\binom{1}{q} \rightarrow H,$$

$$\binom{k}{p} 0j \rightarrow f(p,k)\binom{0}{q}j \rightarrow f(p,k)f(q,0)\binom{j}{p},$$

$$\binom{k}{p} 0k \rightarrow f(p,k)\binom{0}{q}k \rightarrow f(p,k)f(q,0)\binom{k}{p},$$

$$\binom{k}{p} 1 \rightarrow f(p,k)\binom{1}{q} \rightarrow H$$

yielding as accepted sets

$$L_s(T, p) = kj^* \binom{j}{p} \cup \binom{k}{p} (0k)^* 1 \cup L'_s(T, p)$$

with

$$L'_{s}(T,p) = \binom{k}{p} (0k)^{*} 0j \quad \text{if } f(q,0) = k \text{ or } (f(q,0) = j \text{ and } f(p,k) = k),$$
$$L'_{s}(T,p) = kj^{*} \binom{k}{p} (0k)^{*} 0j \quad \text{if } f(q,0) = f(p,k) = j$$

being all regular.

Case 2.3.2: f(p,j) = 0. Here one has

$$\begin{split} j\binom{j}{p} &\to \binom{j}{p} 0, \\ k\binom{j}{p} j \to \binom{k}{p} 0 j \to f(p,k) \binom{0}{q} j \to f(p,k) f(q,0) \binom{j}{p}, \\ k\binom{j}{p} k \to \binom{k}{p} 0 k \to f(p,k) \binom{0}{q} k \to f(p,k) f(q,0) \binom{k}{p}, \\ \binom{k}{p} 0 j \to f(p,k) \binom{0}{q} j \to f(p,k) f(q,0) \binom{j}{p}, \end{split}$$

$$\binom{k}{p} 0k \to f(p,k) \binom{0}{q} k \to f(p,k) f(q,0) \binom{k}{p},$$
$$\binom{k}{p} 1 \to f(p,k) \binom{1}{q} \to H.$$

Case 2.3.2.1: f(q, 0) = k. This yields as accepted sets

$$L_{s}(T,p) = \left(10^{*} {\binom{0}{p}} 0^{*} 1 \cup {\binom{1}{p}} \right) (0^{+} 1)^{*} 1 \quad \text{if } k = 1,$$
$$L_{s}(T,p) = \left({\binom{0}{p}} \cup 0 {\binom{1}{p}} 1^{*} 0 \cup 01^{+} {\binom{1}{p}} \right) (01^{*} 0)^{*} 1 \quad \text{if } k = 0$$

being all regular.

Case 2.3.2.2: f(q,0) = j. Here all 4 remaining machines have to be considered.

$$j = 0: L_s(T,p) = \left(1\binom{0}{p}1 \cup \binom{1}{p}\right)(01)^*1$$
$$j = 1, f(p,0) = 0:$$
$$L_s(T,p) = \left(\binom{0}{p} \cup 0(11)^*\left(\binom{1}{p}(0\cup1) \cup 1\binom{1}{p}\right)\right)(0(0\cup1))^*1$$

all being regular.

The only remaining machine, with j = 1, f(p,0) = 1 however, does not yield a regular set but

$$L_{s}(T, p) = \left\{ 0(11)^{m_{k}} u_{k-1} \cdots u_{1}(11)^{m_{1}} {\binom{0}{p}} 0(00)^{n_{0}} 1(00)^{n_{1}} v_{1} \cdots v_{k-1}(00)^{n_{k}} 01, \\ 0(11)^{m_{k}} u_{k-1} \cdots u_{1}(11)^{m_{1}} {\binom{1}{p}} (00)^{n_{1}} v_{1} \cdots v_{k-1}(00)^{n_{k}} 01, \\ 01(11)^{m_{k}} u_{k-1} \cdots u_{1}(11)^{m_{1}} {\binom{0}{p}} 0(00)^{n_{0}} 1(00)^{n_{1}} v_{1} \cdots v_{k-1}(00)^{n_{k}} 1, \\ 01(11)^{m_{k}} u_{k-1} \cdots u_{1}(11)^{m_{1}} {\binom{0}{p}} (00)^{n_{1}} v_{1} \cdots v_{k-1}(00)^{n_{k}} 1 \mid \\ k \ge 0, m_{i} \ge 0, n_{i} \ge 0, (u_{i} = 0, v_{i} = 1) \text{ or } (u_{i} = v_{i} = 01) \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that this set is not regular but a linear deterministic context-free language being similar to that one from DTM(3,1).

253

Summarizing, one obtains

Theorem 4. All sets accepted by Turing machines from DTM(2,2) are regular except one case only (up to symmetries) giving a linear deterministic context-free language. The halting problem for DTM(2,2) is decidable.

It should be noted that the machine last mentioned is not the beasy beaver machine for DTM(2,2) since that one is the following which can be shown easily:

	p	q
0	1Lq	1 <i>Rp</i>
1	Rq	H

It should also be mentioned that in most cases the sets $L_s(T,p)$ and $L_c(T,p)$ are identical, but that there are some exceptions.

7. DTM(4,4)

Here only a machine accepting a language being not context-free is presented. This machine is

	p	q	r	S
0	R	R	L	L
1	Rq	0Rp	L	Lq
2	R	H	Rp	
3	Lr	2Ls		

where the open positions are irrelevant and may be filled by M.

For the accepted language the following fact holds:

$$L_s(T,p)\cap \binom{2}{p}1^*33=\left\{\binom{2}{p}1^{2^n}33|n\geq 0\right\}.$$

showing that $L_s(T,p)$ is not context-free.

Recently, it has been shown [3] that there exist Turing machines in DTM(2, 5) and DTM(3, 6) closely related to Collatz problems with unknown solutions.

Finally, in 1992 the existence of a universal Turing machine in DTM(3, 10) was shown [8], and in 1995 the existence of another one in DTM(18, 2) [9].

There exists also an unpublished proof by Pavlockaya on the decidability of the halting problem for DTM(3, 2).

Acknowledgements

The author thanks the unknown reviewer for careful reading and useful hints.

References

- V. Diekert and M. Kudlek, Small deterministic Turing machines, Papers on Automata and Languages, Dept. of Math., Karl Marx Univ. of Economics, Budapest, 1988-4, (1989) 77-87.
- [2] G.T. Herman, The Halting problem of one state Turing machines with n-dimensional tape, Z. Math. Logik Grundl. Math. 14 (1968) 185-191.
- [3] P. Michel, Busy beaver competition and Collatz-like problems, Arch. Math. Logic 32 (1993) 351-367.
- [4] M.I. Minsky, Size and structure of universal Turing machines using tag systems, in: Recursive Function Theory, Symposia in Pure Mathematics Vol. 5 (AMS, Providence, RI, 1962) 229–238.
- [5] M.I. Minsky, Computation. Finite and Infinite Machines (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1967–1972).
- [6] L.M. Pavlockaya, Dostatočnye usloviya razrešimosti problemy ostanovki dlya mašin Tyuringa, Problemy Kibernetiki 33 (1978) 91-118.
- [7] Yu.V. Rogozhin, Sem' universal'nyh mašin Tyuringa, Matematičeskie Issledovaniya 69 (1982) 76-90.
- [8] Yu.V. Rogozhin, Universal'naya mašina Tyuringa s 10 sostayaniyah i 3 simbolami, Izvestiya Akademii Nauk Respubliki Moldova Matematika (10) (1992) 80-82.
- [9] Yu.V. Rogozhin, On the notion of universality and Shannon's problem for Turing machines, Presented at MCU/UMC'95, Paris.
- [10] S. Watanabe, 5-symbol 8-state and 5-symbol 6-state universal Turing machines, J. ACM 8 (1961) 476-483.