

INFINITELY GROWING CONFIGURATIONS IN EMIL POST'S TAG SYSTEM PROBLEM

NIKITA V. KURILENKO

ABSTRACT. Emil Post's tag system problem is the question of whether or not a tag system $\{N = 3, P(0) = 00, P(1) = 1101\}$ has a configuration, simulation of which will never halt or end up in a loop. For the past decades, there were several attempts to find an answer to this question, including a recent study, during which the first 2^{84} initial configurations were checked [9]. This paper presents a family of configurations of this type in a form of strings $a^n bc^m$, that evolve to $a^{n+1} bc^{m+1}$ after a finite amount of steps. The proof of this behavior for all non-negative n and m is described further in a paper as a finite verification procedure, which is computationally bounded by 20000 iterations of tag. All corresponding code can be found at <https://github.com/nikitakurilenko/post-tag-infinitely-growing-configurations>.

1. INTRODUCTION

A tag system is a computational model introduced by Emil Post, capable of universal computations [2]. Every tag system is a single string manipulation rule that transforms one string to another by adding symbols to the right side and then removing symbols from the left side. Added symbols depend only on the first symbol of an input string, and the amount of deleted symbols is fixed. Therefore any tag system can be represented by a positive integer N , called *deletion number*, and a symbol-to-string function $P : A \rightarrow A^*$ (where A is an alphabet of a string), called *production rules*. In his paper about canonical systems [6], Emil Post mentioned the tag system $\{N = 3, P(0) = 00, P(1) = 1101\}$ as being "intractable". Since then this tag system appeared in literature as an example of a simple dynamic system that produces chaotic behavior, similar to the behavior of Syracuse function from the famous Collatz conjecture [5], which is still an open problem. *Emil Post's tag system problem* asks if there are strings that will show unbounded growth during manipulations of the system $\{N = 3, P(0) = 00, P(1) = 1101\}$.

As already mentioned in [9] there is no extensive literature on this topic. The main experiments were conducted by Watabale [8], Hayes [4], Asveld [1], Shearer [7], De Mol [3], and, recently, Wolfram [9]. In each study, a large set of initial configurations was checked, and in several of them, new families of periodic evolutions were discovered. The most noticeable works on this problem are [3] and [9], as [3] studied a large set of similar tag systems, and [9] checked a huge amount of possible candidates and presented insightful visualizations of chaotic behavior. Since the quality of computational tools is getting better every year, the problem, if we assume the existence of configurations with unbounded growth, is getting closer to resolution. In this paper, we present a family of configurations of this type and study their behavior in detail.

These strings have an important property that makes them suitable for the theorem related to Post's tag system problem.

Theorem 1. *For Post's tag system there are strings a , b and c such that every string $a^n b c^m$ will eventually evolve to string $a^{n+1} b c^{m+1}$.*

While the lengths of a and c are small, the length of b is 2402, which makes this example hard to find. Note that in particular, b evolves to abc (after 10444 iterations), so b is a zero element of a constructed set. It is not known yet whether or not there is a shorter example of b , but it is possible. Larger examples are very likely to exist.

After a , b , c candidates are given it is easy to check, that the statement is valid for all n and m less than 100. The next step is to formally prove Theorem 1 for every other value of n and m . We will do this in the next section by using properties of a , b , and c and by constructing a verification procedure to fully describe the evolution of words $a^n b c^m$.

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN STATEMENT

We use lower indexing with square brackets to indicate string cutting (from the beginning of a string); for example $1010001_{[2]} = 10001$, $101_{[0]} = 101$. Cutting indices are written in modulo 3, so for example if $n = 1$ then $101100_{[-n]} = 1100$ and $0111000_{[n+n+n+n]} = 111000$.

To avoid corner cases it is assumed that every string in every statement has a large enough length (at least four symbols), so statements like $(ab)_{[x]} = a_{[x]}b$ always hold.

Similarly to string cutting a function l is defined as a length of string modulo 3. As with low indexing addition and subtraction of values of l conducted through modular arithmetic: if $l(a) = 2$ and $l(b) = 1$ then $l(ab) = 0$ and $l(aab) = 2$. By definition the following statement is true:

Lemma 1. $l(a_{[n]}) = l(a) - n$

Proof. Each symbol deletion decreases length by 1. n deletions decreases length by n , and $l(a)$ decreases by n modulo 3. \square

To simplify and prove statements about the behavior of Post's tag system, we define three supporting functions g , f , and F , that break down evolutions of strings $a^n b c^m$ into analyzable groups of operations.

A function g takes every third element of an input string (discards other elements) and replaces it with 1101 if an element is 1, else replaces it with 00. For example, $g(1) = 1101$, $g(000100) = 001101$. The following formula is useful to operate g :

Lemma 2. $g((ab)_{[x]}) = g(a_{[x]})g(b_{[x-l(a)]})$

Proof. If G_s is a set that includes every third element of a string s , then it is easy to see that if the length of a is divisible by 3, then $G_{ab} = G_a \cup G_b$ (hence $g(ab) = g(a)g(b)$).

If $l(a) = 2$ (length of a equals $3 \times k + 2$ for some non-negative k), $g(ab)$ in particular processes every third element of b starting with the second symbol, instead of the first symbol, because

"remainder" symbols of a will shift a set of processed symbols of b . This can be summarized in a formula

$$l(a) = 2 \implies G_{ab} = G_a \cup G_{b_{[1]}}.$$

Similarly,

$$l(a) = 1 \implies G_{ab} = G_a \cup G_{b_{[2]}},$$

which concludes formula

$$G_{ab} = G_a \cup G_{b_{[-l(a)]}},$$

hence proving

$$g(ab) = g(a)g(b_{[-l(a)]}).$$

This formula can split $g((ab)_{[x]})$ into two parts:

$$g((ab)_{[x]}) = g(a_{[x]}b) = g(a_{[x]})g(b_{[-l(a_{[x]})]}).$$

By Lemma 1:

$$g(a_{[x]})g(b_{[-l(a_{[x]})]}) = g(a_{[x]})g(b_{[-(l(a)-x)]}) = g(a_{[x]})g(b_{[x-l(a)]}).$$

□

We define f as a single transformation of the tag system (adding 1101 or 00 and deleting 3 symbols) and F as a function that applies f to an input string until all symbols of the initial string are removed. By definition, the following statement is correct:

Lemma 3. $F(a) = g(a)_{[-l(a)]}$

The verification procedure related to Theorem 1 is the following:

Lemma 4. For binary strings a, b, c, d, e, f (of length at least 3) and numbers $x, y \in \{0, 1, 2\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} x - l(b) = y \pmod{3}, l(a) = l(c) = 0, g(a_{[x]}) = d, g(b_{[x]}) = e, g(c_{[y]}) = f \implies \\ \implies \forall n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : F((a^n b c^m)_{[x]}) = (d^n e f^m)_{[y]} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3:

$$F((a^n b c^m)_{[x]}) = g((a^n b c^m)_{[x]})_{[-l((a^n b c^m)_{[x]})]}.$$

Lemma 1, a property $l(st) = l(s) + l(t)$, conditions $l(a) = l(c) = 0$ and $x - l(b) = y$ can simplify cutting index:

$$-l((a^n b c^m)_{[x]}) = -(l(a^n b c^m) - x) = x - l(a^n b c^m) = x - (l(a) \times n + l(b) + l(c) \times m) = x - l(b) = y. \quad (1)$$

To simplify $g((a^n b c^m)_{[x]})$, first, we need to iteratively apply Lemma 2 and Lemma 1 to the left part of string and use condition $l(a) = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} g((a^n b c^m)_{[x]}) &= g(a_{[x]})g((a^{n-1} b c^m)_{[x-l(a)]}) = g(a_{[x]})g((a^{n-1} b c^m)_{[x]}), \\ g((a^n b c^m)_{[x]}) &= g(a_{[x]})^n g((b c^m)_{[x]}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we need to apply Lemma 2 to b part and use condition $x - l(b) = y$:

$$g(a_{[x]})^n g((b c^m)_{[x]}) = g(a_{[x]})^n g(b_{[x]})g((c^m)_{[x-l(b)]}) = g(a_{[x]})^n g(b_{[x]})g((c^m)_{[y]})$$

Finally, we need to simplify the right side of a string the same way the left side was simplified:

$$g(a_{[x]})^n g(b_{[x]}) g((c^m)_{[y]}) = g(a_{[x]})^n g(b_{[x]}) g(c_{[y]}) g((c^{m-1})_{[y-l(c)]}) = g(a_x)^n g(b_{[x]}) g(c_{[y]}) g((c^{m-1})_{[y]})$$

$$g(a_{[x]})^n g(b_{[x]}) g((c^m)_{[y]}) = g(a_{[x]})^n g(b_{[x]}) g(c_{[y]})^m \quad (2)$$

Combining (1) and (2) with remaining conditions produces the desired equation:

$$F((a^n b c^m)_{[x]}) = g((a^n b c^m)_{[x]})_{[-l((a^n b c^m)_{[x]})]} = (g(a_{[x]})^n g(b_{[x]}) g(c_{[y]})^m)_{[y]} = (d^n e f^m)_{[y]}$$

□

Lemma 4 essentially builds a procedure to verify that a slightly truncated string in a form of $a^n b c^m$ goes to a slightly truncated string in a form of $d^n e f^m$ in a finite amount of steps for every possible n and m .

To prove Theorem 1 we need to create a sequence of quadruplets (a_i, b_i, c_i, x_i) (triples of strings and corresponding cutting indices) that starts with quadruplet (a_1, b_1, c_1, x_1) and ends with quadruplet $(a_{n+1}, b_{n+1}, c_{n+1}, x_{n+1}) = (a_1, a_1 b_1 c_1, c_1, x_1)$, then iteratively apply Lemma 4 to each pair of adjacent quadruplets. Such sequence ω of 14 quadruplets is presented in Appendix A of this paper. Using Lemma 4 we can verify the following lemma for ω :

Lemma 5. *The following properties of ω are valid:*

$$(i) \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, 13\}, \forall n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0 : F(\omega_{i,1}^n \omega_{i,2} \omega_{i,3}^m)_{[\omega_{i,4}]} = (\omega_{i+1,1}^n \omega_{i+1,2} \omega_{i+1,3}^m)_{[\omega_{i+1,4}]}$$

$$(ii) \quad (\omega_{14,1}, \omega_{14,2}, \omega_{14,3}, \omega_{14,4}) = (\omega_{1,1}, \omega_{1,1} \omega_{1,2} \omega_{1,3}, \omega_{1,3}, \omega_{1,4})$$

Since conditions of Lemma 4 are equations in a form $l(s) = k$ or $g(s_{1[k_1]}) = s_{2[k_2]}$, they can be easily verified by a computer (see the Github repository).

4. NOTION OF BUILDING BLOCKS

In this section we briefly shift focus of this paper to heuristics that were used to find strings a , b and c . We introduce the notion of building blocks and make an important claim about the properties of these objects. These structures were implemented along with simple heuristics and programming tricks, but since they have no scientific value, they wouldn't be mentioned.

Suppose $B = \{\varepsilon, v, vv\}\{0, 1\}\{uu0, uu1\}^* \{\varepsilon, w, ww\}$. A *converting set* $B(a)$ for string a from $\{v, u, w, 0, 1\}^*$ is defined as following:

$$B(a) = \{b \in B \mid b \text{ derives from } a \text{ by replacing some of } w \text{ symbols with } u, \\ \text{some of } 0 \text{ and } 1 \text{ symbols with } v, u \text{ or } w\}$$

For example:

$$\begin{aligned}
B(1uu11100) &= \{1uu1uu0w\}, \\
B(v1w0) &= \{v1ww\}, \\
B(0000) &= \{0uu0, v0ww, vv0w\}, \\
B(111) &= \{1ww, v1w, vv1\}, \\
B(10101) &= \{1uu0w, v0uu1, vv1ww\}, \\
B(w1v) &= \{\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We call n strings from B a *building block*. We illustrate them as aligned arrays (See Fig. 1).




FIGURE 1. Illustration of building blocks.

A function $c(a, x) : A^* \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ defined as a function that counts a number of symbols x in string a .

An important procedure that helps to work with building blocks is block extension. The procedure (for the right) is presented as Algorithm 1 and illustrated in Fig. 2. The extension to the left side works the same way, except we add \hat{b}_i to the left side and converting set needs to be redefined.

We call a building block an *initial building block* if it is constructed with another procedure, defined as Algorithm 2 and illustrated in Fig 3

Conjecture 1. *If (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) is a building block and:*

- (i) (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) is constructed from initial building block by several extensions
- (ii) $b_1 = b_{n+1}$
- (iii) $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : c(b_i, w) + c(b_{i+1}, v) = 2$
- (iv) $\exists i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : c(b_i, v) = 0$

then (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) can be reconstructed to periodic evolution of Post's system of tag.

Algorithm 1: Building block extension from the right side

Input: Building block (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1})
Output: None

 \triangleright *in-place algorithm*

 Create a string \hat{b}_1 that $B(b_1\hat{b}_1) = \{b\}$ and $c(b, 0) + c(b, 1) - c(b_1, 0) - c(b_1, 1) = 1$
for i *in* $\{1, \dots, n\}$ **do**

 add \hat{b}_i to the right side of b_i

 replace $b_i\hat{b}_i$ with element from $B(b_i\hat{b}_i)$

 if all symbols of \hat{b}_i in $b_i\hat{b}_i$ are changed during replacement **then**

 return

 else

 form a string \hat{b}_{i+1} by taking unchanged 0's and 1's of \hat{b}_i and changing 0's to 00's
 and 1's to 1101's

return




FIGURE 2. Illustration of Algorithm 1.

This conjecture has several important implications. Mainly it creates a new method for finding periodic evolutions for Post's system of tag. Since for a fixed n the amount of possible initial configurations and block extensions is limited, the search becomes much easier. In particular, most extensions can not be performed one after another, and we can graph connections between them to use this graph to speed up computations. The search goal now becomes to start from any initial building block and extend it using constructed graph so conditions


Algorithm 2: Creation of initial block**Input:** None**Output:** Building block (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) or NoneChoose \hat{b}_1 from $\{\epsilon, v, vv\}\{0, 1\}\{\epsilon, w, ww\}$ **for** i **in** $\{1, \dots, n\}$ **do** replace \hat{b}_i with element b_i from $B(\hat{b}_i)$ **if** $c(b_i, 0) + c(b_i, 1) = 0$ **then** **return** None **else** form a string \hat{b}_{i+1} by taking 0's and 1's of b_i and changing 0's to 00's and 1's to 1101'sreplace \hat{b}_i with element b_i from $B(\hat{b}_i)$ **return** (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) 

FIGURE 3. Illustration of Algorithm 2.

(ii), (iii) and (iv) are met. This method allows to check (in implicit way) configurations with extremely large lengths, since now we iterate over loop lengths and not word lengths, hence producing more interesting results.

Conjecture 1 concerns periodic evolutions of Post's system of tag, but it can be used for non-periodic evolutions as well - the only difference is a slightly more complicated condition (ii). In general, switching from "vertical search" to "horizontal search" is a useful tool to analyze behavior of any system of tag. This tool is not well suited for Collatz conjecture, as the length of any building block will be too big to use extensions graph, but we hope that maybe in the future these structures will help to find insights for this problem too.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS


I want to thank my company management, notably Eugene I. Khorev, for providing me with a flexible work schedule and computational power to complete this project. I also thank Kirill V. Sapunov for reading the initial draft of this paper. I thank prof. Alexander P. Ryjov for supporting me during publication process.

REFERENCES


[1] Asveld P. R. J. (1992). Post's system of tag - A simple discrete nonlinear system. *Proceedings of Nonlinear Dynamics - Twente 91*, 26–31.
 [2] Cocke, J. and Minsky, M. (1964). Universality of tag systems with $P = 2$. *Journal of the ACM*, 11(1), 15–20.
 [3] De Mol L. (2011). On the complex behavior of simple tag systems - an experimental approach. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(1-2), 97–112.
 [4] Hayes B. (1986). Theory and practice: Tag-you're it. *Computer Language*, 12, 21-28.
 [5] Lagarias J. C. (2010). *The Ultimate Challenge: The $3x+1$ Problem*. American Mathematical Society.
 [6] Post E. (1943). Formal reductions of the general combinatorial decision problem. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 65(2), 197-215.
 [7] Shearer J. B. (1996). Periods of strings (letter to the editor). *American Scientist*, 86, 207.
 [8] Watanabe S. (1963). Periodicity of Post's normal process of tag. *Microwave Research Institute symposia series*, 12, 83–99.
 [9] Wolfram S. (2021). After 100 Years, Can We Finally Crack Post's Problem of Tag? A Story of Computational Irreducibility, and More, arXiv:2103.06931.























APPENDIX A. SEQUENCE ω

Strings a , b and c can be rewritten more compactly since all of them consist of substrings 00 (\blacksquare) and 1101 (\blacksquare):




All strings from sequence ω can be rewritten the same way too. As described above the sequence contains 14 quadruplets $(a_1, b_1, c_1, x_1), \dots, (a_{14}, b_{14}, c_{14}, x_{14})$ to represent strings $(a_1^n b_1 c_1^m)_{[x_1]}, \dots, (a_{14}^n b_{14} c_{14}^m)_{[x_{14}]}$. The values of subarrays $a_{1,\dots,14}$, $c_{1,\dots,14}$ and $x_{1,\dots,14}$ are the following:




$a_4 =$		$c_4 =$		$x_4 = 2$
$a_5 =$		$c_5 =$		$x_5 = 1$
$a_6 =$		$c_6 =$		$x_6 = 0$
$a_7 =$		$c_7 =$		$x_7 = 1$
$a_8 =$		$c_8 =$		$x_8 = 0$
$a_9 =$		$c_9 =$		$x_9 = 1$
$a_{10} =$		$c_{10} =$		$x_{10} = 2$
$a_{11} =$		$c_{11} =$		$x_{11} = 0$
$a_{12} =$		$c_{12} =$		$x_{12} = 0$
$a_{13} =$		$c_{13} =$		$x_{13} = 1$
$a_{14} =$		$c_{14} =$		$x_{14} = 0$


Strings b_1, \dots, b_{14} are significantly longer and will be presented separately:




$b_4 =$




$b_5 =$




$b_6 =$








$b_7 =$



$b_8 =$



$b_9 =$  $b_{10} =$  $b_{11} =$  $b_{12} =$  $b_{13} =$ 

$b_{14} =$ 