

A_{TM} is Turing Undecidable

In our study of Turing decidability, we consider Turing machines with states q_{accept} and q_{reject} . We start with the following definition: A language L is Turing decidable if and only if there exists a Turing machine M_L such that:

- M_L halts on every input string w with either “accept” or “reject”.
- M_L accepts w if and only if $w \in L$.

When these two conditions hold, we say M_L decides L . However, there are languages for which no Turing machine exists to decide them. Such languages are called Turing undecidable.

Another important concept is encoding. We use the notation $\langle M \rangle$ to denote the encoding of a Turing machine as a string. We now define (and prove) a Turing undecidable language, A_{TM}

$$A_{\text{TM}} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine and } M \text{ accepts } w \}$$

Theorem: A_{TM} is Turing undecidable.

Proof: (by contradiction) Let H be a Turing machine which decides A_{TM} . We now construct Turing machine D that uses H as a subroutine.

$D =$ “On input $\langle M \rangle$
1. Construct the string $\langle M, \langle M \rangle \rangle$
2. Run H on input $\langle M, \langle M \rangle \rangle$
 a. If H accepts, then reject
 b. If H rejects, then accept ”

If M accepts its own description¹ $\langle M \rangle$ then D rejects $\langle M \rangle$. Conversely, if M does not accept its own description, then D accepts $\langle M \rangle$.

We now consider the case when D is run on its own description $\langle D \rangle$. By definition of D we have:

- If H decides that D accepts $\langle D \rangle$ (on line 2), then D rejects $\langle D \rangle$ (on line 2a).
- If H decides that D rejects $\langle D \rangle$ (on line 2), then D accepts $\langle D \rangle$ (on line 2b).

These two statements above are a contradiction and the theorem is proven. ■

The language A_{TM} is known as the “Acceptance Problem”.

¹The C compiler “gcc” is written in C and it is capable of compiling its own source code. The concept of a program that accepts its own description is a little unusual, but certainly possible.

When a Turing machine M runs on input w there are three possible outcomes:

- M halts with “accept”
- M halts with “reject”
- M runs forever

The possibility that a Turing machine (i.e., a computer program) never stops has important implications to computer science theory. Given a machine M and input w , the problem of deciding whether M eventually halts on input w is known as the *Halting Problem*. The Halting Problem is also Turing undecidable.

Turing Recognizability A language L is Turing recognizable if and only if there exists a Turing machine M such that if M is run on an input string $w \in L$, M will accept w in finitely many steps. However, given a string $x \notin L$, M may reject x , but it may also run forever.

Theorem: A_{TM} is Turing recognizable.

Proof: The following Turing machine is a recognizer for A_{TM} .

$R =$ “On input $\langle M, w \rangle$
1. Run (simulate) M on input w
 a. If M accepts, then accept
 b. If M rejects, then reject ”

If M accepts w , then $\langle M, w \rangle \in A_{\text{TM}}$ and R will accept on line 1a. Therefore, R recognizes A_{TM}

Theorem: If a language L and its complement \bar{L} are both recognizable, then they are both decidable.

Proof: Let R_L and $R_{\bar{L}}$ be recognizers for L and \bar{L} respectively. We construct the following Turing machine:

$S =$ “On input $\langle w \rangle$
1. For $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ do
 a. Run R_L for k steps. If R_L accepts, then accept.
 b. Run $R_{\bar{L}}$ for k steps. If $R_{\bar{L}}$ accepts, then reject.”

Observe that S decides L . The input string w must belong to either L or \bar{L} , but not both. Eventually either R_L or $R_{\bar{L}}$ must recognize (accept) w . At that point we know whether $w \in L$ or $w \in \bar{L}$.

The Turing machine S decides L but a similar machine can be used to decide \bar{L} . Therefore, both L and \bar{L} are decidable.

Corollary: $\overline{A_{\text{TM}}}$ is not Turing recognizable.