In Chapter 4 we established the Turing machine as our model of a general purpose computer. We presented several examples of problems that are solvable on a Turing machine and gave one example of a problem, \( A_{TM} \), that is computationally unsolvable. In this chapter we examine several additional unsolvable problems. In doing so, we introduce the primary method for proving that problems are computationally unsolvable. It is called reducibility.

A reduction is a way of converting one problem to another problem in such a way that a solution to the second problem can be used to solve the first problem. Such reductions come up often in everyday life, even if we don’t usually refer to them in this way.

For example, suppose that you want to find your way around a new city. You know that doing so would be easy if you had a map. Thus, you can reduce the problem of finding your way around the city to the problem of obtaining a map of the city.

Reducibility always involves two problems, which we call \( A \) and \( B \). If \( A \) reduces to \( B \), we can use a solution to \( B \) to solve \( A \). So in our example, \( A \) is the problem of finding your way around the city and \( B \) is the problem of obtaining a map. Note that reducibility says nothing about solving \( A \) or \( B \) alone, but only about the solvability of \( A \) in the presence of a solution to \( B \).

The following are further examples of reducibilities. The problem of traveling from Boston to Paris reduces to the problem of buying a plane ticket between the two cities. That problem in turn reduces to the problem of earning the money for the ticket. And that problem reduces to the problem of finding a job.
Reducibility also occurs in mathematical problems. For example, the problem of measuring the area of a rectangle reduces to the problem of measuring its length and width. The problem of solving a system of linear equations reduces to the problem of inverting a matrix.

Reducibility plays an important role in classifying problems by decidability, and later in complexity theory as well. When $A$ is reducible to $B$, solving $A$ cannot be harder than solving $B$ because a solution to $B$ gives a solution to $A$. In terms of computability theory, if $A$ is reducible to $B$ and $B$ is decidable, $A$ also is decidable. Equivalently, if $A$ is undecidable and reducible to $B$, $B$ is undecidable. This last version is key to proving that various problems are undecidable.

In short, our method for proving that a problem is undecidable will be to show that some other problem already known to be undecidable reduces to it.

## 5.1

### UNDECIDABLE PROBLEMS FROM LANGUAGE THEORY

We have already established the undecidability of $A_{TM}$, the problem of determining whether a Turing machine accepts a given input. Let's consider a related problem, $HALT_{TM}$, the problem of determining whether a Turing machine halts (by accepting or rejecting) on a given input. This problem is widely known as the halting problem. We use the undecidability of $A_{TM}$ to prove the undecidability of the halting problem by reducing $A_{TM}$ to $HALT_{TM}$. Let

$$HALT_{TM} = \{(M, w) | M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ halts on input } w\}.$$  

#### THEOREM 5.1

$HALT_{TM}$ is undecidable.

**Proof Idea** This proof is by contradiction. We assume that $HALT_{TM}$ is decidable and use that assumption to show that $A_{TM}$ is decidable, contradicting Theorem 4.11. The key idea is to show that $A_{TM}$ is reducible to $HALT_{TM}$.

Let's assume that we have a TM $R$ that decides $HALT_{TM}$. Then we use $R$ to construct $S$, a TM that decides $A_{TM}$. To get a feel for the way to construct $S$, pretend that you are $S$. Your task is to decide $A_{TM}$. You are given an input of the form $(M, w)$. You must output `accept` if $M$ accepts $w$, and you must output `reject` if $M$ loops or rejects on $w$. Try simulating $M$ on $w$. If it accepts or rejects, do the same. But you may not be able to determine whether $M$ is looping, and in that case your simulation will not terminate. That's bad because you are a decider and thus never permitted to loop. So this idea by itself does not work.
Instead, use the assumption that you have TM $R$ that decides $HALT_{TM}$. With $R$, you can test whether $M$ halts on $w$. If $R$ indicates that $M$ doesn’t halt on $w$, reject because $(M, w)$ isn’t in $A_{TM}$. However, if $R$ indicates that $M$ does halt on $w$, you can do the simulation without any danger of looping.

Thus, if TM $R$ exists, we can decide $A_{TM}$, but we know that $A_{TM}$ is undecidable. By virtue of this contradiction, we can conclude that $R$ does not exist. Therefore, $HALT_{TM}$ is undecidable.

**Proof** Let’s assume for the purpose of obtaining a contradiction that TM $R$ decides $HALT_{TM}$. We construct TM $S$ to decide $A_{TM}$, with $S$ operating as follows.

$S = \text{“On input } (M, w)\text{, an encoding of a TM } M\text{ and a string } w:\n1. \text{ Run TM } R\text{ on input } (M, w).
2. \text{ If } R\text{ rejects, reject.}
3. \text{ If } R\text{ accepts, simulate } M\text{ on } w\text{ until it halts.}
4. \text{ If } M\text{ has accepted, accept; if } M\text{ has rejected, reject.”}\

Clearly, if $R$ decides $HALT_{TM}$, then $S$ decides $A_{TM}$. Because $A_{TM}$ is undecidable, $HALT_{TM}$ also must be undecidable.

Theorem 5.1 illustrates our strategy for proving that a problem is undecidable. This strategy is common to most proofs of undecidability, except for the undecidability of $A_{TM}$ itself, which is proved directly via the diagonalization method.

We now present several other theorems and their proofs as further examples of the reducibility method for proving undecidability. Let

$$E_{TM} = \{ (M) \mid M\text{ is a TM and } L(M) = \emptyset \}.$$ 

**Theorem 5.2** $E_{TM}$ is undecidable.

**Proof Idea** We follow the pattern adopted in Theorem 5.1. We assume that $E_{TM}$ is decidable and then show that $A_{TM}$ is decidable—a contradiction. Let $R$ be a TM that decides $E_{TM}$. We use $R$ to construct TM $S$ that decides $A_{TM}$. How will $S$ work when it receives input $(M, w)$?

One idea is for $S$ to run $R$ on input $(M)$ and see whether it accepts. If it does, we know that $L(M)$ is empty and therefore that $M$ does not accept $w$. But if $R$ rejects $(M)$, all we know is that $L(M)$ is not empty and therefore that $M$ accepts some string—but we still do not know whether $M$ accepts the particular string $w$. So we need to use a different idea.
Instead of running \( R \) on \( \langle M \rangle \), we run \( R \) on a modification of \( \langle M \rangle \). We modify \( \langle M \rangle \) to guarantee that \( M \) rejects all strings except \( w \), but on input \( w \) it works as usual. Then we use \( R \) to determine whether the modified machine recognizes the empty language. The only string the machine can now accept is \( w \), so its language will be nonempty iff it accepts \( w \). If \( R \) accepts when it is fed a description of the modified machine, we know that the modified machine doesn't accept anything and that \( M \) doesn't accept \( w \).

**Proof** Let's write the modified machine described in the proof idea using our standard notation. We call it \( M_1 \).

\[
M_1 = \text{"On input } x:\n1. \text{ If } x \neq w, \text{ reject.}\n2. \text{ If } x = w, \text{ run } M \text{ on input } w \text{ and accept if } M \text{ does."}
\]

This machine has the string \( w \) as part of its description. It conducts the test of whether \( x = w \) in the obvious way, by scanning the input and comparing it character by character with \( w \) to determine whether they are the same.

Putting all this together, we assume that \( \mathsf{TM} R \) decides \( E_{\mathsf{TM}} \) and construct \( \mathsf{TM} S \) that decides \( A_{\mathsf{TM}} \) as follows.

\[
S = \text{"On input } \langle M, w \rangle, \text{ an encoding of a } \mathsf{TM} M \text{ and a string } w:\n1. \text{ Use the description of } M \text{ and } w \text{ to construct the } \mathsf{TM} M_1 \text{ just described.}\n2. \text{ Run } R \text{ on input } \langle M_1 \rangle.\n3. \text{ If } R \text{ accepts, reject; if } R \text{ rejects, accept."}
\]

Note that \( S \) must actually be able to compute a description of \( M_1 \) from a description of \( M \) and \( w \). It is able to do so because it only needs to add extra states to \( M \) that perform the \( x = w \) test.

If \( R \) were a decider for \( E_{\mathsf{TM}} \), \( S \) would be a decider for \( A_{\mathsf{TM}} \). A decider for \( A_{\mathsf{TM}} \) cannot exist, so we know that \( E_{\mathsf{TM}} \) must be undecidable.

Another interesting computational problem regarding Turing machines concerns determining whether a given Turing machine recognizes a language that also can be recognized by a simpler computational model. For example, we let \( \mathsf{REGULAR}_{\mathsf{TM}} \) be the problem of determining whether a given Turing machine has an equivalent finite automaton. This problem is the same as determining whether the Turing machine recognizes a regular language. Let

\[
\mathsf{REGULAR}_{\mathsf{TM}} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a } \mathsf{TM} \text{ and } L(M) \text{ is a regular language}\}.\n\]
Theorem 5.3

\( \text{REGULAR}_{\text{TM}} \) is undecidable.

Proof Idea

As usual for undecidability theorems, this proof is by reduction from \( A_{\text{TM}} \). We assume that \( \text{REGULAR}_{\text{TM}} \) is decidable by a TM \( R \) and use this assumption to construct a TM \( S \) that decides \( A_{\text{TM}} \). Less obvious now is how to use \( R \)'s ability to assist \( S \) in its task. Nonetheless, we can do so.

The idea is for \( S \) to take its input \( \langle M, w \rangle \) and modify \( M \) so that the resulting TM recognizes a regular language if and only if \( M \) accepts \( w \). We call the modified machine \( M_2 \). We design \( M_2 \) to recognize the nonregular language \( \{0^n1^n | n \geq 0\} \) if \( M \) does not accept \( w \), and to recognize the regular language \( \Sigma^* \) if \( M \) accepts \( w \). We must specify how \( S \) can construct such an \( M_2 \) from \( M \) and \( w \). Here, \( M_2 \) works by automatically accepting all strings in \( \{0^n1^n | n \geq 0\} \). In addition, if \( M \) accepts \( w \), \( M_2 \) accepts all other strings.

Note that the TM \( M_2 \) is not constructed for the purposes of actually running it on some input—a common confusion. We construct \( M_2 \) only for the purpose of feeding its description into the decider for \( \text{REGULAR}_{\text{TM}} \) that we have assumed to exist. Once this decider returns its answer, we can use it to obtain the answer to whether \( M \) accepts \( w \). Thus, we can decide \( A_{\text{TM}} \), a contradiction.

Proof

We let \( R \) be a TM that decides \( \text{REGULAR}_{\text{TM}} \) and construct TM \( S \) to decide \( A_{\text{TM}} \). Then \( S \) works in the following manner.

\[ S = \"\text{On input } \langle M, w \rangle, \text{ where } M \text{ is a TM and } w \text{ is a string:}\]

1. Construct the following TM \( M_2 \).
   \[ M_2 = \"\text{On input } x:\]
   1. If \( x \) has the form \( 0^n1^n \), accept.
   2. If \( x \) does not have this form, run \( M \) on input \( w \) and accept if \( M \) accepts \( w \).”
2. Run \( R \) on input \( \langle M_2 \rangle \).
3. If \( R \) accepts, accept; if \( R \) rejects, reject.”

Similarly, the problems of testing whether the language of a Turing machine is a context-free language, a decidable language, or even a finite language can be shown to be undecidable with similar proofs. In fact, a general result, called Rice’s theorem, states that determining any property of the languages recognized by Turing machines is undecidable. We give Rice’s theorem in Problem 5.28.

So far, our strategy for proving languages undecidable involves a reduction from \( A_{\text{TM}} \). Sometimes reducing from some other undecidable language, such as \( E_{\text{TM}} \), is more convenient when we are showing that certain languages are undecidable. Theorem 5.4 shows that testing the equivalence of two Turing
machines is an undecidable problem. We could prove it by a reduction from $A_{TM}$, but we use this opportunity to give an example of an undecidability proof by reduction from $E_{TM}$. Let

$$EQ_{TM} = \{ \langle M_1, M_2 \rangle | M_1 \text{ and } M_2 \text{ are TMs and } L(M_1) = L(M_2) \}.$$ 

**Theorem 5.4**

$EQ_{TM}$ is undecidable.

**Proof Idea**  Show that if $EQ_{TM}$ were decidable, $E_{TM}$ also would be decidable by giving a reduction from $E_{TM}$ to $EQ_{TM}$. The idea is simple. $E_{TM}$ is the problem of determining whether the language of a TM is empty. $EQ_{TM}$ is the problem of determining whether the languages of two TMs are the same. If one of these languages happens to be $\emptyset$, we end up with the problem of determining whether the language of the other machine is empty—that is, the $E_{TM}$ problem. So in a sense, the $E_{TM}$ problem is a special case of the $EQ_{TM}$ problem wherein one of the machines is fixed to recognize the empty language. This idea makes giving the reduction easy.

**Proof**  We let $TM \, R$ decide $EQ_{TM}$ and construct $TM \, S$ to decide $E_{TM}$ as follows.

$S = "On \, input \, \langle M \rangle, \, where \, M \, is \, a \, TM:\n1. \, Run \, R \, on \, input \, \langle M, M_1 \rangle, \, where \, M_1 \, is \, a \, TM \, that \, rejects \, all \, inputs.\n2. \, If \, R \, accepts, \, accept; \, if \, R \, rejects, \, reject."

If $R$ decides $EQ_{TM}$, $S$ decides $E_{TM}$. But $E_{TM}$ is undecidable by Theorem 5.2, so $EQ_{TM}$ also must be undecidable.

---

**Reductions via Computation Histories**

The computation history method is an important technique for proving that $A_{TM}$ is reducible to certain languages. This method is often useful when the problem to be shown undecidable involves testing for the existence of something. For example, this method is used to show the undecidability of Hilbert's tenth problem, testing for the existence of integral roots in a polynomial.

The computation history for a Turing machine on an input is simply the sequence of configurations that the machine goes through as it processes the input. It is a complete record of the computation of this machine.
**Definition 5.5**

Let $M$ be a Turing machine and $w$ an input string. An *accepting computation history* for $M$ on $w$ is a sequence of configurations, $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_l$, where $C_1$ is the start configuration of $M$ on $w$, $C_l$ is an accepting configuration of $M$, and each $C_i$ legally follows from $C_{i-1}$ according to the rules of $M$. A *rejecting computation history* for $M$ on $w$ is defined similarly, except that $C_l$ is a rejecting configuration.

Computation histories are finite sequences. If $M$ doesn't halt on $w$, no accepting or rejecting computation history exists for $M$ on $w$. Deterministic machines have at most one computation history on any given input. Nondeterministic machines may have many computation histories on a single input, corresponding to the various computation branches. For now, we continue to focus on deterministic machines. Our first undecidability proof uses the computation history method concerns a type of machine called a linear bounded automaton.

**Definition 5.6**

A *linear bounded automaton* is a restricted type of Turing machine wherein the tape head isn't permitted to move off the portion of the tape containing the input. If the machine tries to move its head off either end of the input, the head stays where it is—in the same way that the head will not move off the left-hand end of an ordinary Turing machine's tape.

A linear bounded automaton is a Turing machine with a limited amount of memory, as shown schematically in the following figure. It can only solve problems requiring memory that can fit within the tape used for the input. Using a tape alphabet larger than the input alphabet allows the available memory to be increased up to a constant factor. Hence we say that for an input of length $n$, the amount of memory available is linear in $n$—thus the name of this model.

![Schematic of a linear bounded automaton](image-url)

**Figure 5.7**

Schematic of a linear bounded automaton
Despite their memory constraint, linear bounded automata (LBAs) are quite powerful. For example, the deciders for \( A_{\text{DFA}}, A_{\text{CFG}}, E_{\text{DFA}}, \) and \( E_{\text{CFG}} \) all are LBAs. Every CFL can be decided by an LBA. In fact, coming up with a decidable language that can't be decided by an LBA takes some work. We develop the techniques to do so in Chapter 9.

Here, \( A_{\text{LBA}} \) is the problem of determining whether an LBA accepts its input. Even though \( A_{\text{LBA}} \) is the same as the undecidable problem \( A_{\text{TM}} \) where the Turing machine is restricted to be an LBA, we can show that \( A_{\text{LBA}} \) is decidable. Let

\[
A_{\text{LBA}} = \{ (M, w) | M \text{ is an LBA that accepts string } w \}.
\]

Before proving the decidability of \( A_{\text{LBA}} \), we find the following lemma useful. It says that an LBA can have only a limited number of configurations when a string of length \( n \) is the input.

**Lemma 5.8**

Let \( M \) be an LBA with \( q \) states and \( g \) symbols in the tape alphabet. There are exactly \( qng^n \) distinct configurations of \( M \) for a tape of length \( n \).

**Proof** Recall that a configuration of \( M \) is like a snapshot in the middle of its computation. A configuration consists of the state of the control, position of the head, and contents of the tape. Here, \( M \) has \( q \) states. The length of its tape is \( n \), so the head can be in one of \( n \) positions, and \( g^n \) possible strings of tape symbols appear on the tape. The product of these three quantities is the total number of different configurations of \( M \) with a tape of length \( n \).

**Theorem 5.9**

\( A_{\text{LBA}} \) is decidable.

**Proof Idea** In order to decide whether LBA \( M \) accepts input \( w \), we simulate \( M \) on \( w \). During the course of the simulation, if \( M \) halts and accepts or rejects, we accept or reject accordingly. The difficulty occurs if \( M \) loops on \( w \). We need to be able to detect looping so that we can halt and reject.

The idea for detecting when \( M \) is looping is that as \( M \) computes on \( w \), it goes from configuration to configuration. If \( M \) ever repeats a configuration, it would go on to repeat this configuration over and over again and thus be in a loop. Because \( M \) is an LBA, the amount of tape available to it is limited. By Lemma 5.8, \( M \) can be in only a limited number of configurations on this amount of tape. Therefore, only a limited amount of time is available to \( M \) before it will enter some configuration that it has previously entered. Detecting that \( M \) is looping is possible by simulating \( M \) for the number of steps given by Lemma 5.8. If \( M \) has not halted by then, it must be looping.
**Proof**  The algorithm that decides $A_{LBA}$ is as follows.

$L = \langle M, w \rangle$, where $M$ is an LBA and $w$ is a string:

1. Simulate $M$ on $w$ for $qng^n$ steps or until it halts.
2. If $M$ has halted, accept if it has accepted and reject if it has rejected. If it has not halted, reject.

If $M$ on $w$ has not halted within $qng^n$ steps, it must be repeating a configuration according to Lemma 5.8 and therefore looping. That is why our algorithm rejects in this instance.

Theorem 5.9 shows that LBAs and TMs differ in one essential way: For LBAs the acceptance problem is decidable, but for TMs it isn’t. However, certain other problems involving LBAs remain undecidable. One is the emptiness problem $E_{LBA} = \{ \langle M \rangle | M \text{ is an LBA where } L(M) = \emptyset \}$. To prove that $E_{LBA}$ is undecidable, we give a reduction that uses the computation history method.

**Theorem 5.10**

$E_{LBA}$ is undecidable.

**Proof Idea**  This proof is by reduction from $A_{TM}$. We show that if $E_{LBA}$ were decidable, $A_{TM}$ would also be. Suppose that $E_{LBA}$ is decidable. How can we use this supposition to decide $A_{TM}$?

For a TM $M$ and an input $w$, we can determine whether $M$ accepts $w$ by constructing a certain LBA $B$ and then testing whether $L(B)$ is empty. The language that $B$ recognizes comprises all accepting computation histories for $M$ on $w$. If $M$ accepts $w$, this language contains one string and so is nonempty. If $M$ does not accept $w$, this language is empty. If we can determine whether $B$’s language is empty, clearly we can determine whether $M$ accepts $w$.

Now we describe how to construct $B$ from $M$ and $w$. Note that we need to show more than the mere existence of $B$. We have to show how a Turing machine can obtain a description of $B$, given descriptions of $M$ and $w$.

As in the previous reductions we’ve given for proving undecidability, we construct $B$ only to feed its description into the presumed $E_{LBA}$ decider, but not to run $B$ on some input.

We construct $B$ to accept its input $x$ if $x$ is an accepting computation history for $M$ on $w$. Recall that an accepting computation history is the sequence of configurations, $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_l$ that $M$ goes through as it accepts some string $w$. For the purposes of this proof, we assume that the accepting computation history is presented as a single string with the configurations separated from each other by the # symbol, as shown in Figure 5.11.
The LBA $B$ works as follows. When it receives an input $x$, $B$ is supposed to accept if $x$ is an accepting computation history for $M$ on $w$. First, $B$ breaks up $x$ according to the delimiters into strings $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_l$. Then $B$ determines whether the $C_i$’s satisfy the three conditions of an accepting computation history.

1. $C_1$ is the start configuration for $M$ on $w$.
2. Each $C_{i+1}$ legally follows from $C_i$.
3. $C_l$ is an accepting configuration for $M$.

The start configuration $C_1$ for $M$ on $w$ is the string $q_0w_1w_2\ldots w_n$, where $q_0$ is the start state for $M$ on $w$. Here, $B$ has this string directly built in, so it is able to check the first condition. An accepting configuration is one that contains the $q_{\text{accept}}$ state, so $B$ can check the third condition by scanning $C_l$ for $q_{\text{accept}}$. The second condition is the hardest to check. For each pair of adjacent configurations, $B$ checks on whether $C_{i+1}$ legally follows from $C_i$. This step involves verifying that $C_i$ and $C_{i+1}$ are identical except for the positions under and adjacent to the head in $C_i$. These positions must be updated according to the transition function of $M$. Then $B$ verifies that the updating was done properly by zig-zagging between corresponding positions of $C_i$ and $C_{i+1}$. To keep track of the current positions while zig-zagging, $B$ marks the current position with dots on the tape. Finally, if conditions 1, 2, and 3 are satisfied, $B$ accepts $w$. By inverting the decider’s answer, we obtain the answer to whether $M$ accepts $w$. Thus we can decide $A_{TM}$, a contradiction.

**Proof** Now we are ready to state the reduction of $A_{TM}$ to $E_{LBA}$. Suppose that $TM$ $R$ decides $E_{LBA}$. Construct $TM$ $S$ to decide $A_{TM}$ as follows.

$S =$ “On input $\langle M, w \rangle$, where $M$ is a TM and $w$ is a string:
1. Construct LBA $B$ from $M$ and $w$ as described in the proof idea.
2. Run $R$ on input $\langle B \rangle$.
3. If $R$ rejects, accept; if $R$ accepts, reject.”

If $R$ accepts $\langle B \rangle$, then $L(B) = \emptyset$. Thus, $M$ has no accepting computation history on $w$ and $M$ doesn’t accept $w$. Consequently, $S$ rejects $\langle M, w \rangle$. Similarly, if $R$ rejects $\langle B \rangle$, the language of $B$ is nonempty. The only string that $B$ can accept is an accepting computation history for $M$ on $w$. Thus, $M$ must accept $w$. Consequently, $S$ accepts $\langle M, w \rangle$. Figure 5.12 illustrates LBA $B$. 
We can also use the technique of reduction via computation histories to establish the undecidability of certain problems related to context-free grammars and pushdown automata. Recall that in Theorem 4.8 we presented an algorithm to decide whether a context-free grammar generates any strings—that is, whether \( L(G) = \emptyset \). Now we show that a related problem is undecidable. It is the problem of determining whether a context-free grammar generates all possible strings. Proving that this problem is undecidable is the main step in showing that the equivalence problem for context-free grammars is undecidable. Let

\[
ALL_{CFG} = \{ (G) \mid G \text{ is a CFG and } L(G) = \Sigma^* \}.
\]

**Theorem 5.13**

\(ALL_{CFG}\) is undecidable.

**Proof.** This proof is by contradiction. To get the contradiction, we assume that \(ALL_{CFG}\) is decidable and use this assumption to show that \(A_{TM}\) is decidable. This proof is similar to that of Theorem 5.10 but with a small extra twist: It is a reduction from \(A_{TM}\) via computation histories, but we modify the representation of the computation histories slightly for a technical reason that we will explain later.

We now describe how to use a decision procedure for \(ALL_{CFG}\) to decide \(A_{TM}\). For a TM \(M\) and an input \(w\), we construct a CFG \(G\) that generates all strings if and only if \(M\) does not accept \(w\). So if \(M\) does accept \(w\), \(G\) does not generate some particular string. This string is—guess what—the accepting computation history for \(M\) on \(w\). That is, \(G\) is designed to generate all strings that are not accepting computation histories for \(M\) on \(w\).

To make the CFG \(G\) generate all strings that fail to be an accepting computation history for \(M\) on \(w\), we utilize the following strategy. A string may fail to be an accepting computation history for several reasons. An accepting computation history for \(M\) on \(w\) appears as \(#C_1#C_2#\cdots#C_i#\), where \(C_i\) is the configuration of \(M\) on the \(i\)th step of the computation on \(w\). Then, \(G\) generates all strings...
1. that do not start with $C_1$,
2. that do not end with an accepting configuration, or
3. in which some $C_i$ does not properly yield $C_{i+1}$ under the rules of $M$.

If $M$ does not accept $w$, no accepting computation history exists, so all strings fail in one way or another. Therefore, $G$ would generate all strings, as desired.

Now we get down to the actual construction of $G$. Instead of constructing $G$, we construct a PDA $D$. We know that we can use the construction given in Theorem 2.20 (page 117) to convert $D$ to a CFG. We do so because, for our purposes, designing a PDA is easier than designing a CFG. In this instance, $D$ will start by nondeterministically branching to guess which of the preceding three conditions to check. One branch checks on whether the beginning of the input string is $C_1$ and accepts if it isn’t. Another branch checks on whether the input string ends with a configuration containing the accept state, $q_{\text{accept}}$, and accepts if it isn’t.

The third branch is supposed to accept if some $C_i$ does not properly yield $C_{i+1}$. It works by scanning the input until it nondeterministically decides that it has come to $C_i$. Next, it pushes $C_i$ onto the stack until it comes to the end marked by the # symbol. Then $D$ pops the stack to compare with $C_{i+1}$. They are supposed to match except around the head position, where the difference is dictated by the transition function of $M$. Finally, $D$ accepts if it discovers a mismatch or an improper update.

The problem with this idea is that when $D$ pops $C_i$ off the stack, it is in reverse order and not suitable for comparison with $C_{i+1}$. At this point, the twist in the proof appears: We write the accepting computation history differently. Every other configuration appears in reverse order. The odd positions remain written in the forward order, but the even positions are written backward. Thus, an accepting computation history would appear as shown in the following figure.

![Figure 5.14](image)

**Figure 5.14**

Every other configuration written in reverse order

In this modified form, the PDA is able to push a configuration so that when it is popped, the order is suitable for comparison with the next one. We design $D$ to accept any string that is not an accepting computation history in the modified form.

In Exercise 5.1 you can use Theorem 5.13 to show that $EQ_{CFG}$ is undecidable.
5.3 MAPPING REDUCIBILITY

We have shown how to use the reducibility technique to prove that various problems are undecidable. In this section we formalize the notion of reducibility. Doing so allows us to use reducibility in more refined ways, such as for proving that certain languages are not Turing-recognizable and for applications in complexity theory.

The notion of reducing one problem to another may be defined formally in one of several ways. The choice of which one to use depends on the application. Our choice is a simple type of reducibility called mapping reducibility.¹

Roughly speaking, being able to reduce problem $A$ to problem $B$ by using a mapping reducibility means that a computable function exists that converts instances of problem $A$ to instances of problem $B$. If we have such a conversion function, called a reduction, we can solve $A$ with a solver for $B$. The reason is that any instance of $A$ can be solved by first using the reduction to convert to an instance of $B$ and then applying the solver for $B$. A precise definition of mapping reducibility follows shortly.

COMPUTABLE FUNCTIONS

A Turing machine computes a function by starting with the input to the function on the tape and halting with the output of the function on the tape.

**DEFINITION 5.17**

A function $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ is a **computable function** if some Turing machine $M$, on every input $w$, halts with just $f(w)$ on its tape.

**EXAMPLE 5.18**

All usual, arithmetic operations on integers are computable functions. For example, we can make a machine that takes input $\langle m, n \rangle$ and returns $m + n$, the sum of $m$ and $n$. We don't give any details here, leaving them as exercises.

**EXAMPLE 5.19**

Computable functions may be transformations of machine descriptions. For example, one computable function $f$ takes input $w$ and returns the description of a Turing machine $\langle M' \rangle$ if $w = \langle M \rangle$ is an encoding of a Turing machine $M$.

¹It is called many-one reducibility in some other textbooks.
The machine $M'$ is a machine that recognizes the same language as $M$, but never attempts to move its head off the left-hand end of its tape. The function $f$ accomplishes this task by adding several states to the description of $M$. The function returns $\varepsilon$ if $w$ is not a legal encoding of a Turing machine.

**FORMAL DEFINITION OF MAPPING REDUCIBILITY**

Now we define mapping reducibility. As usual, we represent computational problems by languages.

**DEFINITION 5.20**

Language $A$ is **mapping reducible** to language $B$, written $A \leq_m B$, if there is a computable function $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$, where for every $w$,

$$w \in A \iff f(w) \in B.$$  

The function $f$ is called the **reduction** from $A$ to $B$.

The following figure illustrates mapping reducibility.

\[ \text{FIGURE 5.21} \]

Function $f$ reducing $A$ to $B$

A mapping reduction of $A$ to $B$ provides a way to convert questions about membership testing in $A$ to membership testing in $B$. To test whether $w \in A$, we use the reduction $f$ to map $w$ to $f(w)$ and test whether $f(w) \in B$. The term **mapping reduction** comes from the function or mapping that provides the means of doing the reduction.

If one problem is mapping reducible to a second, previously solved problem, we can thereby obtain a solution to the original problem. We capture this idea in Theorem 5.22.
THEOREM 5.22

If $A \leq_m B$ and $B$ is decidable, then $A$ is decidable.

PROOF We let $M$ be the decider for $B$ and $f$ be the reduction from $A$ to $B$. We describe a decider $N$ for $A$ as follows.

\[ N = \text{"On input } w: \]
1. 'Compute $f(w)$.
2. Run $M$ on input $f(w)$ and output whatever $M$ outputs.'

Clearly, if $w \in A$, then $f(w) \in B$ because $f$ is a reduction from $A$ to $B$. Thus, $M$ accepts $f(w)$ whenever $w \in A$. Therefore, $N$ works as desired.

The following corollary of Theorem 5.22 has been our main tool for proving undecidability.

COROLLARY 5.23

If $A \leq_m B$ and $A$ is undecidable, then $B$ is undecidable.

Now we revisit some of our earlier proofs that used the reducibility method to get examples of mapping reducibilities.

EXAMPLE 5.24

In Theorem 5.1 we used a reduction from $A_{TM}$ to prove that $HALT_{TM}$ is undecidable. This reduction showed how a decider for $HALT_{TM}$ could be used to give a decider for $A_{TM}$. We can demonstrate a mapping reducibility from $A_{TM}$ to $HALT_{TM}$ as follows. To do so, we must present a computable function $f$ that takes input of the form $\langle M, w \rangle$ and returns output of the form $\langle M', w' \rangle$, where

\[ \langle M, w \rangle \in A_{TM} \text{ if and only if } \langle M', w' \rangle \in HALT_{TM}. \]

The following machine $F$ computes a reduction $f$.

\[ F = \text{"On input } \langle M, w \rangle: \]
1. Construct the following machine $M'$.

$M'$ = "On input $x$:
1. Run $M$ on $x$.
2. If $M$ accepts, accept.
3. If $M$ rejects, enter a loop."

2. Output $\langle M', w \rangle$.

A minor issue arises here concerning improperly formed input strings. If $TM F$ determines that its input is not of the correct form as specified in the input line "On input $\langle M, w \rangle$:” and hence that the input is not in $A_{TM}$, the TM outputs a
string not in $HALT_{TM}$. Any string not in $HALT_{TM}$ will do. In general, when we describe a Turing machine that computes a reduction from $A$ to $B$, improperly formed inputs are assumed to map to strings outside of $B$.

**Example 5.25**

The proof of the undecidability of the Post Correspondence Problem in Theorem 5.15 contains two mapping reductions. First, it shows that $A_{TM} \leq_m MP CP$ and then it shows that $MP CP \leq_m PCP$. In both cases, we can easily obtain the actual reduction function and show that it is a mapping reduction. As Exercise 5.6 shows, mapping reducibility is transitive, so these two reductions together imply that $A_{TM} \leq_m PCP$.

**Example 5.26**

A mapping reduction from $E_{TM}$ to $EQ_{TM}$ lies in the proof of Theorem 5.4. In this case, the reduction $f$ maps the input $(M)$ to the output $(M, M_1)$, where $M_1$ is the machine that rejects all inputs.

**Example 5.27**

The proof of Theorem 5.2 showing that $E_{TM}$ is undecidable illustrates the difference between the formal notion of mapping reducibility that we have defined in this section and the informal notion of reducibility that we used earlier in this chapter. The proof shows that $E_{TM}$ is undecidable by reducing $A_{TM}$ to it. Let's see whether we can convert this reduction to a mapping reduction.

From the original reduction, we may easily construct a function $f$ that takes input $(M, w)$ and produces output $(M_1)$, where $M_1$ is the Turing machine described in that proof. But $M$ accepts $w$ if and only if $L(M_1)$ is empty so $f$ is a mapping reduction from $A_{TM}$ to $E_{TM}$. It still shows that $E_{TM}$ is undecidable because decidability is not affected by complementation, but it doesn't give a mapping reduction from $A_{TM}$ to $E_{TM}$. In fact, no such reduction exists, as you are asked to show in Exercise 5.5.

The sensitivity of mapping reducibility to complementation is important in the use of reducibility to prove nonrecognizability of certain languages. We can also use mapping reducibility to show that problems are not Turing-recognizable. The following theorem is analogous to Theorem 5.22.

**Theorem 5.28**

If $A \leq_m B$ and $B$ is Turing-recognizable, then $A$ is Turing-recognizable.

The proof is the same as that of Theorem 5.22, except that $M$ and $N$ are recognizers instead of deciders.
COROLLARY 5.29

If \( A \leq_m B \) and \( A \) is not Turing-recognizable, then \( B \) is not Turing-recognizable.

In a typical application of this corollary, we let \( A \) be \( \overline{A_{TM}} \), the complement of \( A_{TM} \). We know that \( A_{TM} \) is not Turing-recognizable from Corollary 4.23. The definition of mapping reducibility implies that \( A \leq_m B \) means the same as \( \overline{A} \leq_m \overline{B} \). To prove that \( B \) isn’t recognizable, we may show that \( A_{TM} \leq_m \overline{B} \). We can also use mapping reducibility to show that certain problems are neither Turing-recognizable nor co-Turing-recognizable, as in the following theorem.

THEOREM 5.30

\( EQ_{TM} \) is neither Turing-recognizable nor co-Turing-recognizable.

PROOF First we show that \( EQ_{TM} \) is not Turing-recognizable. We do so by showing that \( A_{TM} \) is reducible to \( EQ_{TM} \). The reducing function \( f \) works as follows.

\( F = \) “On input \((M, w)\), where \( M \) is a TM and \( w \) a string:

1. Construct the following two machines, \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \).
   \( M_1 = \) “On any input:
   1. \( \text{Reject.} \)”
   \( M_2 = \) “On any input:
   1. Run \( M \) on \( w \). If it accepts, \( \text{accept.} \)”

2. Output \((M_1, M_2)\).”

Here, \( M_1 \) accepts nothing. If \( M \) accepts \( w \), \( M_2 \) accepts everything, and so the two machines are not equivalent. Conversely, if \( M \) doesn’t accept \( w \), \( M_2 \) accepts nothing, and they are equivalent. Thus \( f \) reduces \( A_{TM} \) to \( EQ_{TM} \), as desired.

To show that \( \overline{EQ_{TM}} \) is not Turing-recognizable, we give a reduction from \( A_{TM} \) to the complement of \( \overline{EQ_{TM}} \)—namely, \( EQ_{TM} \). Hence we show that \( A_{TM} \leq_m \overline{EQ_{TM}} \). The following TM \( G \) computes the reducing function \( g \).

\( G = \) “On input \((M, w)\), where \( M \) is a TM and \( w \) a string:

1. Construct the following two machines, \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \).
   \( M_1 = \) “On any input:
   1. \( \text{Accept.} \)”
   \( M_2 = \) “On any input:
   1. Run \( M \) on \( w \).
   2. If it accepts, \( \text{accept.} \)”

2. Output \((M_1, M_2)\).”

The only difference between \( f \) and \( g \) is in machine \( M_1 \). In \( f \), machine \( M_1 \) always rejects, whereas in \( g \) it always accepts. In both \( f \) and \( g \), \( M \) accepts \( w \) iff \( M_2 \) always accepts. In \( g \), \( M \) accepts \( w \) iff \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) are equivalent. That is why \( g \) is a reduction from \( A_{TM} \) to \( EQ_{TM} \).