HAL open science

Turing degrees of multidimensional SFTs

Emmanuel Jeandel, Pascal Vanier

▶ To cite this version:

Emmanuel Jeandel, Pascal Vanier. Turing degrees of multidimensional SFTs. 2011. hal-00613165v2

HAL Id: hal-00613165

https://hal.science/hal-00613165v2

Preprint submitted on 25 Aug 2011 (v2), last revised 1 Jun 2012 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Turing degrees of multidimensional SFTs

Emmanuel Jeandel*

Pascal Vanier †

Laboratoire d'informatique fondamentale de Marseille (LIF)
Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS
39 rue Joliot-Curie, 13453 Marseille Cedex 13, FRANCE

Abstract

In this paper we are interested in computability aspects of subshifts and in particular Turing degrees of 2-dimensional SFTs (i.e. tilings). We start by finding, for any Π^0_1 subset P of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, a SFT X such that X and $P \times \mathbb{Z}^2$ are almost recursively homeomorphic. That is to say, that there exists a computable set O of computable points of X such that $X \setminus O$ is recursively homeomorphic to $P \times \mathbb{Z}^2$. As a consequence, when P contains a computable member, its set of Turing degrees is exactly the same as X's. On the other hand, we prove that when P does not contain any computable member, it is not in general possible to find a subshift with the exact same set of Turing degrees. We prove in particular that any subshift containing only non-computable points always contain points with different but comparable degrees. This gives a fairly complete study of Turing degrees of SFTs.

Wang tiles have been introduced by Wang [24] to study fragments of first order logic. Independently, subshifts of finite type (SFTs) were introduced to study dynamical systems. From a computational and dynamical perspective, SFTs and Wang tiles are equivalent, and most recursive-flavoured results about SFTs were proved in a Wang tile setting.

Knowing whether a tileset can tile the plane with a given tile at the origin (also known as the origin constrained domino problem) was proved undecidable by Wang [25]. Knowing whether a tileset can tile the plane in the general case was proved undecidable by Berger [3, 4].

Understanding how complex, in the sense of recursion theory, the points of an SFT can be is a question that was first studied by Myers [20] in 1974. Building on the work of Hanf [13], he gave a tileset with no recursive tilings. Durand/Levin/Shen [12] showed, 40 years later, how to build a tileset for which all tilings have high Kolmogorov complexity.

A Π^0_1 class is an effectively closed subset of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, or equivalently the set of oracles on which a given Turing machine does not halt. Π^0_1 sets occur naturally in various areas in computer science and recursive mathematics, see e.g. [7, 22] and the upcoming book [8]. It is easy to see that any SFT is a Π^0_1 class (up to a recursive coding of $\Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ into $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$). This has various consequences. As an

*mail: Emmanuel.Jeandel@lif.univ-mrs.fr
†mail: Pascal.Vanier@lif.univ-mrs.fr

example, every non-empty SFT contains a point which is not Turing-hard (see Durand/Levin/Shen [12] for a self-contained proof). The main question is how different SFTs are from Π^0_1 classes. In the one-dimensional case, some answers to these questions were given by Cenzer/Dashti/King/Tosca/Wyman [10, 5, 6].

The main result in this direction was obtained by Simpson [23], building on the work of Hanf and Myers: for every Π^0_1 class S, there exists a SFT with the same *Medvedev* degree as S. The Medvedev degree roughly relates to the "easiest" Turing degree of S. What we are interested in is a stronger result: *can we find for every Π^0_1 set S a SFT which has the same Turing degrees ?* We prove in this article that this is true if S contains a recursive point but not always when this is not the case. More exactly we build (Theorem 4.1) for every Π^0_1 class S a SFT for which the set of Turing degrees is exactly the same as for S with the additional Turing degree of recursive points. We also show that SFTs that do not contain any recursive point always have points with different but comparable degrees (Corollary 5.11), a property that is not true for all Π^0_1 classes. In particular there exists Π^0_1 classes that do not have any points with comparable degrees.

As a consequence, as every *countable* Π^0_1 class contains a recursive point, the question is solved for countable sets: the sets of Turing degrees of countable Π^0_1 classes are the same as the sets of Turing degrees of countable sets of tilings. In particular, there exist countable sets of tilings with some non-recursive points. This can be thought as a two-dimensional version of Theorem 8 in [6].

This paper is organized as follows. After some preliminary definitions, we start with a quick proof of a generalization of Hanf, already implicit in Simpson [23]. We then build a very specific tileset, which forms a grid-like structure while having only countably many tilings, all of them recursive. This tileset will then serve as the main ingredient to prove the result on the case of classes with a recursive point in section 4. In section 5 we finally show the result on classes without recursive points.

1 Preliminaries

1.1 SFTs and tilings

We give here some standard definitions and facts about multidimensional subshifts, one may consult Lind [18] for more details. Let Σ be a finite alphabet, the d-dimensional full shift on Σ is the set $\Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^d} = \left\{c = (c_x)_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \middle| \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, c_x \in \Sigma\right\}$. For $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, the shift functions $\sigma_v : \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \to \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, are defined locally by $\sigma_v(c_x) = c_{x+v}$. The full shift equipped with the distance $d(x, y) = 2^{-\min\left\{\|v\| \middle| v\in\mathbb{Z}^d, x_v\neq y_v\right\}}$ is a compact, perfect, metric space on which the shift functions act as homeomorphisms. An element of $\Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is called a *configuration*.

Every closed shift-invariant (invariant by application of any σ_v) subset X of $\Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is called a *subshift*. An element of a subshift is called a point of this subshift.

Alternatively, subshifts can be defined with the help of forbidden patterns. A *pattern* is a function $p : P \to \Sigma$, where P is a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a collection of *forbidden* patterns, the subset X_F of $\Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ containing only

configurations having nowhere a pattern of F. More formally, $X_{\mathcal{F}}$ is defined by

$$X_{\mathcal{F}} = \left\{ x \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \middle| \forall z \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \forall p \in F, x_{z+P} \neq p \right\}.$$

In particular, a subshift is said to be a *subshift of finite type* (SFT) when the collection of forbidden patterns is finite. Usually, the patterns used are *blocks* or *n-blocks*, that is they are defined over a finite subset P of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ of the form $[\![0, n-1]\!]^d$.

Given a subshift X, a block or pattern p is said to be *extensible* if there exists $x \in X$ in which p appears, p is also said to be extensible to x.

In the rest of the paper, we will use the notation Σ_X for the alphabet of the subshift X.

A subshift $X \subseteq \Sigma_X^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ is a *sofic shift* if and only if there exists a SFT $Y \subseteq \Sigma_Y^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ and a local map $f : \Sigma_Y \to \Sigma_X$ such that for any point $x \in X$, there exists a point $y \in Y$ such that for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d, x_z = f(y_z)$.

Wang tiles are unit squares with colored edges which may not be flipped or rotated. A *tileset* T is a finite set of Wang tiles. A *coloring of the plane* is a mapping $c : \mathbb{Z}^2 \to T$ assigning a Wang tile to each point of the plane. If all adjacent tiles of a coloring of the plane have matching edges, it is called a tiling.

In particular, the set of tilings of a Wang tileset is a SFT on the alphabet formed by the tiles. Conversely, any SFT is isomorphic to a Wang tileset. From a recursivity point of view, one can say that SFTs and Wang tilesets are equivalent. In this paper, we will be using both indiscriminately. In particular, we note X_T the SFT associated to a set of tiles T.

We say a SFT (tileset) is *origin constrained* when the letter (tile) at position $(0, 0)$ is forced, that is to say, we only look at the valid tilings having a given letter (tile) t at the origin.

More information on SFTs may be found in Lind and Marcus' book [19].

The notion of *Cantor-Bendixson derivative* is defined on set of configurations. This notion was introduced for tilings by Ballier/Durand/Jeandel [1]. A configuration c is said to be *isolated* in a set of configurations C if there exists a pattern p such that c is the only configuration of C containing p. The Cantor-Bendixson derivative of C is noted $D(C)$ and consists of all configurations of C except the isolated ones. We define $C^{(\lambda)}$ inductively for any ordinal λ:

- $C^{(0)} = S$
- $C^{(\lambda+1)} = D\left(C^{(\lambda)}\right)$
- $C^{(\lambda)} = \bigcap_{\gamma<\lambda} C^{(\gamma)}$ when λ is limit.

The *Cantor-Bendixson rank* of C, noted $CB(C)$, is defined as the first ordinal λ such that $C^{(\lambda)} = C^{(\lambda+1)}$. An element x is of rank λ in C if λ is the least ordinal such that $x \notin C^{(\lambda)}$.

A configuration x is *periodic*, if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $\sigma_{ne_i}(x) = x$, for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, where the e_i's form the standard basis. A *vector of periodicity* of a configuration is a vector $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{(0, \ldots, 0)\}$ such that $\sigma_v(x) = x$. A configuration x is *quasiperiodic* (see Durand [11] for instance) if for any pattern p appearing in x, there exists N such that this pattern appears in all N^d cubes in x. In particular, a periodic point is quasiperiodic. A configuration is *strictly quasiperiodic* if it is quasiperiodic and not periodic. A subshift is *minimal* if

it is non-empty and contains no proper non-empty subshift. Equivalently, all its points have the same patterns. In this case, it contains only quasiperiodic points. It is known that every subshift contains a minimal subshift, see e.g. Durand [11].

1.2 Computability background

A Π^0_1 *class* $P \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a class of infinite sequences on $\{0,1\}$ for which there exists a Turing machine that given $x \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ as an oracle halts if and only if $x \notin P$. Equivalently, a class $S \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is Π^0_1 if there exists a recursive set L so that $x \in S$ if no prefix of x is in L. An element of a Π^0_1 class is called a *member* of this class.

We say that two sets S, S' are *recursively homeomorphic* if there exists a bijective recursive function $f : S \to S'$. That is to say there are two Turing machines M (resp. M') such that given a member of S (resp. S') computes a member of S' (resp. S). Furthermore, for any $s \in S, s' \in S'$ such that s' is computed by M from s, M' computes s from s'.

The *Cantor-Bendixson rank* of S, is well defined similarly as for subshifts.

See Cenzer/Remmel [7] for Π^0_1 sets and Kechris [17] for Cantor-Bendixson rank and derivative.

For $x, y \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we say that x is *Turing-reducible* to y if y is computable by a Turing machine using x as an oracle and we write $y \leq_T x$. If $x \leq_T y$ and $y \leq_T x$, we say that x and y are *Turing-equivalent* and we write $x \equiv_T y$. The *Turing degree* of $x \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is its equivalence class under the relation $\equiv_T$.

1.3 Subshifts and Π^0_1 classes

As it is clear from the definitions, SFTs in any dimension are Π^0_1 classes. More generally, *effective* subshifts, see e.g. Cenzer/Dashti/King [5]), that is subshifts defined by a computable (or equivalently, in this case, by a computably enumerable) set of forbidden patterns are Π^0_1 classes. As such, they enjoy similar properties. In particular, there exists many "basis theorems", ie theorems that assert that any Π^0_1 (non-empty) class has a member with some specific property.

As an example, every countable Π^0_1 class has a computable member, see e.g. Cenzer/Remmel [8]. For subshifts, we can say a bit more: every countable subshift has a periodic (hence computable) member. Every Π^0_1 class has a point of low degree, as prove in Jockusch/Soare [15]. A proof of this from the point of view of subshifts (actually tilings) is given in Durand/Levin/Shen [12].

2 Π^0_1 sets and origin constrained tilings

A straighforward corollary of Hanf [13] is that Π^0_1 classes and origin constrained SFTs are recursively isomorphic. This is stated explicitely in Simpson [23].

Theorem 2.1. *Given any Π^0_1 class $P \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, there exists a SFT X and a letter $t \in \Sigma_X$ such that each origin constrained point corresponds to a member of P.*

Proof. Let P be a Π^0_1 class, and M the Turing machine that proves it, that is M given $x \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ as an oracle halts if and only if $x \notin P$.



Figure 1: A set of Wang tiles, encoding computation of a Turing machine: the states are in the circles and the tape is in the rectangles. A tiling containing the bottom right tile contains the space-time diagram of a run of the Turing machine.

We use the classic encoding of Turing machines, see fig. 1. We modify all tiles containing a symbol from the tape, to allow them to contain a second symbol. This symbol is copied vertically. All these second symbols represent the oracle.

Then the SFT constrained by the tile starting the computation contains exactly the runs of the Turing machine with members of P on the oracle tape. □

Corollary 2.2. *Any Π^0_1 subset P of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is recursively homeomorphic to an origin constrained SFT.*

3 Producing a sparse grid

The main problem in the previous construction is that points which do not have the given letter at the origin can be very wild: they may correspond to configurations with no computation (no head of the Turing Machine) or computations starting from an arbitrary (not initial) configuration. A way to solve this problem is described in Myers' paper [20] but is unsuitable for our purposes (It was however used by Simpson to obtain a weaker result on Medvedev degrees, see [23]).

Our idea is as follows: we build a SFT which will contain, among others points, the *sparse grid* of Figure 2c. The interest being that all others points will have at most one intersection of two black lines. This means that if we put computation cells of a given Turing machine in the intersection points, every point which is not of the form of Figure 2c will contain at most one cell of the Turing machine, and thus will contain no computation.



Figure 2: The tiling in which the Turing machines will be encoded.



Figure 3: Our set of Wang tiles T.

To do this construction, we will first draw increasingly big and distant columns as in Figure 2a and then superimpose the same construction for rows as in Figure 2b, thus obtaining the grid of Figure 2c.

It is then fairly straightforward to see how we can encode a Turing machine inside a configuration having the skeleton of Figure 2c by looking at it diagonally: time increases going to the north-east and the tape is written on the north-west/south-east diagonals[1].

Our set of tiles T of Figure 3 gives the skeleton of Figure 2a when forgetting everything but the black vertical borders. We will prove in this section that it is countable. We set here the vocabulary:

- a vertical line is formed of a vertical succession of tiles containing a vertical black line (tiles 5, 6, 17, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 35, 36, 37).
- a horizontal line is formed of a horizontal succession of tiles containing a horizontal black line (tiles 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 23, 38) or a bottom signal,
- the bottom signal is formed by a connected path of tiles among (30, 31, 27, 14, 7, 36, 38)
- the red signal is formed by a connected path of tiles containing a red line (tiles among 3 ,7, 10, 12, 14, 19, 22, 32, 33, 38).
- tile 30 is the corner tile
- tiles 30, 32, 33, 34 are the bottom tiles

Lemma 3.1. *The SFT X_T admits at most one point, up to translation, with two or more vertical lines. This point is drawn on Figure 4.*

Proof. The idea of the construction is to force that whenever there are two vertical lines, then the point is a shifted of the one in Figure 4. Note also that whenever the corner tile appears in a point, it is necessarily a shifted version of the point on Figure 4.

Suppose that we have a tiling in which two vertical lines appear. These two lines necessarily face each other horizontaly: it is impossible for them not to have a bottom, and their bottoms are at the same height. Suppose the horizontal distance between them is $k+1$. There must then be horizontal lines between them forming squares, because of the diagonal. Inside these squares there must be a red signal: inside each square, this red signal is vertical, it is shifted to the right each time it crosses a horizontal line. This ensures that there are exactly k squares in this column. Furthermore, the bottom square has necessarily a bottom signal going through its top horizontal line. The bottom signal forces the square of the column before to be of size $k-1$ and the square of the column after to be of size exactly $k+1$. Thus, the corner tile appears in the point. □

Lemma 3.2. *X_T is countable.*

Proof. Lemma 3.1 states that there is one point, up to shift, that has two or more vertical lines. This means that the other points have at most one such line.

[1]Note that we will have to skip one diagonal out of two in our construction, in order for the tape to increase at the same rate as the time.



Figure 4: Tiling α: the unique valid tiling of T in which there are 2 or more vertical lines.

- If a point has exactly one vertical line, then it can have at most two horizontal lines: one on the left of the vertical one and one on the right. A red signal can then appear on the left or the right of the vertical line arbitrary far from it. There is a countable number of such points.
- If a point has no vertical line, then it has at most one horizontal line. A red signal can then appear only once. There is a finite number of such points, up to shift.

There is a countable number of points that can be obtained with the tileset T. All types of obtainable points are shown in Figure 5 and 4.

□

By taking our tileset $T = \{1, \ldots, 40\}$ and mirroring all the tiles along the south-west/north-east diagonal, we obtain a tileset $T' = \{1', \ldots, 40'\}$ with the exact same properties, except it enforces the squeleton of Figure 2b. Remember that whenever the corner tile appeared in a point, then necessarily this point was a shifted of α. Analogously, the corner tile of T' appearing in a point means the this point is a shifted of α'. We hence construct a third tileset $\tau = (T \setminus \{30\} \times T' \setminus \{30'\}) \cup \{(30, 30')\}$ which is the superimposition of T and T' with the restriction that tiles 30 and $30'$ are necessarily superimposed to each other. The corner tile $(30, 30')$ of τ has the property that whenever it appears, the tiling is the superimposition of the skeletons of Figures 2a and 2b with the corner tiles at the same place: there is only one such tiling, we call it β.

The skeleton of Figure 2c is obtained from β if we forget about the parts of the lines of the T layer (resp. T') that are superimposed to white tiles, 29' (resp. 29), of T' (resp. T).

As a consequence of Lemma 3.2, X_τ is also countable. And as a consequence of Lemma 3.1, the only points in x_τ in which computation can be embedded are the shifts of β. The shape of β is the one of Figure 2c, the coordinates of the points of the grid are the following (supposing tile $(30, 30')$ is at the center of the grid):

$$\{(f(n), f(m)) \mid f(m)/4 \leq f(n) \leq 4f(m)\}$$
$$\{(f(n), f(m)) \mid m/2 \leq n \leq 2m\}$$

where $f(n) = (n+1)(n+2)/2 - 1$.

Lemma 3.3. *The Cantor-Bendixson rank of X_τ is 12.*

Proof. The Cantor-Bendixson rank of $X_T \setminus \{\alpha\}$ is 6, see Figure 5, thus the rank of $X_T \setminus \{\alpha\} \times X_{T'} \setminus \{\alpha'\}$ is 11. Adding the configurations corresponding to the superimposition of α and α', X_τ has rank 12. □

4 Π^0_1 classes with recursive members and SFTs

The SFT constructed before will allow us to prove a series of theorems on Π^0_1 classes with recursive points. The foundation of these is Theorem 4.1 which establishes a recursive homeomorphism between SFTs and Π^0_1 classes, up to a recursive subset of the SFT. This recursive homeomorphism is the best we can hope for, as will be shown in section 5. Then from this "partial" homeomorphism,



Figure 5: The other configurations: the $A - ZZ$ configurations are unique (up to shift), and the configurations with subscripts $i, j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ represent the fact that distances between some of the lines can vary. Note that configuration ZZ cannot have a red signal on its left, because it would force another vertical line.

we will be able to deduce results on the set of Turing degrees of SFTs and Π^0_1 classes.

Theorem 4.1. *For any Π^0_1 class S of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists a tileset τ_S such that $S \times \mathbb{Z}^2$ is recursively homeomorphic to $X_{\tau_S} \setminus O$ where O is a computable set of configurations.*

Proof. This proof uses the construction of section 3. Let M be a Turing machine such that M halts with x as an oracle iff $x \notin S$. Take the tileset τ of section 3 and encode, as explained earlier, in configuration β the Turing machine M having as an oracle x on an unmodifiable second tape. This gives us τ_M, O is the set all points except the β ones. To each $(x, z) \in S \times \mathbb{Z}^2$ we associate the β tiling having a corner at position z and having x on its oracle tape. O is computable, because it contains a countable number (Lemma 3.2) of computable points (none of these points can contain more than one step of computation). □

Corollary 4.2. *For any Π^0_1 class S of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with a recursive member, there exists a SFT X with the same set of Turing degrees.*

Corollary 4.3. *For any countable Π^0_1 class S of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, there exists a SFT X with the same set of Turing degrees.*

Proof. We know, from Cenzer/Remmel [7], that countable Π^0_1 sets have $\mathbf{0}$ (computable elements) in their set of Turing degrees, thus the SFT X_{τ_M} described in the proof of Theorem 4.1 has exactly the same set of Turing degrees as S. □

Theorem 4.4. *For any countable Π^0_1 class S of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists a SFT X with the same set of Turing degrees such that $CB(X) = CB(S) + 11$.*

Proof. Lemma 3.3 states that X_τ is of Cantor-Bendixson rank 12, 11 without β. In the tileset τ_M of the previous proof, the Cantor-Bendixson rank of the contents of the tape is exactly $CB(S)$, hence $CB(X_{\tau_S}) = CB(S) + 11$.

□

From Ballier/Durand/Jeandel [1] we know that for any subshift X, if $CB(X) \leq 2$, then X has only recursive points. Thus an optimal construction would have to augment the Cantor-Bendixson rank by at least 2.

Corollary 4.5. *For any countable Π^0_1 class S of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there exists a sofic subshift X with the same set of Turing degrees such that $CB(X) = CB(S) + 2$.*

Proof. Take a projection that just keeps the symbols of the Turing machine tape τ_M of the proof of Theorem 4.1 and maps everything else to a blank symbol. Recall the Turing machine tape cells are the intersections of the vertical lines and horizontal lines. This projection leads to 3 possible configurations :

- a completely blank configuration,
- a completely blank configuration with only one symbol somewhere,
- a configuration with a white background and points corresponding to the intersections in the sparse grid of Figure 2c.

□

Note that a similar theorem in dimension one for effective rather than sofic subshifts was conjectured in Cenzer/Dashti/Toska/Wyman [6] and later proved by the authors (personal communication).

5 Π^0_1 classes without recursive members and subshifts

In this section we prove that two-dimensional SFTs containing only non-recursive points have the property that they always have points with different but comparable degrees, this is corollary 5.11. But we first prove this result for one-dimensional subshifts, not necessarily of finite type, in Theorem 5.3, the proof for two-dimensional SFTs needing only a bit more work.

One interest of these proofs, lies in the following theorem, proved by Jockusch and Soare:

Theorem 5.1 (Jockusch, Soare)**.** *There exists Π^0_1 classes containing no recursive member, such that any two different members are Turing-incomparable.*

The proof of this result can be found in Cenzer and Remmel's upcoming book [7] or in the original articles by Jockusch and Soare [15, 14].

This means that one cannot expect a full recursive homeomorphism, i.e. without removal of the recursive points. Furthermore, this shows that in general, when a Π^0_1 class P has no computable member, it is not true that one can find a SFT with the same set of Turing degrees.

The main idea of the proof is that any subshift contains a minimal subshift. If the subshift has no recursive points (actually, no periodic points), this minimal subshift contains only strictly quasiperiodic points. We will then use some combinatorial properties of this minimal subshift to obtain our results.

5.1 One-dimensional subshifts

We start with a technical lemma that will allow us to prove the theorem:

Lemma 5.2. *Let x be a strictly quasiperiodic point of a minimal one-dimensional subshift A and $\prec$ be an order on Σ_A. For any word w extensible to x, there exists two words w_0 and w_1 such that:*

- *w appears exactly twice in w_0 and w_1 respectively,*
- *let a and b (resp. c and d) be the first differing letters in the blocks directly following the first and second occurence of w in w_0 (resp. w_1), then $a \prec b$ (resp. $d \prec c$).*

Proof. By quasiperiodicity of x, w appears infinitely many times in x. By non periodicity, any two occurences of w must be followed by eventually distinct words. Let y be the largest word so that whenever w appears in x, then wy appears. Note that w appears only once in wy, otherwise the x would be periodic.

By definition of y, the letters after each occurence of wy cannot be all the same. So there exists two consecutive occurences of wy with differing next letters a, b with, e.g., $a \prec b$ (the other case being similar). w_0 is then defined as the smallest word containg both occurences of wy and these letters a, b.

Now x is quasiperiodic, hence some occurence of wyb must also appear before some occurence of wya, so we can find between these two positions two occurences of wy with differing next letters c, d with $d \prec c$. We can then define w_1 similarly.



Figure 6: Two nearest w blocks, the first differing letter a, b and c, d in their following blocks, and how they form the w_i. Note that the first differing letter might in some cases be inside the second occurence of w, as illustrated on the right with c, d.

See Figure 6 for an illustration of the construction of w_0 and w_1.

□

Theorem 5.3. *Let A be a minimal subshift containing only strictly quasiperiodic points and x a point of A. Then for any Turing degree d such that $\deg_T x \leq d$, there exists a point $y \in A$ with Turing degree d.*

Proof. To prove the theorem, we will give two computable functions $f : A \times \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to A$ and $g : A \to \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that for any $x \in A$ and $s \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we have $g(f(x,s)) = s$. This means in terms of Turing degrees:

$$\deg_T s \leq \deg_T f(x,s) \leq \sup_T(\deg_T x, \deg_T s)$$

That is to say, we give two algorithms, one (f) that given a point x of A and a sequence s of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ reversibly computes a point of A that embeds s, the second (g) retrieves s from the computed point.

Let us now give f. Let $\prec$ be an order on Σ_A. Given a point $x \in A$ and a sequence $s \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, f recursively constructs another point of A: it starts with a block $C_{-1} = x_0$ and recursively constructs bigger and bigger blocks C_i such that C_{i+1} has C_i in its center. Furthermore these blocks are each centered in 0. So that the sequence $C_{-1} \to C_0 \to C_1 \to \cdots \to C_i \to \ldots$ converges to a point c of A having all C_i's in its center. It is sufficient to show then how C_{i+1} is constructed from C_i.

f works as follows: It searches for two consecutive occurences of C_i in x, where the two first differing letters satisfy $a \prec b$ if $s_{i+1} = 0$ and $b \prec a$ if $s_{i+1} = 1$. We know that f will eventually succeed in finding these occurences due to Lemma 5.2.

Now we define C_{i+1} as the word in x where we find these two occurences, correctly cut so that the first occurence of C_i is at its center, and its last letter is the differing letter of the second occurence. See Figure 7.

We thus have f, which is clearly computable. We give now g.

Given C_i and c, one can compute s_{i+1} easily: we just have to look for the second occurence of C_i in c, the first one being in its center. We then check whether the first differing letters between the blocks following each occurence are such that $e \prec f$ or $f \prec e$. This also gives us C_{i+1}.

This means that from c, one can recover s. We know $C_{-1} = c_0$ and from this information, we can get the rest: from c and C_i, one computes easily C_{i+1} and s_i. We have constructed our function g.

So now if we take a sequence s such that $\deg_T s > \deg_T x$, we can take $y = c = f(x,s)$. It has the same Turing degree as s since $\deg_T s = \sup_T(\deg_T x, \deg_T s)$.

□



Figure 7: How we construct c_{i+1} from c_i. When $s_{i+1} = 0$, we have $e \prec f$ and $f \prec e$ otherwise. The words of Lemma 5.2 are completed on the left with the block preceeding them in x.

Corollary 5.4. *Every non-empty one-dimensional subshift S containing only non recursive points has points with different but comparable degrees.*

Proof. Take any minimal subshift of S. It must contain only strictly quasiperiodic points, so the previous theorem apply. □

For effective subshifts, we can do better

Lemma 5.5. *Every nonempy effective subshift S contains a minimal subshift $\tilde{S}$ whose set of valid patterns is of Turing degree less than $0'$.*

$0'$ is the degree of the Halting problem.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the computable set of forbidden patterns defining S. Let w_n be a (computable) enumeration of all words. Define $\mathcal{F}_n$ as follows: $\mathcal{F}_{-1} = \emptyset$. Then if $\mathcal{F}_n \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \{w_{n+1}\}$ defines a non-empty subshift, then $\mathcal{F}_{n+1} = \mathcal{F} \cup \{w_{n+1}\}$ else $\mathcal{F}_{n+1} = \mathcal{F}_n$.

Now take $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \cup_n \mathcal{F}_n$. It is clear from the construction that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is computable given the Halting problem. Moreover $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ defines a non-empty, minimal subshift $\tilde{S}$. More exactly the complement of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is exactly the set of patterns appearing in $\tilde{S}$. □

This lemma cannot be improved: an effective subshift is built in Ballier/Jeandel [2] for which the language of every minimal subshift is at least of Turing degree $0'$.

Now it is clear that any minimal subshift $\tilde{S}$ has a point computable in its set of valid patterns, so that:

Corollary 5.6. *Every non-empty effective subshift with no recursive point contains configurations of every Turing degree above $0'$.*

We do not know if this can be improved. While it is true that all minimal subshifts in [2] have a language of Turing degree at least $0'$, this does not mean that their configurations have all Turing degree at least $0'$. In the construction of [2], there indeed exists recursive minimal points. The construction of Myers [20] has nonrecursive points, but points of low degree.

5.2 Two-dimensional SFTs

We now prove an analoguous theorem for two dimensional SFTs. We cannot use the previous result directly as it is not true that any strictly quasiperiodic configuration always contain a strictly quasiperiodic (horizontal) line. Indeed, there exists strictly quasiperiodic configurations, even in SFTs with no periodic configurations, where some line in the configuration is not quasiperiodic (this is

the case of the "cross" in Robinson's construction [21]) or for which every line is periodic of different period (such configurations happen in particular in the Kari-Culik construction [9, 16]).

We will first try to prove a result similar to Lemma 5.2, for which we will need an intermediate definition and lemma.

Definition 5.7 (line)**.** *A* line *or* n-line *of a two-dimensional configuration* $x \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ *is a function* $l : \mathbb{Z} \times H \to \Sigma$*, with* $H = h + [\![0; n-1]\!]$*,* $h \in \mathbb{Z}$*, such that*

$$x_{|\mathbb{Z}\times H} = l.$$

Where n *is the width of the line and* h *the vertical placement.*

One can also define a line in a block by simply taking the intersection of both domains. The notion of quasiperiodicity for lines is exactly the same as the one for one dimensional subshifts. We need this notion for the following lemma, that will help us prove the two-dimensional version of Lemma 5.2. We also think that this lemma might be of interest in itself.

Lemma 5.8. *Let* A *be a minimal subshift. There exists a point* $x \in A$ *such that all its lines are quasiperiodic.*

Proof. Let $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ and $H_i = a_i + [\![0; b_i]\!]$.

If x is a configuration, denote by $p_i(x) : \mathbb{Z} \times H_i \mapsto \Sigma$ the restriction of x to $\mathbb{Z} \times H_i$. We will often view p_i as a map from A to $(\Sigma^{H_i})^{\mathbb{Z}}$. A *horizontal* subshift is a subset of $\Sigma^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ which is closed and invariant by a horizontal shift.

We will build by induction a non-empty horizontal subshift A_i of A with the property that every configuration x of A_i has the property that every line of support H_j, for any $j < i$, is quasiperiodic. More precisely, $p_j(A_i)$ will be a minimal subshift.

Define $A_{-1} = A$. If A_i is defined, consider $p_{i+1}(A_i)$. This is a non-empty subshift, so it contains a minimal subshift X. Now we define the horizontal subshift $A_{i+1} = p_{i+1}^{-1}(X) \cap A_i$. By construction $p_{i+1}(A_{i+1})$ is minimal. Furthermore, for any $j < i$, $p_j(A_{i+1})$ is a non-empty subshift, and it is included in $p_j(A_j)$, which is minimal, hence it is minimal.

To end the proof, remark that by compactness $\cap_i A_i$ is non-empty, as every finite intersection is non-empty. □

Lemma 5.9. *Let* A *be a two-dimensional minimal subshift where all points (equivalently, some point) have no horizontal period.*

Let x *be a point of* A *and* $\prec$ *be an order on* Σ_A*. For each* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*, for any* n*-block* w *extensible to* x*, there exists two blocks* w_0 *and* w_1 *extensible to* x *such that:*

- w *appears exactly twice in both* w_0 *and* w_1*, on the same* n*-line of vertical placement 0.*
- *the first differring letters* e *and* f *in the blocks containing and starting with each occurence of* w *are such that* $e \prec f$ *in* w_0 *and* $f \prec e$ *in* w_1*.*

Here the word "first" refers to an adequate enumeration of $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}$*.*



Figure 8: How c_{i+1} is constructed inductively from c_i. c_i is in the center of c_{i+1}. The letters e and f are the first differing letters in the blocks containing the c_i's. Whether $e \prec f$ of $f \prec e$ depends on what symbol we want to embed, 0 or 1.

Proof. As the result is about patterns rather than configurations, we can suppose w.l.o.g by Lemma 5.8 that all lines of x are quasiperiodic.

Since w appears in x, it appears a second time on the same n-line in x. Since x is not horizontally periodic, both occurences are in the center of different blocks. (The place where they differ may be on a different line, though, if this particular n-line is periodic)

Now we use the same argument as lemma 5.2 on the m-line containing both occurences of w and the first place they differ. (Note that we cannot use directly the lemma as this m-line might itself be periodic, but the proof still works in this case) □

Theorem 5.10. *Let A be a two-dimensional minimal subshift where all points (equivalently, some point) have no horizontal period and x a point of A. Then for any Turing degree d such that $\deg_T x \leq d$, there exists a point $y \in A$ with Turing degree d.*

Proof. The proof is identical as the one of Theorem 5.3, Lemma 5.9 being the two-dimensional counterpart of Lemma 5.2. One can see in Figure 8 how the C_i's are contructed in this case. □

Corollary 5.11. *Every two-dimensional non-empty subshift X containing only non-recursive points has points with different but comparable degrees.*

Proof. X contains a minimal subshift A, which cannot be periodic. If A contains a point with a horizontal period, then all points of A have a horizontal period, and the result follows from Theorem 5.3. Otherwise, it follows from the previous theorem. □

Lemma 5.5 is still valid in any dimensions so that we have:

Corollary 5.12. *Every two-dimensional non-empty effective subshift (in particular any non-empty SFT) with no recursive points contains points of any Turing degree above* $0'$.

We conjecture that a stronger statement is true: The set of Turing degrees of any subshift with no recursive points is upward closed. To prove this, it is sufficient to prove that for any subshift S and any configuration x of S (which is not minimal), there exists a minimal configuration in S of Turing degree less than the degree of x. We however have no idea how to prove this, and no counterexample comes to mind.

References

[1] Alexis Ballier, Bruno Durand, and Emmanuel Jeandel. Structural aspects of tilings. *25th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS).*, 2008.

[2] Alexis Ballier and Emmanuel Jeandel. Computing (or not) quasi-periodicity functions of tilings. In *Symposium on Cellular Automata (JAC)*, pages 54–64, 2010.

[3] Robert Berger. *The Undecidability of the Domino Problem.* PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1964.

[4] Robert Berger. *The Undecidability of the Domino Problem.* Number 66 in Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society. 1966.

[5] Douglas Cenzer, Ali Dashti, and Jonathan L. F. King. Computable symbolic dynamics. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 54(5):460–469, 2008.

[6] Douglas Cenzer, Ali Dashti, Ferit Toska, and Sebastian Wyman. Computability of Countable Subshifts. In *Computability in Europe (CiE)*, volume 6158 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 88–97, 2010.

[7] Douglas Cenzer and J.B. Remmel. Π^0_1 classes in mathematics. In *Handbook of Recursive Mathematics - Volume 2: Recursive Algebra, Analysis and Combinatorics*, volume 139 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, chapter 13, pages 623–821. Elsevier, 1998.

[8] Douglas Cenzer and Jeffrey Remmel. *Effectively Closed Sets.* ASL Lecture Notes in Logic, 2011. in preparation.

[9] Karel Culik II. An aperiodic set of 13 Wang tiles. *Discrete Mathematics*, 160:245–251, 1996.

[10] Ali Dashti. *Effective Symbolic Dynamics.* PhD thesis, University of Florida, 2008.

[11] Bruno Durand. Tilings and Quasiperiodicity. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 221(1-2):61–75, 1999.

[12] Bruno Durand, Leonid A. Levin, and Alexander Shen. Complex tilings. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 73(2):593–613, 2008.

[13] William Hanf. Non Recursive Tilings of the Plane I. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 39(2):283–285, 1974.

[14] Carl G. Jockusch and Robert I. Soare. Degrees of members of Π^0_1 classes. *Pacific J. Math.*, 40:605–616, 1972.

[15] Carl G. Jockusch and Robert I. Soare. Π^0_1 classes and degrees of theories. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 173:33–56, 1972.

[16] Jarkko Kari. A small aperiodic set of Wang tiles. *Discrete Mathematics*, 160:259–264, 1996.

[17] Alexander S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

[18] Douglas Lind. Multi-dimensional symbolic dynamics. *Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics*, 60:81–120, 2004.

[19] Douglas Lind and Brian Marcus. *An introduction to symbolic dynamics and coding*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1995.

[20] Dale Myers. Non Recursive Tilings of the Plane II. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 39(2):286–294, 1974.

[21] Raphael M. Robinson. Undecidability and Nonperiodicity for Tilings of the Plane. *Inventiones Math.*, 12, 1971.

[22] Stephen G. Simpson. Mass Problems Associated with Effectively Closed Sets. in preparation, 2011.

[23] Stephen G. Simpson. Medvedev Degrees of 2-Dimensional Subshifts of Finite Type. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 2011.

[24] Hao Wang. Proving theorems by Pattern Recognition II. *Bell Systems technical journal*, 40:1–41, 1961.

[25] Hao Wang. Dominoes and the $\forall\exists\forall$ case of the decision problem. *Mathematical Theory of Automata*, pages 23–55, 1963.