

Fixed point theorem and aperiodic tilings*

Bruno Durand¹, Andrei Romashchenko^{1,2}, Alexander Shen^{1,2}

¹ LIF, CNRS & Univ. de Provence, Marseille

² Institute for Information Transmission Problems, Moscow

Abstract. We propose a new simple construction of an aperiodic tile set based on self-referential (fixed point) argument.

People often say about some discovery that it appeared “ahead of time”, meaning that it could be fully understood only in the context of ideas developed later. For the topic of this note, the construction of an aperiodic tile set based on the fixed-point (self-referential) approach, the situation is exactly the opposite. It should have been found in 1960s when the question about aperiodic tile sets was first asked: all the tools were quite standard and widely used at that time. However, the history had chosen a different path and many nice geometric *ad hoc* constructions were developed instead (by Berger, Robinson, Penrose, Ammann and many others, see [6]; a popular exposition of Robinson-style construction is given in [3]). In this note we try to correct this error and present a construction that should have been discovered first but seemed to be unnoticed for more than forty years.

1 The statement: aperiodic tile sets

A tile is a square with colored sides. Given a set of tiles, we want to find a tiling, i.e., to cover the plane by (translated copies of) these tiles in such a way that colors match (a common side of two neighbor tiles has the same color in both).³

For example, if tile set consists of two tiles (one has black lower and left side and white right



Fig. 1. Tile set that has only periodic tilings

and top sides, the other has the opposite colors), it is easy to see that only periodic (checkerboard)

* Partially supported by ANR (Sycomore and Nafit grants) and RFBR (05-01-02803, 06-01-00122a).

³ Tiles appeared first in the context of *domino problem* posed by Hao Wang. Here is the original formulation from [10]: “Assume we are given a finite set of square plates of the same size with edges colored, each in a different manner. Suppose further there are infinitely many copies of each plate (plate type). We are not permitted to rotate or reflect a plate. The question is to find an effective procedure by which we can decide, for each given finite set of plates, whether we can cover up the whole plane (or, equivalently, an infinite quadrant thereof) with copies of the plates subject to the restriction that adjoining edges must have the same color.” This question (domino problem) is closely related to the existence of aperiodic tile sets: (1) if they did not exist, domino problem would be decidable for some simple reasons (one may look in parallel for a periodic tiling or a finite region that cannot be tiled) and (2) the aperiodic tile sets are used in the proof of the undecidability of domino problem. However, in this note we concentrate on aperiodic tile sets only.

tiling is possible. However, if we add some other tiles the resulting tile set may admit also non-periodic tilings (e.g., if we add all 16 possible tiles, any combination of edge colors becomes possible). It turns out that there are other tile set that have *only* aperiodic tilings.

Formally: let C be a finite set of *colors* and let $\tau \subset C^4$ be a set of *tiles*; the components of the quadruple are interpreted as upper/right/lower/left colors of a tile. Our example tile set with two tiles is represented then as

$$\{\langle \text{white, white, black, black} \rangle, \langle \text{black, black, white, white} \rangle\}.$$

A τ -tiling is a mapping $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \tau$ that satisfies matching conditions. Tiling U is called *periodic* if it has a *period*, i.e., if there exists a non-zero vector $T \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $U(x+T) = U(x)$ for all x .

Now we can formulate the result (first proven by Berger [1]):

Proposition. *There exists a finite tile set τ such that τ -tilings exist but all of them are aperiodic.*

There is a useful reformulation of this result. Instead of tilings we can consider two-dimensional infinite words in some finite alphabet A (i.e., mappings of type $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow A$) and put some local constraints on them. This means that we choose some positive integer N and look at the word through a window of size $N \times N$. Local constraint then says which patterns of size $N \times N$ are allowed to appear in a window. Now we can reformulate our Proposition as follows: *there exists a local constraint that is consistent (some infinite words satisfy it) but implies aperiodicity (all satisfying words are aperiodic).*

It is easy to see that these two formulations are equivalent. Indeed, the color matching condition is 2×2 checkable. On the other hand, any local constraint can be expressed in terms of tiles and colors if we use $N \times N$ -patterns as tiles and $(N-1) \times N$ -patterns as colors; e.g., the right color of $(N \times N)$ -tile is the tile except for its left column; if it matches the left color of the right neighbor, these two tiles overlap correctly.

2 Why theory of computation?

At first glance this proposition has nothing to do with theory of computation. However, the question appeared in the context of the undecidability of some logical decision problems, and, as we shall see, can be solved using theory of computations. (A rare chance to convince “normal” mathematicians that theory of computations is useful!)

The reason why theory of computation comes into play is that rules that determine the behavior of a computation device — say, a Turing machine with one-dimensional tape — can be transformed into local constraints for the space-time diagram that represents computation process. So we can try to prove the proposition as follows: consider a Turing machine with a very complicated (and therefore aperiodic) behavior and translate its rules into local constraints; then any tiling represents a time-space diagram of a computation and therefore is aperiodic.

However, this naïve approach does not work since local constraints are satisfied also at the places where no computation happens (in the regions that do not contain the head of a Turing machine) and therefore allow periodic configurations. So a more sophisticated approach is needed.

3 Self-similarity

The main idea of this more sophisticated approach is to construct a “self-similar” set of tiles. Informally speaking, this means that any tiling can be uniquely split by vertical and horizontal lines into $M \times M$ blocks that behave exactly like the individual tiles. Then, if we see a tiling and zoom out with scale $1 : M$, we get a tiling with the same tile set.

Let us give a formal definition. Assume that a non-empty set of tiles τ and positive integer $M > 1$ are fixed. A *macro-tile* is a square of size $M \times M$ filled with matching tiles from τ . Let ρ be a non-empty set of macro-tiles.

Definition. We say that τ *implements* ρ if any τ -tiling can be uniquely split by horizontal and vertical lines into macro-tiles from ρ .

Now we give two examples that illustrate this definition: one negative and one positive.

Negative example: Consider a set τ that consists of one tile with all white sides. Then there is only one macro-tile (of given size $M \times M$). Let ρ be a one-element set that consists of this macro-tile. Any τ -tiling (i.e., the only possible τ -tiling) can be split into ρ -macro-tiles. However, the splitting lines are not unique, so τ does *not* implement ρ .

Positive example: Let τ is a set of M^2 tiles that are indexed by pairs of integers modulo M : The colors are pairs of integers modulo M arranged as shown (Fig. 2). Then there exists only one




Fig. 2. Elements of τ (here i, j are integers modulo M)

τ -tiling (up to translations), and this tiling can be uniquely split into $M \times M$ squares whose borders have colors $(0, j)$ and $(i, 0)$. Therefore, τ implements a set ρ that consists of one macro-tile (Fig. 3).

Definition. A set of tiles τ is *self-similar* if it implements some set of macro-tiles ρ that is isomorphic to τ .

This means that there exist a 1-1-correspondence between τ and ρ such that matching pairs of τ -tiles correspond exactly to matching pairs of ρ -macro-tiles.

The following statement follows directly from the definition:

Proposition. A *self-similar* tile set τ has only aperiodic tilings.

Proof. Let T be a period of some τ -tiling U . By definition U can be uniquely split into ρ -macro-tiles. Shift by T should respect this splitting (otherwise we get a different splitting), so T is a multiple of M . Zooming the tiling and replacing each ρ -macro-tile by a corresponding τ -tile, we




Fig. 3. The only element of ρ : border colors are pairs that contain 0

get a T/M -shift of a τ -tiling. For the same reason T/M should be a multiple of M , then we zoom out again etc. We conclude therefore that T is a multiple of M^k for any k , i.e., T is a zero vector. \square

Note also that any self-similar set τ has at least one tiling. Indeed, by definition we can tile a $M \times M$ square (since macro-tiles exist). Replacing each τ -tile by a corresponding macro-tile, we get a τ -tiling of $M^2 \times M^2$ square, etc. In this way we can tile an arbitrarily large finite region, and then standard compactness argument (König’s lemma) shows that we can tile the entire plane.

So it remains to construct a self-similar set of tiles (a set of tiles that implements itself, up to an isomorphism).

4 Fixed points and self-referential constructions

The construction of a self-similar tile set is done in two steps. First (in Section 5) we explain how to construct (for a given tile set σ) another tile set τ that implements σ (i.e., implements a set of macro-tiles isomorphic to σ). In this construction the tile set σ is given as a program p_σ that checks whether four bit strings (representing four side colors) appear in one σ -tile. The tile set τ then guarantees that each macro-tile encodes a computation where p_σ is applied to these four strings (“macro-colors”) and accepts them.

This gives us a mapping: for every σ we have $\tau = \tau(\sigma)$ that implements σ and depends on σ . Now we need a fixed point of this mapping where $\tau(\sigma)$ is isomorphic to σ . It is done (Section 6) by a classical self-referential trick that appeared as liar’s paradox, Cantor’s diagonal argument, Russell’s paradox, Gödel’s (first) incompleteness theorem, Tarsky’s theorem, undecidability of the Halting problem, Kleene’s fixed point (recursion) theorem and von Neumann’s construction of self-reproducing automata — in all these cases the core argument is essentially the same.

The same trick is used also in a classical programming challenge: to write a program that prints its own text. Of course, for every string s it is trivial to write a program $t(s)$ that prints s , but how do we get $t(s) = s$? It seems at first that $t(s)$ should incorporate the string s itself plus some overhead, so how $t(s)$ can be equal to s ? However, this first impression is false. Imagine that our computational device is a universal Turing machine U where the program is written in a special read-only layer of the tape. (This means that the tape alphabet is a Cartesian product of two components, and one of the components is used for the program and is never changed by U .) Then the program can get access to its own text at any moment, and, in particular, can copy it to

the output tape.⁴ Now we explain in more details how to get a self-similar tile set according to this scheme.

5 Implementing a given tile set

In this section we show how one can implement a given tile set σ , or, better to say, how to construct a tile set τ that implements some set of macro-tiles that is isomorphic to σ .

There are easy ways to do this. Though we cannot let $\tau = \sigma$ (recall that zoom factor M should be greater than 1), we can do essentially the same for every $M > 1$. Let us extend our “positive” example (with one macro-tile and M^2 tiles) by superimposing additional colors. Superimposing two sets of colors means that we consider the Cartesian product of color sets (so each edge carries a pair of colors). One set of colors remains the same (M^2 colors for M^2 pairs of integers modulo M). Let us describe additional (superimposed) colors. Internal edges of each macro-tile should have the same color and this color should be different for all macro-tiles, so we allocate $\#\sigma$ colors for that. This gives $\#\sigma$ macro-tiles that can be put into 1-1-correspondence with σ -tiles. It remains to provide correct border colors, and this is easy to do since each tile “knows” which σ -tile it simulates (due to the internal color). In this way we get $M^2\#\sigma$ tiles that implement the tile set σ with zoom factor M .

However, this (trivial) simulation is not really useful. Recall that our goal is to get isomorphic σ and τ , and in this implementation τ -tiles have more colors than σ -tiles (and we have more tiles, too). So we need a more creative encoding of σ -colors that makes use of the space available: a side of a macro-tile has a “macro-color” that is a sequence of M tile colors, and we can have a lot of macro-colors in this way.

So let us assume that colors in σ are k -bit strings for some k . Then the tile set is a subset $S \subset \mathbb{B}^k \times \mathbb{B}^k \times \mathbb{B}^k \times \mathbb{B}^k$, i.e., a 4-ary predicate on the set \mathbb{B}^k of k -bit strings. Assume that S is presented by a program that computes Boolean value $S(x, y, z, w)$ given four k -bit strings x, y, z, w . Then we can construct a tile set τ as follows.

We start again with a set of M^2 tiles from our example and superimpose additional colors but use them in a more economical way. Assuming that $k \ll M$, we allocate k places in the middle of each side of a macro-tile and allow each of them to carry an additional color bit; then a macro-color represents a k -bit string. Then we need to arrange the internal colors in such a way that macro-colors (k -bit strings) x, y, z and w can appear on the four sides of a macro-tile if and only if $S(x, y, z, w)$ is true.

To achieve this goal, let us agree that the middle part (of size, say, $M/2 \times M/2$) in every $M \times M$ -macro-tile is a “computation zone”. Tiling rules (for superimposed colors) in this zone guarantee that it represents a time-space diagram of a computation of some (fixed) universal Turing machine. (We assume that time goes up in a vertical direction and the tape is horizontal.) It is convenient

⁴ Of course, this looks like cheating: we use some very special universal machine as an interpreter of our programs, and this makes our task easy. Teachers of programming that are seasoned enough may recall the BASIC program

that indeed prints its own text. However, this trick can be generalized enough to show that a self-printing program exists in every language.

to assume that program of this machine is written on a special read-only layer of the tape (see the discussion in Section 4).

Outside the computation zone the tiling rules guarantee that bits are transmitted from the sides to the initial configuration of a computation.




Fig. 4. k -macro-colors are transmitted to the computation zone where they are checked

We also require that this machine should accept its input before running out of time (i.e., less than in $M/2$ steps), otherwise the tiling is impossible.

Note that in this description different parts of a macro-tile behave differently; this is OK since we start from our example where each tile “knows” its position in a macro-tile (keeps two integers modulo M). So the tiles in the “wire” zone know that they should transmit a bit, the tiles inside the computation zone know they should obey the local rules for time-space diagram of the computation, etc.

This construction uses only bounded number of additional colors since we have fixed the universal Turing machine (including its alphabet and number of states); we do not need to increase the number of colors when we increase M and k (though k should be small compared to M to leave enough space for the wires; we do not give an exact position of the wires but it is easy to see that if k/M is small enough, there is enough space for them). So the construction uses $O(M^2)$ colors (and tiles).

6 A tile set that implements itself

Now we come to the crucial point in our argument: can we arrange things in such a way that the predicate S (i.e., the tile set it generates) is isomorphic to the set of tiles τ used to implement it?

Assume that $k = 2\log M + O(1)$; then macro-colors have enough space to encode the coordinates modulo M plus superimposed colors (which require $O(1)$ bits for encoding).

Note that many of the rules that define τ do not depend on σ (i.e., on the predicate S). So the program for the universal Turing machine may start by checking these rules. It should check that

- bits that represent coordinates (integers modulo M) on the four sides of a macro-tile are related in the proper way (left and lower sides have identical coordinates, on the right/upper side one of the coordinates increases modulo M);
- if the macro-tile is outside computation zone and the wires, it does not carry additional colors;
- if the macro-tile is a part of a wire, then it transmits a bit in a required direction (of course, for this we should fix the position of the wires by some formulas that are then checked by a program);
- if the macro-tile is a part of the computation zone, it should obey the local rules for the computation zone (bits of the read-only layer should propagate vertically, bits that encode the content of the tape and the head of our universal Turing machine should change as time increases according to the behavior of this machine, etc.)

This guarantees that on the next layer macro-tiles are grouped into macro-macro-tiles where bits are transmitted correctly to the computation zone of a macro-macro-tile and *some* computation of the universal Turing machine is performed in this zone. But we need more: this computation should be the same computation that is performed on the macro-tile level (fixed point!). This is also easy to achieve since in our model the text of a running program is available to it (recall the we assume that the program is written in a read-only layer): the program should check also that *if a macro-tile is in the computation zone, then the program bit it carries is correct* (program knows the x -coordinate of a macro-tile, so it can go at the corresponding place of its own tape to find out which program bit resides in this place).

This sound like some magic, but we hope that our previous example (a program for the UTM that prints its own text) makes this trick less magical (indeed, reliable and reusable magic is called technology).

7 So what?

We believe that our proof is rather natural. If von Neumann lived few years more and were asked about aperiodic tile sets, he would probably immediately give this argument as a solution. (He was especially well prepared to it since he used very similar self-referential tricks to construct a self-reproducing automata, see [9].) In fact this proof somehow appeared, though not very explicitly, in P. Gács' papers on cellular automata [5]; the attempts to understand these papers were our starting points.

This proof is rather flexible and can be adapted to get many results usually associated with aperiodic tilings: undecidability of domino problem (Berger [1]), recursive inseparability of periodic tile sets and inconsistent tile sets (Gurevich – Koryakov [7]), enforcing substitution rules (Mozes [8]) and others (see [2,4]). But does it give something new?

We believe that indeed there are some applications that hardly could be achieved by previous arguments. Let us conclude by mentioning two of them. First is the construction of *robust* aperiodic

tile sets. We can consider tilings with holes (where no tiles are placed and therefore no matching rules are checked). A robust aperiodic tile set should have the following property: if the set of holes is “sparse enough”, then tiling still should be far from any periodic pattern (say, in the sense of Besicovitch distance, i.e., the limsup of the fraction of mismatched positions in a centered square as the size of the square goes to infinity). The notion of “sparsity” should not be too restrictive here; we guarantee, for example, that a Bernoulli random set with small enough probability p (each cell belongs to a hole independently with probability p) is sparse.

While the first example (robust aperiodic tile sets) is rather technical (see [4] for details), the second is more basic. Let us split all tiles in some tile set into two classes, say, A- and B-tiles. Then we consider a fraction of A-tiles in a tiling. If a tile set is not restrictive (allows many tilings), this fraction could vary from one tiling to another. For classical aperiodic tilings this fraction is usually fixed: in a big tiled region the fraction of A-tiles is close to some limit value, usually an eigenvalue of an integer matrix (and therefore an algebraic number). The fixed-point construction allows us to get any computable number. Here is the formal statement: *for any computable real $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ there exists a tile set τ divided into A- and B-tiles such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists N such that for all $n > N$ the fraction of A-tiles in any τ -tiling of $n \times n$ -square is between $\alpha - \varepsilon$ and $\alpha + \varepsilon$.*

References

1. R. Berger, The Undecidability of the Domino Problem. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **66**, 1966.
2. Egon Börger, Erich Grädel, Yuri Gurevich, *The Classical Decision Problem*, Springer, 1987. ISBN 3-540-57073-X
3. Bruno Durand, Leonid Levin, Alexander Shen, Local Rules and Global Order, or Aperiodic Tilings, *Mathematical Intelligencer*, **27**(1), 64–68 (2005).
4. Bruno Durand, Andrei Romashchenko, Alexander Shen, Fixed Point and Aperiodic Tilings, *Developments in Language Theory, 12th International Conference, DLT 2008, Kyoto, Japan, September 16–19, 2008. Proceedings*, Springer, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, volume 5257, 2008. ISBN: 978-3-540-85779-2.
5. Peter Gács, Reliable Cellular Automata with Self-Organization, *J. Stat. Phys.*, **103** (1/2), 45–267, 2001.
6. Branko Grünbaum, Geoffrey C. Shephard, *Tilings and Patterns*, W.H. Freeman & Co, 1986.
7. Yuri Gurevich, Igor Koryakov, A remark on Berger’s paper on the domino problem, *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, **13**, 319–321, 1972.
8. Shahar Mozes, Tilings, Substitution Systems and Dynamical Systems Generated by Them, *J. Analyse Math.*, **53**, 139–186, 1989.
9. John von Neumann, *Theory of Self-reproducing Automata*, edited by A. Burks, University of Illinois Press, 1966.
10. Hao Wang, Proving theorems by pattern recognition II, *Bell System Technical Journal*, **40**, 1–42 (1961).