

ALL MELODIES ARE LOST – RECOGNIZABILITY FOR WEAK AND STRONG α -ITRMS

MERLIN CARL

ABSTRACT. For exponentially closed ordinals α , we consider recognizability of constructible subsets of α for α -(w)ITRMs and their distribution in the constructible hierarchy. In particular, we show that, for class many values of α , the sets of α -wITRM-computable and α -wITRM-recognizable subsets of α are both non-empty, but disjoint, and, also for class many values of α , the set of α -wITRM-recognizable subsets of α is empty.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [14], Hamkins and Lewis introduced infinite time Turing machines (ITTMs), which are Turing machines that compute with transfinite time, but still on a “standard” tape of length ω . Koepke then introduced a number of models of computation in which also memory is extended to transfinite ordinals; these include α -ITTMs [16], which are ITTMs with a tape of length α , and also transfinite generalizations of register machines which can store a single ordinal less than a given ordinal α in each of their registers.

Associated with each model of computation are a concept of explicit definability – called computability – which concerns the ability of the machine to produce a certain object “from scratch”, and another one of implicit definability, which concerns the ability of the machine to decide whether or not an object given in the oracle is equal to a certain x ; in ordinal computability, the latter is known as “recognizability”. For many models of ordinal computability, the “lost melody phenomenon” occurs, which means that there are objects which are recognizable, but not computable; this phenomenon was first discovered (and named) for ITTMs in [14]. Recognizability has been studied in detail for ITTMs and ITRMs in [14], [6], [7], [8] and for Ordinal Turing Machines (OTMs) in [4]. In [6], we considered recognizability by α -ITRMs. All of these works concerned real numbers, i.e., subsets of ω . This has the advantage that the recognizability strength of different models becomes comparable.

Key words and phrases. Infinite Time Register Machines; Recognizability; Constructibility.

However, the natural domain of computation for α -(w)ITRMs are clearly subsets of α , not just subsets of ω . (By analogy, the computability strength of these models (and also of α -ITTMs) is studied in terms of subsets of α , not of ω .) The recognizability of subsets of arbitrary ordinals by OTMs with ordinal parameters is currently studied in joint work with Philipp Schlicht and Philip Welch; since already the recognizable subsets of ω can, depending on the set-theoretical background, go far beyond L in this case by [4], it is hardly surprising that the same happens in the more general case. However, interesting phenomena also arise under the assumption $V = L$. This paper studies the recognizability strength of weak and strong α -register machines with respect to constructible subsets of α . While α -ITRMs behave rather similarly to ITRMs, α -wITRMs show a rather interesting behaviour. In particular, while the computable sets are included in the recognizable sets for all models studied so far, we will below show that, for class many values of α , the sets of α -wITRM-computable and α -wITRM-recognizable subsets of α are both non-empty and disjoint, while for other values of α , the set of α -wITRM-recognizable subsets of α is empty.

2. BASIC DEFINITIONS

In the following, α will denote an exponentially closed ordinal, unless explicitly stated otherwise. We briefly describe α -ITRMs and α -wITRMs, which were originally introduced by Koepke in [16]; full definitions can also be found in [3].

α -register machines use finitely many registers, which can store a single ordinal strictly less than α each. Programs the α -(w)ITRMs are finite sequences of program lines, each containing one of the basic commands to increment the content of a register by 1, to copy the content of one register to another, or to jump to a certain program line when the contents of two registers agree and continue with the next one afterwards. For reasons of technical convenience, the last command was extended a bit in [5] to allow for an instantaneous comparison of two finite sequences of registers; this modification has no influence on the results in this paper. In addition, there is the oracle command: Oracles for α -register machines are subsets x of α . Given a register index $j \in \omega$, the oracle command takes the content of the j -th register, say ι , and then writes 1 to the j th register when $\iota \in x$ and otherwise 0.

Infinitary register computations are now defined by recursion along the ordinals. At successor ordinals, the command in the active program line is simply carried out. (We shall assume that α is a limit ordinal, so that there is no question what to do when the incrementation operator increases a register content above α .) At limit stages, the register contents and the active program line are obtained as the inferior limits of the sequences of the register contents and active program lines so far.

A difficulty arises when this limit is equal to α , and this can be solved in two ways: Either one regards the computation as undefined in such a way, thus obtaining “weak” or “unresetting” α -register machines, called α -wITRMs, or one resets the contents of the overflowing registers to 0, which yields “resetting” or “strong” α -register machines, called α -ITRMs. When one lets $\alpha = \text{On}$, thus allowing arbitrary ordinals as register contents, one obtains Koepke’s Ordinal Register Machines (ORMs), which are equal in computational power to Ordinal Turing Machines (OTMs, [17]) and can compute exactly the constructible sets of ordinals [20]. Thus, α -wITRMs can be regarded as space-bounded versions of ORMs (with a constant space bound).¹

Thus, α -wITRM-programs and α -ITRM-programs are the same and both are just classical register machine programs as, e.g., introduced in [11]. When we write something like “ α -wITRM-program”, we really mean that the program is intended to be run on an α -wITRM.

An important observation about α -(w)ITRM-computations is the following:

Definition 1. *In an α -(w)ITRM-computation, a “strong loop” is a pair (ι, ξ) of ordinals such that the computation states – i.e., the active program line and the register contents – at times ι and ξ are identical and such that, for every time in between, the computation states were in each component greater than or equal to these states.*

It is easy to see from the liminf-rule that a strong loop will be repeated forever.

Theorem 1 (Cf. [3], generalizing [18], Lemma 3). *An α -ITRM-program either halts or runs into a strong loop. An α -wITRM-program either halts, runs into a strong loop or is undefined due to a register overflow.*

We denote by χ_x the characteristic function of a set $x \subseteq \alpha$.

Definition 2. *A set $x \subseteq \alpha$ is α -(w)ITRM-computable if and only if there is an α -(w)ITRM-program P such that, for each $\iota < \alpha$, $P(\iota) \downarrow = \chi_x(\iota)$.*

We will now define the concept of decidability of a set of subsets of α . For the tape models of transfinite computations, such as ITTMs,

¹It is occasionally complained that ordinal computability, rather than providing a single, canonical model of infinitary computability, rather provides a whole menagerie of such models. We regard this complaint as misguided. At the “top level”, one has the confluence of models familiar from finite computability: OTMs, ORMs, ordinal λ -calculus (see Fischbach and Seyfferth [12]) all have the same computational power. The other models, such as (α) -ITTMs, (α) -(w)ITRMs etc. can be regarded as versions with space- or time bounds and thus as analogous to complexity classes. The difference to the finite context is that, since ordinals can have nice closure properties, constant time- and space bounds lead to convenient and interesting classes; but this is a feature, rather than a bug, of ordinal computability.

one needs to distinguish between recognizability, semirecognizability and co-recognizability, depending on whether $\{x\}$ is decidable, semi-decidable or has a semi-decidable complement. Indeed for ITTMs, these concepts have different extensions, see [4].

For ITRMs, no such distinction had to be introduced, as they exhibit a rather surprising feature: The halting problem for ITRMs with a fixed number of registers is solvable by an ITRM-program with a larger number of registers, uniformly in the oracle (see Koepke and Miller, [18], Theorem 4). Thus, semi-, co- and plain decidability all coincide. For wITRMs, there is even less reason for conceptual differentiation, since for these, recognizability coincides with computability, see [6], [3].

For general α -(w)ITRMs, however, the situation is different. It is currently not known whether the bounded halting problem is solvable for α -ITRMs unless $\alpha = \omega$ or $L_\alpha \models \text{ZF}^-$. Moreover, for α -wITRMs, one needs to decide whether, in the definition of the semi-decidability of a set $x \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\alpha)$, one allows undefined computations (i.e., computations in which an oracle overflows) or not.

Definition 3. For $X \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\alpha)$, let us denote by χ_X the characteristic function of X in $\mathfrak{P}(\alpha)$.

A set $X \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\alpha)$ is α -(w)ITRM-semi-decidable if and only if there are an α -(w)ITRM-program P and some $\xi < \alpha$ such that, for all $y \subseteq \alpha$, $P^y(\xi) \downarrow$ if and only if $y \in X$. In the case of α -wITRMs, we demand that the computations $P^y(\xi)$ for $y \notin X$ do not halt, but are still defined.

X is called α -(w)ITRM-co-semi-decidable if and only if $\mathfrak{P}(\alpha) \setminus X$ is α -(w)ITRM-semi-decidable.

If X is both α -(w)ITRM-semi-decidable and α -(w)ITRM-co-semi-decidable, i.e., if there is an α -(w)ITRM-program P and some $\xi < \alpha$ such that $P^y(\xi) \downarrow = \chi_X(y)$ for all $y \subseteq \alpha$, we call X α -(w)ITRM-decidable.

If there are an α -wITRM-program P and some $\xi < \alpha$ such that $P^y(\xi) \downarrow$ for all $y \in X$ and, for all $y \notin X$, $P^y(\xi)$ is either undefined or diverges, we call X “weakly α -wITRM-semi-decidable”. The concept of weak α -wITRM-co-semidecidability and of α -wITRM-decidability are now defined in the obvious way.

Definition 4. Let $x \subseteq \alpha$.

x is called α -(w)ITRM-recognizable if and only if $\{x\}$ is α -(w)ITRM-decidable.

x is called α -(w)ITRM-semirecognizable if and only if $\{x\}$ is α -(w)ITRM-semidecidable.

x is called α -(w)ITRM-cosemirecognizable if and only if $\{x\}$ is α -(w)ITRM-co-semi-decidable.

The weak versions of α -wITRM-semirecognizability and α -wITRM-co-semi-recognizability are defined in the obvious way.

We will use p to denote Cantor’s ordinal pairing function.

When X is a set and E is a binary relation on X , then the structure (X, E) can be encoded as a subset of an exponentially closed ordinal α (cf., e.g., [3], Def. 2.3.18) by fixing a bijection $f : \alpha \rightarrow X$ and letting $c_f(X, E) := \{p(\iota, \xi) : \iota, \xi < \alpha \wedge f(\iota)Ef(\xi)\}$. In general, when $\alpha \subseteq \alpha$, it is computationally nontrivial to identify which $\iota < \alpha$ codes a certain ordinal $\xi < \alpha$. In order to circumvent this problem, we define a class of codes for which this is trivial, as $\iota < \alpha$ is encoded by the ι -th limit ordinal.

Definition 5. *Let α be exponentially closed, X be a transitive set with $\alpha \subseteq X$, and let $f : \alpha \rightarrow X$ be such that, for all $\iota < \alpha$, we have $f(\omega\iota) = \iota$. Then $c_f(X, \in)$ is called a “nice” α -code for X .*

When proving that certain subsets of α are not computable, it is often convenient to recall from the folklore that no L -level can contain a nice code for itself:

Lemma 1. *Let $\beta < \alpha$. Then L_α does not contain a nice β -code for L_α .*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that $c \in \mathfrak{P}(\beta) \cap L_\alpha$ codes L_α via $f : \beta \rightarrow L_\alpha$. There is some $\delta < \alpha$ such that c is defined over L_δ by some \in -formula (possibly with parameters in L_δ).

Consider the set $D := \{\iota < \beta : p(\omega\iota, \iota) \notin c\}$. Since c is definable over L_δ , so is D , so that $D \in L_\alpha$. Pick ξ such that $f(\xi) = D$. Now $\xi \in D \leftrightarrow p(\omega\xi, \xi) \notin c \leftrightarrow f(\omega\xi) \notin f(\xi) \leftrightarrow \xi \notin D$, a contradiction. \square

Remark 1. *In ordinal computability and in definability considerations, one can often switch back and forth between ordinals and the corresponding L -levels, so that their difference seems negligible. Here, we have a noteworthy exception, since already $L_{\omega+1}$ contains codes for all ordinals below ω_1^{CK} , but not even a code for $L_{\omega+1}$.*

Question 1. *Is it possible for an L -level to contain a code for itself?*

We recall a standard definition and two observations.

Definition 6. *For $\alpha \in \text{On}$, σ_α is the first stable ordinal above α , that is, the smallest ordinal $\beta > \alpha$ such that $L_\beta \prec_{\Sigma_1} L$.*

The next lemmas are part of the folklore.

Lemma 2. *For an ordinal α , σ_α is the supremum of all ordinals β such that, for some \in -formula ϕ and some $\xi < \alpha$, β is minimal with the property $L_\beta \models \phi(\xi)$.*

Lemma 3. *If α and β are ordinals such that $\beta \in [\alpha, \sigma_\alpha)$, then $\sigma_\beta = \sigma_\alpha$.*

Proof. It is clear that $\sigma_\alpha \leq \sigma_\beta$.

For the converse, let $\rho < \beta$ and pick $\beta' > \rho$ such that, for some formula ϕ and some $\xi < \alpha$, β' is minimal with $L_{\beta'} \models \phi(\xi)$. By a standard fine-structural argument, $L_{\beta'}$ is the Σ_1 -hull of $\xi + 1$ in $L_{\beta'}$.

Thus, ρ is the minimal witness for some such formula ψ in some parameter $\zeta < \xi + 1$. It follows that ρ is the unique witness x of the formula “There is a minimal L -level L_γ that satisfies $\phi(\xi)$ and in L_γ , x is minimal such that $\psi(x, \zeta)$ ”. Consequently, every \in -formula in the parameter ρ is equivalent to some \in -formula using only parameters less than α . Thus $\sigma_\beta \leq \sigma_\alpha$. \square

Definition 7. (Cf. [3], p. 34)

An ordinal α is called α -(w)ITRM-singular if and only if there are an α -(w)ITRM-program P and an ordinal $\xi < \alpha$ such that, for some $\beta < \alpha$, P computes a cofinal function $f : \beta \rightarrow \alpha$ in the parameter ξ .

We will make use of the following result of Boolos:

Lemma 4. ([2], Theorem 1') *There is a parameter-free \in -formula ϕ such that, for a transitive set X , we have $X \models \phi$ if and only if X is of the form L_α for some ordinal α . We will call this sentence “I am an L -level” from now on.*

3. α -ITRMs

In this section, we will consider recognizability of subsets of α for α -ITRMs. In particular, we will prove that lost melodies exist for all exponentially closed α .

We recall the following theorem from [5]. (ZF^- denotes Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory without the power set axiom; see [13] for a discussion of the axiomatizations.)

Theorem 2. *For every α , there is an ordinal $\gamma := \beta(\alpha)$ such that $x \subseteq \alpha$ is α -ITRM-computable if and only if $x \in L_\gamma$. Moreover, γ is smaller than the next Σ_2 -admissible ordinal after α . If $L_\alpha \models ZF^-$, then $\gamma = \alpha + 1$.*

Proof. It is shown in [5] that $\gamma = \alpha + 1$ if and only if $L_\alpha \models ZF^-$ (Theorem 1) and that γ is the supremum of the α -ITRM-clockable ordinals otherwise (Theorem 42). The upper bound is Corollary 3.4.13 of [3]. \square

It was shown in [5] that, for α ITRM-singular, there is a lost melody for α -ITRMs, namely the halting set (encoded as a subset of α). We start by showing that the extra condition is in fact unnecessary and that there are constructible lost melodies for all exponentially closed ordinals α .²

Lemma 5. *Let α be exponentially closed.*

²The condition of exponential closure is a technical convenience; it allows us, for example, to carry out halting algorithms after each other or run nested loops of algorithms without caring for possible register overflows. We conjecture that dropping this condition would not substantially change most of the results, but merely lead to more cumbersome arguments.

- (1) If α is not a regular cardinal in L , then there are a constructible set $s \subseteq \alpha$ and a program $P_{\alpha-WO}$ such that, for all $x \subseteq \alpha$, $P_{\alpha-WO}^{x \oplus s} \downarrow = 1$ if and only if x codes a well-ordering, and otherwise, $P_{\alpha-WO}^{x \oplus s} \downarrow = 0$.
- (2) ([3], Exercise 2.3.26) If $\alpha = \omega$ or $cf^V(\alpha) > \omega$, then there is such a program $P_{\alpha-WO}$ that works in the empty oracle.

Proof. By simply searching through α , it is easy to check whether a given $x \subseteq \alpha$ codes a linear ordering. We are thus left with checking whether this ordering is well-founded.

- (1) In [[3], Theorem 2.3.25], the well-foundedness test on ITRMs by Koepke and Miller [18] is generalized to α -ITRMs when α is ITRM-singular, i.e., there is an α -ITRM-computable cofinal function $f : \beta \rightarrow \alpha$ for some $\beta < \alpha$. Since we assume that α is not a regular cardinal in L , there is a constructible cofinal function $f : \beta \rightarrow \alpha$ for some $\beta < \alpha$. Let $s = \{p(\iota, f(\iota)) \mid \iota < \beta\}$. Then α is ITRM-singular in the oracle s , and one can easily check that the argument in [3] does not depend on whether the program computing the singularization uses an oracle.
- (2) For $\alpha = \omega$, this is proved in Koepke and Miller [18]. We now assume that α is uncountable.³ By assumption, every countable sequence of elements of α is bounded in α . It thus suffices to search through all sequences bounded by β , for all elements of an unbounded set of ordinals β below α . Since α is exponentially closed, it suffices to consider multiplicatively closed values of β . To this end, count upwards to α in some separate register R and consider the multiplicatively closed ordinals β occurring in R . By [3], Theorem 2.3.25(ii), there is, for each such β , an α -wITRM-program P that checks subsets of β for coding well-orderings. Moreover, this program is uniform in β .

□

We also recall the following generalization of results by Koepke and Seyffferth [19], which is Theorem 2.3.28(iii) of [3].

Lemma 6. *For every exponentially closed α and any $n \in \omega$, there is an α -ITRM-program $P_{\alpha-ntruth}$ such that, for every formula ϕ that starts with n quantifier alternations, followed by a quantifier-free formula and every $x \subseteq \alpha$, $P_{\alpha-ntruth}^{x \oplus s}(\phi, x) \downarrow = 1$ if and only if ϕ holds in the structure coded by x , and otherwise, $P_{\alpha-ntruth}^{x \oplus s} \downarrow = 0$.*

Theorem 3. *For every exponentially closed α , there is a lost melody for α -ITRMs, i.e., a set $x \subseteq \alpha$ such that x is α -ITRM-recognizable, but not α -ITRM-computable.*

³The following argument is sketched in the hint to Exercise 2.3.26 in [3] and is given here for the convenience of the reader.

Proof. By Theorem 2, every α -ITRM-computable $x \subseteq \alpha$ will be an element of $L_{\beta(\alpha)}$. It thus suffices to find a recognizable subset of α that is not contained in L_δ . To this end, we define a (particularly) nice α -code c for and L -level L_β with $\beta \geq \beta(\alpha)$ and then use Lemma 1.

We split the proof into two cases, depending on whether or not α is a regular cardinal in L .

Case 1: α is not a regular cardinal in L .

Recall from Theorem 2 that $\beta(\alpha) < \delta$, where δ is the smallest Σ_2 -admissible ordinal strictly larger than α . We consider the $<_L$ -minimal nice α -code c for L_δ in which additionally α is coded by 1. By finestructure, L_δ is the Σ_2 -Skolem hull of $\alpha+1$ in itself, so a bijection $f : \alpha \rightarrow L_\delta$ is definable over L_δ and thus, we have $c \in L_{\delta+1}$. This means that $c = \{\iota < \alpha : L_\delta \models \phi(\rho, \iota)\}$ for some $\rho < \delta$ and some \in -formula ϕ . In c , let ρ be coded by $\rho' < \alpha$. By Lemma 1, we have $c \notin L_\delta$, and thus, c is not α -ITRM-computable.

We claim that c is α -ITRM-recognizable in the parameter ρ' . To see this, let $x \subseteq \alpha$ be given in the oracle; we need to determine whether $x = c$.

We can check as in Case 2 below that, in x , each $\iota < \alpha$ is coded by $\omega\iota$ while 1 codes α . By Lemma 5, we can check whether x codes a well-founded structure (X, E) . By Lemma 6, we can check whether (X, E) is a model of “I am an L -level” and of Σ_2 -collection. If any of these checks fails, we halt with output 0. Otherwise, we know that x codes a Σ_2 -admissible L -level L_γ with $\gamma > \alpha$, i.e., $\gamma \geq \delta$.

To see whether $\gamma = \delta$, we use the algorithm from Lemma 6 once more to check whether (X, E) contains a Σ_2 -admissible L -level L_ξ with $\xi > \alpha$. If so, we have $\gamma > \delta$ and halt with output 0. Otherwise, we know that x codes L_δ , and it remains to see that x is the “right” code. To check this, we use Lemma 6 once more to run through α and check, for every $\iota < \alpha$, whether $\iota \in c$ holds if and only if $L_\delta \models \phi(\iota, \rho)$ (recall that, at this point, we are guaranteed that L_δ is coded by c and we also know that, in c , ρ is coded by ρ'). If this is the case, we halt with output 1; otherwise, we halt with output 0.

Case 2:⁴ α is a regular cardinal in L . In this case, we have $L_\alpha \models \text{ZF}^-$, and so it follows from Theorem 2 that the α -ITRM-computable subsets of α are exactly those in $L_{\alpha+1}$. By Lemma 1, it suffices to show that there is an α -ITRM-recognizable nice α -code for $L_{\alpha+1}$. Let c be the $<_L$ -minimal nice α -code for $L_{\alpha+1}$ in which additionally α is coded by 1. It is not hard to see that such a code occurs in $L_{\alpha+2}$ and is thus definable over $L_{\alpha+1}$, say by the formula ϕ in the parameter $\rho < \alpha + 1$.

⁴This case uses ideas similar to those used for proving the lost melody theorem for infinite time Blum-Shub-Smale machines, see [9].

Let $f : \alpha \rightarrow L_{\alpha+1}$ be the corresponding bijection. Pick ζ such that $f(\zeta) = \rho$. We claim that c is α -ITRM-recognizable in the parameter ζ .

To see this, let $d \subseteq \alpha$ be given in the oracle. We start by checking whether, for each $\iota < \alpha$, we have $p(\xi, \iota) \in d$ if and only if ξ is of the form $\omega\xi'$ with $\xi' < \iota$, which is easily done by searching through α . If not, we halt with output 0. Otherwise, we know that $\omega\iota$ codes ι , for $\iota < \alpha$. Next, we check whether $p(\xi, 1) \in d$ if and only if ξ is of the form $\omega\xi$ with $\xi < \alpha$, which is again easy. If not, we halt with output 0; otherwise, we know that 1 codes α .

Using bounded truth predicate evaluation from Lemma 6, we can now run through α and check, for each $\iota < \alpha$, whether the \in -structure coded by d believes that ι codes an ordinal if and only if ι is either 1 or a limit ordinal. If not, we halt with output 0; otherwise, we know that the set of ordinals coded by d is equal to $\alpha + 1$.

Again using bounded truth predicate evaluation, we check whether the structure coded by d is a model of the sentence “I am an L -level”. If not, we halt with output 0. Otherwise, we know that d codes $L_{\alpha+1}$, and it remains to check that d is the “right” code.

Running through α and using ζ and bounded truth predicate evaluation once more, we can now check, for each $\iota < \alpha$, whether $L_\alpha \models \phi(\iota, \rho)$ if and only if $\iota \in d$. If not, we halt with output 0. Otherwise, we have $d = c$, and we halt with output 1. □

Definition 8. Denote by $\rho(\alpha)$ the supremum of the set of ordinals β for which $L_{\beta+1} \setminus L_\beta$ contains an α -ITRM-recognizable subset of α . Similarly, we write $\rho^w(\alpha)$ for the analogous concept for α -wITRMs.

Moreover, denote by $\theta(\alpha)$ and $\theta^w(\alpha)$ the suprema of ordinals with an α -ITRM-computable and an α -wITRM-computable α -code, respectively.

Remark 2. It was shown in [5] that $\theta(\alpha) = \beta(\alpha)$ unless $L_\alpha \models ZF^-$.

The only property of $\alpha + 1$ used in the argument for the existence of a recognizable nice α -code for $L_{\alpha+1}$ is the existence of an α -ITRM-computable α -code for it. The same argument hence yields:

Corollary 1. If β has an α -ITRM-computable α -code, then L_β has an α -ITRM-recognizable α -code. In particular, we have $\rho(\alpha) \geq \theta(\alpha)$.

It is shown in [6] that $\rho^w(\omega) = \beta^w(\omega)$. We currently do not know whether $\rho(\alpha) = \beta(\alpha)$ for any exponentially closed α (it is known to be false for $\alpha = \omega$).

Proposition 1. If α is an uncountable regular cardinal in L , then every α -ITRM-recognizable $x \subseteq \alpha$ is $\Delta_1^1(L_\alpha)$

Proof. Let $x \subseteq \alpha$ be α -ITRM-recognizable, and let P be an α -ITRM-program that recognizes x . Suppose that P uses n registers. By an

easy relativization of the argument in [5], Lemma 14, P^x halts in $< \alpha^n$ many steps. Using the “Pull-Back” technique from [5], we can express the statement “ P^x halts in $< \alpha^n$ many steps” as an \in -formula in the parameter x over L_α ; more precisely, there is an \in -formula ϕ_P such that, for all $y \subseteq \alpha$, $L_\alpha[x] \models \phi(y)$ if and only if P^y halts in $< \alpha^n$ many steps.

Thus, we can describe x as “ $\iota \in X$ if and only if $\exists Y (P(Y) \downarrow = 1 \wedge \iota \in Y)$ – which is $\Sigma_1^1(L_\alpha)$ – and as $\forall Y (P(Y) \downarrow = 1 \rightarrow \iota \in Y)$ – which is $\Pi_1^1(L_\alpha)$, so x is $\Delta_1^1(L_\alpha)$ \square

Remark 3. *The preceding proposition fails in general. For example, $L_{\omega_1^{CK}}$ contains all Δ_1^1 -subsets of ω (see, e.g., [1], Corollary 3.2), but there are ω -ITRM-recognizable subsets of ω in $L_{\alpha+1} \setminus L_\alpha$ for cofinally in σ many ordinals α occur in up to σ , which is much bigger than ω_1^{CK} .*

4. α -wITRMs

We now consider recognizability for unresetting α -register machines; again, we are only interested in the recognizability of constructible subsets of α .

A convenient feature of α -ITRMs is their ability to “search through α ”, i.e., count upwards in some register from 0 on until it overflows, thus making it possible to check each element of α for a certain property. For unresetting machines, this obvious strategy is not available: Counting upwards in some register would lead to an overflow of that register at time α , which results in the computation being undefined. In some cases, however, such a search is still possible. This motivates the next definition.

Definition 9. *An ordinal α is wITRM-searchable if and only if there is a halting α -wITRM-program P such that the first register used by P contains each element of α at least once before P stops. If such a program exists in the oracle $x \subseteq \alpha$, we call α wITRM-searchable in x .*

Based on the results in [5], we can give a full characterization of the wITRM-searchable ordinals. To this end, we recall from [[5], Definition 53] that an ordinal is called “ u -weak” if and only if any halting α -wITRM in the empty input halts in less than α many steps. It is shown in [5] that all Π_3 -reflecting ordinals (and hence, in particular, all Σ_2 -admissible ordinals) are u -weak. Moreover, the following was proved in [5]:

Theorem 4 ([5], Theorem 54 and 56). *An ordinal is u -weak if and only if it is admissible and not wITRM-singular.*

Lemma 7. *An ordinal α is wITRM-searchable if and only if it is not u -weak, i.e., if and only if α is admissible and wITRM-singular.*

Proof. Suppose first that α is wITRM-searchable, and let P be an α -wITRM-program that halts after writing each element of α to the first register R_1 at least once. Consider the slightly modified program P' that runs P but, whenever the content of R_1 changes, uses a separate register to count from 0 upwards to the content of R_1 . Clearly, P' will run for at least α many steps before halting, so that α is not u -weak.

On the other hand, suppose that α is not u -weak. Thus, α is not admissible or wITRM-singular. In the latter case, it is immediate from the definition of wITRM-singularity that there is an α -wITRM-computable cofinal function $f : \beta \rightarrow \alpha$ for some $\beta < \alpha$, in the former cases, this is shown in [[5], Theorem 56]. For simplicity, let us assume without loss of generality that f is increasing. Consider the following algorithm, which works in the parameter β : Use some register R_2 to run through β . For each $\iota < \beta$, compute $f(\iota)$ and $f(\iota + 1)$ and store them in R_3 and R_4 . Copy the content of R_3 to R_1 and use R_1 to count upwards until one reaches the content of R_4 . After that, reset the contents of R_1 , R_3 and R_4 to 0 and increase the content of R_2 by 1. If R_2 contains β , halt. It is easy to see that, in this way, R_1 will contain every ordinal less than α at least once before halting. □

It was shown in [6], Corollary 9 (see also [3], Corollary 4.2.20) to follow from Kreisel's basis theorem that there are no lost melodies for ω -wITRMs.

If α is an uncountable regular cardinal in L , then the lost melody theorem fails for α -wITRMs for rather drastic reasons:

Lemma 8. *If α is a regular cardinal in L , then there are no constructible α -wITRM-recognizable subsets of α .*

Proof. If α is a regular cardinal in L , then it is in particular Σ_2^x -admissible for any constructible set $x \subseteq \alpha$. It is shown in [[3], Lemma 3.4.10(ii)] that this implies that, for every $x \subseteq \alpha$ and any α -wITRM-program P , P^x will either halt in $< \alpha$ many steps or not at all.

We can now use a standard compactness argument: Suppose for a contradiction that α is regular in L and that $x \subseteq \alpha$ is recognized by the α -wITRM-program P in the parameter $\rho < \alpha$. In particular, this means that P^x halts in $\tau < \alpha$ many steps. Since the basic command set for α -wITRMs allows a register content to increase at most by 1 in each step, all register contents generated by P during this computation will be smaller than $\rho + \tau$. Since α is indecomposable, we have $\rho + \tau < \alpha$. In particular, the oracle command can only be applied to the first $\rho + \tau$ many bits of x . Consequently, if we flip the $(\rho + \tau + 1)$ th bit of x to obtain \tilde{x} , we shall have $P(\rho)^{\tilde{x}} \downarrow = 1$ and $\tilde{x} \neq x$, contradicting the assumption that P recognizes x in the parameter ρ . □

The proof of Lemma 8 now yields:

Corollary 2. *If α is u -weak, then no α -wITRM-computable subset of α is α -wITRM-recognizable.*

We recall some results from [3], which in turn are generalizations of results from Koepke [15] (pp. 261f).

Lemma 9. *Let α be exponentially closed, $\beta < \alpha$ and c a nice β -code for a (transitive) \in -structure $S \supseteq \alpha$ via some bijection $f : \beta \rightarrow S$.*

- (1) (Cf. [3], Lemma 2.3.29, generalizing [15], p. 261f.) *There is an α -wITRM-program P_{compare} such that, when $c, c' \subseteq \beta$ are nice β -codes for (transitive) \in -structures and $\iota, \iota' < \beta$ are such that ι codes an ordinal in c and ι' codes an ordinal in c' , then $P_{\text{compare}}^{c \oplus c'}(\iota, \iota')$ decides whether ι codes the same ordinal in c that ι' codes in c' .*
- (2) *There is an α -wITRM-program P_{identify} such that, for every $\iota < \alpha$, $P_{\text{identify}}^c(\iota, \beta)$ halts with output $f^{-1}(\iota)$ (i.e., the ordinal that codes ι in the sense of c).*
- (3) *Moreover, there is an α -wITRM-program P_{decode} such that, for every $\iota < \beta$ such that $f(\omega\iota) \in \alpha$, $P_{\text{decode}}^c(\omega\iota, \beta)$ halts with output $f(\omega\iota)$, i.e., with output ι .*

Proof. In [3], Lemma 2.3.29 and Corollary 2.3.31, it is shown that this can be achieved when $\iota < \beta$. However, this condition can be met by simply making β larger if necessary and regarding c as a subset of the increased β .

We sketch the (slightly generalized) algorithms described in [3] for the convenience of the reader.

Note that P_{identify} is easily obtained from P_{compare} : We fix a code $c_{\iota+1} := \{p(\iota_1, \iota_2) : \iota_1 < \iota_2 < \iota + 1\}$ for $\iota + 1$; c_{ι} is clearly computable on an α -wITRM. Then, we can run $P_{\text{compare}}^{c \oplus c_{\iota+1}}(\xi, \iota)$ for every $\xi < \alpha$ and output ξ as soon as the answer is positive.

Likewise, given the program P_{identify} of (1), P_{decode} is easily obtained: Given $\iota < \beta$, first compute $\omega\iota$, then use an extra register to run through α and, for each $\xi < \alpha$, apply P_{identify} to check whether $\omega\iota$ codes ξ . By assumption, such a ξ will eventually be considered, in which case the algorithm stops and outputs ξ .

It thus remains to sketch P_{compare} . So let $c, c' \subseteq \beta$ and $\iota, \iota' < \beta$ be given. Note that, by assumption, c and c' code well-founded structures, say via bijections $f : \beta \rightarrow S$, $f' : \beta \rightarrow S'$.

We work with two main registers R and R' , both of which are intended store finite sequences of ordinals below $\max\{\beta, \iota\}$, encoded via iterated Cantor pairing; let us write $p(\iota_0, \dots, \iota_k)$ for this code. In order to ensure compatibility with inferior limits – i.e., in order to ensure that $\liminf_{\xi < \lambda} p(\iota_0, \dots, \iota_{k, \xi}) = p(\iota_0, \dots, \liminf_{\xi < \lambda} \iota_{k, \xi})$ – we fix $\mu := \max(\beta, \iota) + 1$

as the first element of these sequences, which will never be changed.⁵ Let $\delta := f(\iota)$, $\delta' := f(\iota')$ be the ordinals coded by ι in c and by ι' in c' , respectively.

We now perform two checks, one whether there is an order-preserving embedding of δ into δ' and one for the reverse embedding. These checks will recursively call P_{compare} . The well-foundedness of c and c' will ensure that the recursion terminates.

To check whether δ embeds into δ' , we start with the sequences (μ, ι) in R and (μ, ι') in R' . Now, for every $\xi < \beta$, we check whether $p(\xi, \iota) \in c$, i.e., whether $f(\xi) \in f(\iota)$. If that is the case, we replace the content of R by (μ, ι, ξ) and do the following: Searching through β , we test for each $\xi' < \beta$ whether $p(\xi', \iota') \in c'$ (i.e., whether $f'(\xi') \in f'(\iota')$). If that is the case, we replace the content of R' with (μ, ι', ξ') . If such a ξ , but no such ξ' is found, or vice versa, we output 0; this means one, but not the other, of ι, ι' codes 0, so that they do not code the same ordinal. Otherwise, we recursively call P_{compare} to use R and R' to check whether $f(\xi) = f'(\xi')$ (leaving the first three elements of the sequences stored in this register unchanged). When this check terminates with output 0, we know that ξ and ξ' do not code the same ordinal, and so we proceed with the next candidate for ξ' . When no candidate for ξ' are left – i.e., when the search through β has been completed without success –, we know that δ has an element that is not isomorphic to any element of δ' , so that we must have $\delta > \delta'$ and output 0. Otherwise, we continue with the next candidate for ξ . When all $\xi < \beta$ have been checked and the check has not terminated with a negative result, we know that $\delta \leq \delta'$. We then proceed in exactly the same way to check whether $\delta' \leq \delta$.

When both of these checks terminate successfully, we halt with output 1.

□

Lemma 10. *Let α be an exponentially closed ordinal such that, for some β , we have $\beta < \alpha < \sigma_\beta$. Then there is a lost melody for α -wITRMs.*

Proof. By Lemma 3, we have $\sigma_\alpha = \sigma_\beta$.

The statement “There is an ordinal τ such that every α -wITRM-program in every parameter $\rho < \alpha$ either halts, loops or overflows by time τ ” is Σ_1 (since computations of length $< \tau$ are contained in L_τ) and thus, since such τ exists, it is $< \sigma_\alpha$.

By finestructure, L_{σ_β} contains a bijection $f : \beta \rightarrow \alpha$. Pick $\gamma \in (\alpha, \sigma_\beta)$ such that $f \in L_\gamma$, and for some $\rho \in \beta$ and some \in -formula ϕ , γ is minimal with the property $L_\gamma \models \phi(\rho)$. Let c be the $<_L$ -minimal nice β -code for L_γ and let $\xi < \beta$ be the ordinal that codes f in the sense of

⁵See [3], p. 31-32 or [5] for a detailed explanation of this trick.

c . By the techniques discussed in section 4, c is β -ITRM-recognizable in the parameter ρ .

We claim that c is α -wITRM-recognizable (as a subset of α) in the parameters β , ρ and ι . Thus, let a set $d \subseteq \alpha$ be given in the oracle.

First, use the parameter β to simulate a β -ITRM-program that recognizes c (as a subset of β) on an α -wITRM and run this program on $d \cap \beta$. If the program returns 0, we halt with output 0.

Otherwise, we know that the first β many bits of d are correct and it remains to check that there d contains no elements that are greater than or equal to β .

Using the parameter ι and the program P_{decode} from Lemma 9, we can compute the bijection $f : \beta \rightarrow \alpha$ as follows: Given $\xi < \beta$, search through c to find the (unique) element of the form $p(p(\xi, \zeta), \iota)$. Then run $P_{\text{decode}}^c(\zeta, \beta)$.

Using f , we can now run through β and check, for every $\xi \in \beta$, whether $f(\xi) \geq \beta$ and whether $f(\xi) \in c$. If the answer is positive for some $\xi \in \beta$, we halt with output 0. Otherwise, we halt with output 1. \square

We note the following amusing consequence which yields examples of a definability concept for which the sets of explicitly and implicitly definable objects are disjoint:

Corollary 3. *If α is Π_3 -reflecting and $\alpha \in (\beta, \sigma_\beta)$ for some ordinal β , then the set of α -wITRM-computable subsets of α and the set of constructible α -wITRM-recognizable subsets of α are (both non-empty, but) disjoint.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 10 and Corollary 2. \square

It thus remains to consider the cases where α is either of the form σ_β or a limit of ordinals of this form (note that the latter case generalizes the case of regular cardinals in L).

Lemma 11. *If α is of the form σ_β for some ordinal β or a limit of such ordinals, then there are no α -wITRM-recognizable constructible subsets of α (and this, in particular, no lost melodies for α -wITRMs).*

Proof. Let us first assume that $\alpha = \sigma_\beta$ for some $\beta \in \text{On}$. Suppose for a contradiction that $x \subseteq \alpha$ is α -wITRM-recognizable by the program P in the parameter $\rho < \alpha$. Thus, L believes that there are a set $x \subseteq \alpha$ and a halting α -wITRM-computation of $P^x(\rho)$ with output 1. In particular, L believes that there are a set $x \subseteq \text{On}$ and a halting ORM-computation of $P^x(\rho)$ with output 1, which is a Σ_1 -formula in the parameter ρ . By definition of σ_β , and the fact that $\sigma_\beta = \sigma_{\rho+1}$ (see Lemma 3 above), the same holds in L_σ . Since computations are absolute between transitive \in -structures, L_{σ_β} contains a set x of ordinals and a halting ORM-computation P^x with output 1. Let δ be

the length of this computation. Then $\delta < \alpha$. Consequently, this computation cannot generate register contents $\geq \alpha$ and is thus actually a σ -wITRM-computation. During this computation, at most the first δ many bits of x can be considered. It follows that both $P^{(x \cap \delta)}(\rho)$ and $P^{(x \cap \delta) \cup (\delta+1)}(\rho)$ halt in δ many steps with output 1 without generating register contents $\geq \alpha$; thus, we have found two different oracles y for which the α -wITRM-computation $P^y(\rho)$ halts with output 1, a contradiction to the assumption that P recognizes x in the oracle y . If α is a limit of ordinals of the form σ_β , pick $\beta \in \text{On}$ large enough such that $\rho \in \sigma_\beta$ and repeat the above argument. \square

This settles the question whether lost melodies exist for α -wITRMs for all exponentially closed values of α .

By basically the same arguments, we obtain:

Corollary 4. *If α is of the form σ_β for some ordinal β or a limit of such ordinals, then there are no (weakly) α -wITRM-semi-recognizable and no α -wITRM-co-semi-recognizable constructible subsets of α .*

Proof. This works by the same argument as Lemma 11, noting that “There is x such that $P^x(\rho)$ halts” is a Σ_1 -formula and that “There is x such that $P^x(\rho)$ does not halt (but is defined)” is equivalent to “There is x such that there is a strong loop in the computation of $P^x(\rho)$ ”, which is again Σ_1 . \square

For weak α -wITRM-co-semi-recognizability, however, things are different:

Proposition 2. *For all α , each α -wITRM-computable subset $x \subseteq \alpha$ is also α -wITRM-co-semi-recognizable.*

Proof. Let $x \subseteq \alpha$ be α -wITRM-computable, and pick a program P and an ordinal $\xi < \alpha$ such that P computes x in the parameter ξ . Let Q be the program that, for each $\iota < \alpha$, stored in some register R , computes $P(\iota, \xi)$ and compares the output to the ι -th bit of the oracle. If they agree, Q continues with $\iota + 1$; otherwise, Q halts. Clearly, R will overflow at time α if and only if the oracle is equal to x , and otherwise, Q will halt. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Barwise. Admissible Sets and Structures. An Approach to Definability Theory. Cambridge University Press (2016)
- [2] G. Boolos. On the Semantics of the Constructible Levels. *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, vol. 18 (1970)
- [3] M. Carl. Ordinal Computability. An Introduction to Infinitary Machines. *De Gruyter*, 2019.
- [4] M. Carl, P. Schlicht, P. Welch. Recognizable sets and Woodin cardinals: computation beyond the constructible universe. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 169 (2015)

- [5] M. Carl. Taming Koepke's Zoo II: Register Machines. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* vol. 173(3) (2021)
- [6] M. Carl. The lost melody phenomenon. In: *S. Geschke et al. (eds.). Infinity, Computability and Metamathematics. Festschrift Celebrating the 60th Birthdays of Peter Koepke and Philip Welch. College Publications, London, (2014)*
- [7] M. Carl. The distribution of ITRM-recognizable reals. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* vol. 165(9) (2012)
- [8] M. Carl. Optimal Results on Recognizability for Infinite Time Register Machines. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* vol. 80(4) (2015)
- [9] M. Carl. The Lost Melody Theorem for Infinite Time Blum-Shub-Smale Machines. In: L. de Mol et al. (eds.). *Connecting with Computability, 17th Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2021.* (2021)
- [10] M. Carl, P. Schlicht, P. Welch. Decision Times for Infinite Computations. Preprint, arXiv:2011.04942v4 (2020)
- [11] N. Cutland. *Computability. An Introduction to Recursive Function Theory.* Cambridge University Press (1980)
- [12] T. Fischbach, B. Seyffert. On λ -definable functions on ordinals. In: P. Bonizzoni et al. (eds.). *The Nature of Computation. Logic, Algorithms, Applications. CiE 2013.* (2013)
- [13] V. Gitman, J. Hamkins, T. Johnstone. What is the theory ZFC without power set? *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, vol. 62(4) (2011)
- [14] J. Hamkins, A. Lewis. Infinite Time Turing Machines. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 65(2) (1998)
- [15] P. Koepke. Infinite Time Register Machines. In: A. Beckmann et al. (eds.). *Logical Approaches to Computational Barriers. Second Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2006* (2006)
- [16] P. Koepke. Ordinal Computability. In: K. Ambos-Spies et al. (eds.). *Mathematical Theory and Computational Practice. 5th Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2009* (2009)
- [17] P. Koepke. Turing Computations on Ordinals. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 11(3) (2005)
- [18] P. Koepke, R. Miller. An enhanced theory of infinite time register machines. In: A. Beckmann et al. (eds.) *Logic and Theory of Algorithms. 4th Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2008* (2008)
- [19] P. Koepke, B. Seyffert. Ordinal Machines and Admissible Recursion Theory. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 160(3) (2009)
- [20] P. Koepke, R. Siders. Register Computations on Ordinals. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, vol. 47(6) (2008)