

Characteristics of Minimal Effective Programming Systems*

Samuel E. Moelius III
IDA Center for Computing Sciences
17100 Science Drive, Bowie, MD 20715-4300
semoeli@super.org

February 28, 2022

Abstract. The Rogers semilattice of effective programming systems (**epses**) is the collection of all effective numberings of the partial computable functions ordered such that $\theta \leq \psi$ whenever θ -programs can be algorithmically translated into ψ -programs. Herein, it is shown that an **eps** ψ is minimal in this ordering if and only if, for each translation function t into ψ , there exists a computably enumerable equivalence relation (**ceer**) R such that (i) R is a subrelation of ψ 's program equivalence relation, and (ii) R equates each ψ -program to some program in the range of t . It is also shown that there exists a minimal **eps** for which no *single* such R does the work for all such t . In fact, there exists a minimal **eps** ψ such that, for each **ceer** R , either R contradicts ψ 's program equivalence relation, or there exists a translation function t into ψ such that the range of t fails to intersect *infinitely many* of R 's equivalence classes.

Keywords: computably enumerable equivalence relation, Friedberg numbering, minimal effective programming system, Rogers semilattice

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{N} be the set of natural numbers, i.e., $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. An effective programming systems (**eps**) is a partial computable function $\lambda p, x. \psi_p(x)$ mapping \mathbb{N}^2 to \mathbb{N} , and having the following property. For each partial computable function ζ mapping \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{N} , there exists a p such that $\psi_p = \zeta$. Effective programming systems abstract the notion of *programming language* in the following sense. One can think of p as a *program*, and of ψ_p as the partial computable function denoted by p within some programming language corresponding to ψ .

Rogers [Rog58] introduced the following ordering on **epses**. For **epses** θ and ψ , $\theta \leq \psi$ iff there exists a computable function $t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that, for each p , $\theta_p = \psi_{t(p)}$. Intuitively, $\theta \leq \psi$ whenever θ -programs can be algorithmically translated into ψ -programs. Moreover, an **eps** ψ is *minimal* in this ordering iff having the ability to algorithmically translate θ -programs into ψ -programs implies having the ability to algorithmically translate ψ -programs into θ -programs, for each **eps** θ .

Arguably, the most well studied collection of minimal **epses** is that of the Friedberg numberings [Fri58, Kum90]. Recall that a Friedberg numbering is an **eps** that is 1-1, i.e., for each p and q , $\psi_p = \psi_q$ implies $p = q$. Examples of works that make use of this concept include [Lav77, MWY78, Ric81, FKW82, Sch82, Roy87, Kum89, Spr90, GYY93, HK94, JST11].

In [PE64], Pour-El asked whether every minimal **eps** is equivalent to some Friedberg numbering. Ershov [Ers68, §5] showed that there exists a minimal effective numbering of the *computably enumerable sets* that is not equivalent to any 1-1 numbering. Shortly thereafter, his student, Khutoretskii, established the analogous result for the partial computable functions, thereby answering Pour-El's question.

Theorem 1 (Khutoretskii [Khu69a, Ex. 1 and Cor. 4]). There exists a minimal **eps** that is *not* equivalent to any Friedberg numbering.

For the purposes of this paper, Theorem 1 is best viewed through the following folklore theorem. (For completeness we give a proof of this result.)

Theorem 2 (Folklore). For each **eps** ψ , ψ is equivalent to a Friedberg numbering iff ψ 's program equivalence relation is computable.

* This is an expanded version of [Moe12].

Proof. Let ψ be given.

(\Rightarrow) Suppose that ψ is equivalent to a Friedberg numbering η , and that $t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ witnesses $\psi \leq \eta$. Then, clearly, for each p and q ,

$$\psi_p = \psi_q \Leftrightarrow \eta_{t(p)} = \eta_{t(q)} \Leftrightarrow t(p) = t(q). \quad (1)$$

Thus, since $\lambda p, q. [t(p) = t(q)]$ is computable, ψ 's program equivalence relation is computable.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that ψ 's program equivalence relation is computable. Let M be the set of *minimal programs* in ψ , i.e., $M = \{m_0, m_1, \dots\}$ where, for each i , m_i is *least* such that

$$\psi_{m_i} \notin \{\psi_{m_0}, \dots, \psi_{m_{i-1}}\}. \quad (2)$$

Note that, since ψ 's program equivalence relation is computable, M is computable. Let η be such that, for each i ,

$$\eta_i = \psi_{m_i}. \quad (3)$$

Using the fact the M is computable, it is straightforward to verify that η is a Friedberg numbering, and that $\psi \equiv \eta$. □ (**Theorem 2**)

In light of Theorem 2, Theorem 1 may be restated as: there exists a minimal **eps** whose program equivalence relation is *not* computable. On the other hand, as noted in the proof of Theorem 1, the constructed **eps**'s program equivalence relation is computably enumerable. (In particular, exactly one such equivalence class is a simple set [Rog67, §8.1], and all others a singletons.) Thus, one has the following.

Theorem 3 (Khutoretskii, corollary of Thm. 2 and proof of Thm. 1). There exists an **eps** whose program equivalence relation is computably enumerable, but *not* computable.

Subsequent to the above, Khutoretskii showed the following.

Theorem 4 (Khutoretskii, corollary of [Khu69b, Thm. 1]). There exists a minimal **eps** whose program equivalence relation is *not* computably enumerable.

Clearly, Theorems 3 and 4 can be viewed as a sharpening of Theorem 1. Herein, we sharpen Khutoretskii's results even further.

To facilitate the statement of our results, we first give a few definitions. Suppose that ψ is an **eps**. For each $t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we say that t is a *translation function into ψ* iff there exists an **eps** θ such that t witnesses $\theta \leq \psi$. The following definition is equivalent. For each $t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, t is a translation function into ψ iff t is computable and the partial function $\lambda p, x. \psi_{t(p)}(x)$ is an **eps**.

Definition 5. Suppose that ψ is an **eps**, and that t is a translation function into ψ . Then, for each equivalence relation R , (a) and (b) below.

- (a) R *strongly ties t into ψ* iff R satisfies (i) and (ii) just below.¹
 - (i) R is a subrelation of ψ 's program equivalence relation.
 - (ii) The range of t intersects each of R 's equivalence classes.
- (b) R *weakly ties t into ψ* iff R satisfies (i) just above and (ii*) just below.²
 - (ii*) The range of t intersects all but finitely many of R 's equivalence classes.

Thus, if equivalence relation R strongly ties translation function t into **eps** ψ , then R equates each ψ -program to some program in the range of t . If R merely weakly ties t into ψ , then there may be infinitely many ψ -programs that R does *not* equate to any program in the range of t . However, those infinitely many such ψ -programs will form only finitely many equivalence classes.


Our first main result is that the minimal **epses** may be *characterized* as follows.

Theorem 6. For each **eps** ψ , (a)-(c) below are equivalent.

- (a) ψ is minimal.

¹ In some places, we omit the phrase “into ψ ” when it is clear from context.

² See footnote 1.



- $P_0(\psi) \Leftrightarrow \psi$ is equivalent to a Friedberg numbering.
- $P'_0(\psi) \Leftrightarrow \psi$'s program equivalence relation is computable.
- $P_1(\psi) \Leftrightarrow \psi$'s program equivalence relation is computably enumerable.
- $P_2(\psi) \Leftrightarrow$ there exists a **ceer** R that strongly ties each translation function into ψ .
- $P_3(\psi) \Leftrightarrow$ there exists a **ceer** R that weakly ties each translation function into ψ .
- $P_4(\psi) \Leftrightarrow$ for each translation function t into ψ , there exists a **ceer** that strongly ties t into ψ .
- $P'_4(\psi) \Leftrightarrow$ for each translation function t into ψ , there exists a **ceer** that weakly ties t into ψ .
- $P''_4(\psi) \Leftrightarrow \psi$ is minimal.

Fig. 1. A summary of the results mentioned in Section 1. In addition to the above: Mal'cev [Mal65, Mal71] showed that $P_1 \Rightarrow P''_4$, and Khutoretskii [Khu69b] showed that $P_1 \not\Leftarrow P'_4$ (see Theorem 4).

- (b) For each translation function t into ψ , there exists a computably enumerable equivalence relation (**ceer**)³ that strongly ties t into ψ .
- (c) For each translation function t into ψ , there exists a **ceer** that weakly ties t into ψ .

Note that Theorem 4 is about a *single* equivalence relation, i.e., the program equivalence relation of a certain **eps**, whereas Theorem 6 is about one equivalence relation *per* translation function into any given **eps**. Thus, one might ask: if ψ is a minimal **eps**, then might there always exist a *single* **ceer** that strongly ties each translation function into ψ ? The answer, as it turns out, is *no*. In fact, as Theorem 7 below states, there need not even exist a single **ceer** that *weakly* ties each translation function into ψ .

Theorem 7. There exists an **eps** ψ satisfying (a) and (b) below.

- (a) ψ is minimal.
- (b) For each **ceer** R , there exists a translation function t into ψ such that R does *not* weakly tie t into ψ .

Continuing with this line of thought, one finds that the strong and weak notions of Definition 5 separate when one considers single equivalence relations.

Theorem 8. There exists an **eps** ψ and a **ceer** R satisfying (a) and (b) below.

- (a) For each translation function t into ψ , R weakly ties t into ψ .
- (b) For each **ceer** R' , there exists a translation function t into ψ such that R' does *not* strongly tie t into ψ .

Clearly, if ψ is an **eps**, and ψ 's program equivalence relation is computably enumerable, then there exists a single **ceer** R that strongly ties each translation function into ψ , i.e., R is ψ 's program equivalence relation. Thus, one might ask: does the converse hold? Theorem 9, just below, establishes that it does *not*.

Theorem 9. There exists an **eps** ψ and a **ceer** R satisfying (a) and (b) below.

- (a) For each translation function t into ψ , R strongly ties t into ψ .
- (b) ψ 's program equivalence relation is *not* computably enumerable.

Figure 1 summarizes the results mentioned in this section. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 covers preliminaries. Section 3 gives complete proofs of Theorems 6 through 9.

³ We pronounce **ceer** like the first syllable of “series”. Computably enumerable equivalence relations are of interest in their own right. Gao and Gerdes [GG01] give an excellent survey.

2 Preliminaries

Computability-theoretic concepts not covered below are treated in [Rog67].

Lowercase math-italic letters (e.g., i, p, x), with or without decorations, range over elements of \mathbb{N} , unless stated otherwise. Uppercase math-italic letters (e.g., I, P, X), with or without decorations, range over subsets of \mathbb{N} , unless stated otherwise. For each *non-empty* X , $\min X$ denotes the minimum element of X . $\min \emptyset \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \infty$. For each *non-empty, finite* X , $\max X$ denotes the maximum element of X . $\max \emptyset \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -1$. \mathcal{Fin} denotes the collection of all finite subsets of \mathbb{N} .

$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes any fixed pairing function, i.e., a 1-1, onto, computable function of type $\mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ [Rog67, page 64]. For each x, y , and z , $\langle x, y, z \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle x, \langle y, z \rangle \rangle$. For each X and Y , $X \times Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\langle x, y \rangle \mid x \in X \wedge y \in Y\}$.

Every partial function considered herein maps \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{N} , unless stated otherwise. For each partial function ζ , and each x , $\zeta(x)\downarrow$ denotes that $\zeta(x)$ converges; whereas, $\zeta(x)\uparrow$ denotes that $\zeta(x)$ diverges. We use \uparrow to denote the value of a divergent computation. For the sake of some subsequent proofs, it is convenient to have the following notation. For each i and n ,

$$i^{<n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda x. \begin{cases} i, & \text{if } x < n; \\ \uparrow, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Thus, $i^{<n}$ is the partial function that maps each value less than n to i , and that diverges everywhere else. For each partial function ζ , $\text{rng}(\zeta)$ denotes the range of ζ , i.e., $\text{rng}(\zeta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y \mid (\exists x)[\zeta(x) = y]\}$. *PartComp* denotes the set of all partial computable functions (mapping \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{N}).

φ denotes any fixed acceptable (i.e., maximal) eps [Rog58, Rog67, MWY78, Ric81, Roy87]. For each p , $W_p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \mid \varphi_p(x)\downarrow\}$. For each p and s , the following.

$$\varphi_p^s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda x. \begin{cases} \varphi_p(x), & \text{if } x < s \text{ and } \varphi_p(x) \text{ converges in fewer than } s \text{ steps;} \\ \uparrow, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$W_p^s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \mid \varphi_p^s(x)\downarrow\}. \quad (6)$$

For each eps ψ , $\text{Equiv}(\psi)$ denotes ψ 's program equivalence relation, i.e.,

$$\text{Equiv}(\psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\langle p, q \rangle \mid \psi_p = \psi_q\}. \quad (7)$$

For each equivalence relation R , $\text{Classes}(R)$ denotes the set of R 's equivalence classes, i.e., $\text{Classes}(R)$ is the set of exactly those E satisfying (a)-(c) below.

- (a) $E \neq \emptyset$.
- (b) $(\forall p, q \in E)[\langle p, q \rangle \in R]$.
- (c) $(\forall p \in E)(\forall q \notin E)[\langle p, q \rangle \notin R]$.

3 Results

This section recounts our main results (Theorem 6 through 9), and gives their complete proofs.

Our first main result is that the minimal epses may be *characterized* as per Theorem 6, restated just below. Recall from Definition 5 that if equivalence relation R strongly ties translation function t into eps ψ , then (i) R is a subrelation of ψ 's program equivalence relation, and (ii) the range of t intersects each of R 's equivalence classes. On the other hand, if R merely weakly ties t into ψ , then the range of t need only intersect all but finitely many of R 's equivalence classes.

Theorem 6. For each eps ψ , (a)-(c) below are equivalent.

- (a) ψ is minimal.
- (b) For each translation function t into ψ , there exists a ceer that strongly ties t into ψ .
- (c) For each translation function t into ψ , there exists a ceer that weakly ties t into ψ .

Proof. Let ψ be given.

(a) \Rightarrow (b): Suppose that ψ is minimal. Let t be any translation function into ψ , and let θ be such that t witnesses $\theta \leq \psi$. Since ψ is minimal, there exists a $t' : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ witnessing $\psi \leq \theta$. Let R be the reflexive, symmetric, transitive closure of

$$\{\langle p, (t \circ t')(p) \rangle \mid p \in \mathbb{N}\}. \quad (8)$$

Clearly, R is a ceer and $R \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$. It remains to show that, for each $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$, $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. So, let $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$ be given, and let $p \in E$ be arbitrary. Then, clearly, $(t \circ t')(p) \in \text{rng}(t) \cap E$.

(b) \Rightarrow (c): Immediate.

(c) \Rightarrow (a): Suppose (c). Further suppose that θ is an eps, and that $t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ witnesses $\theta \leq \psi$. Then, by (c), there exists a ceer $R \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$ such that, for all but finitely many $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$, $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. Let n be the number of elements of $\text{Classes}(R)$ that do *not* intersect $\text{rng}(t)$, and let E_0, \dots, E_{n-1} be those elements. Choose q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} such that, for each $i < n$ and $p \in E_i$, $\theta_{q_i} = \psi_p$. Note that, for each p , either R equates p to some element of $\text{rng}(t)$, or $p \in E_i$, for some $i < n$. It follows that the function $t' : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, defined next, is computable.

$$t' = \lambda p. \begin{cases} q, & \text{where } q \text{ is first found such that } \langle p, t(q) \rangle \in R, \\ & \text{if such a } q \text{ exists;} \\ q_i, & \text{otherwise, where } i \text{ is such that } p \in E_i. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

It is straightforward to verify that t' witnesses $\psi \leq \theta$. □ (Theorem 6)

Theorem 7, restated just below, is our second main result. It establishes that there there exists a minimal eps ψ such that, for each ceer R , either R contradicts ψ 's program equivalence relation, or there exists a translation function t into ψ such that the range of t *fails* to intersect *infinitely many* of R 's equivalence classes.

Theorem 7. There exists an eps ψ satisfying (a) and (b) below.

(a) ψ is minimal.

(b) For each ceer R , there exists a translation function t into ψ such that R does *not* weakly tie t into ψ .

The proof of Theorem 7 makes use of the following lemma.

Lemma 10. Let J_0, \dots, J_{n-1} be any finite collection of computably enumerable sets. Then, there exists an infinite, computable set X , and a finite set $L \subseteq \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, such that, for each $x \in X$ and $\ell < n$, $x \in J_\ell$ iff $\ell \in L$.

Proof. Let J_0, \dots, J_{n-1} be as stated. The set X is the set X_n , constructed as follows. Set $X_0 = \mathbb{N}$. Then, for each $\ell < n$, act according to the following conditions.

- COND. (a) [$J_\ell \cap X_\ell$ is infinite]. Set $X_{\ell+1}$ to any infinite, computable subset of $J_\ell \cap X_\ell$.
- COND. (b) [$J_\ell \cap X_\ell$ is finite]. Set $X_{\ell+1} = \{x \in X_\ell \mid x > \max(J_\ell \cap X_\ell)\}$.

The set L is such that

$$L = \{\ell \mid \text{cond. (a) applies for } \ell\}. \quad (10)$$

Clearly, X is infinite and computable. Further note that

$$X_0 \supseteq X_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq X_n. \quad (11)$$

It is easily seen that, for each $\ell < n$: if $\ell \in L$, then $J_\ell \supseteq X_{\ell+1}$; whereas, if $\ell \notin L$, then $J_\ell \cap X_{\ell+1} = \emptyset$. It then follows from (11) that, for each $x \in X_n$ and $\ell < n$, $x \in J_\ell$ iff $\ell \in L$. □ (Lemma 10)

Proof of Theorem 7. The eps ψ is constructed below, following some necessary definitions. Let $\mathcal{Aux} \subseteq \text{PartComp}$ be such that

$$\mathcal{Aux} = \text{PartComp} \setminus \{\langle i, j \rangle^{<k+1} \mid i, j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge k < 2^i\}. \quad (12)$$

It is straightforward to show that \mathcal{Aux} is 1-1, computably enumerable. So, let $(\alpha_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a 1-1, effective numbering of \mathcal{Aux} .

As is common, ψ is constructed in stages, i.e., ψ is the union of $\psi^0 \subseteq \psi^1 \subseteq \dots$. In conjunction with ψ , four computable predicates are constructed: $\lambda i, s. [i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$, $\lambda i, j, \ell, s. [\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s]$, $\lambda \ell, s. [\ell \in \text{Src}^s]$, and $\lambda p, s. [p \in \text{Dst}^s]$. The purposes of these predicates are as follows.

- The R -flags predicate keeps track of which i are such that W_i contradicts ψ 's program equivalence relation. More precisely, for each i , if there exists an s such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^s$, then $W_i \not\subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$.
- The t -flags predicate helps to keep track of which ℓ may be such that φ_ℓ is a translation function into ψ . It will turn out that: if i and ℓ are such that $W_i \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$ and φ_ℓ is a translation function into ψ , then, for each j , and all but finitely many s , $\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s$.
- The Src predicate keeps track of which ℓ are such that α_ℓ has not yet been assigned to any ψ -program. In particular, if ℓ and s are such that $\ell \in \text{Src}^s$ and $\alpha_\ell \neq \lambda x.\uparrow$, then, for each p , $\psi_p^s \neq \alpha_\ell$.
- The Dst predicate keeps track of which ψ -programs have not yet been used. More precisely, if p and s are such that $p \in \text{Dst}^s$, then $\psi_p^s = \lambda x.\uparrow$.

For each i and s , $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s+1}$ iff $i \in R\text{-flags}^s$, unless stated otherwise. Analogous statements apply to the t -flags, Src, and Dst predicates, as well. The following will be clear from the construction of ψ , for each s .

$$R\text{-flags}^s \subseteq R\text{-flags}^{s+1}. \quad (13)$$

$$t\text{-flags}^s \subseteq t\text{-flags}^{s+1}. \quad (14)$$

$$\text{Src}^s \supseteq \text{Src}^{s+1}. \quad (15)$$

$$\text{Dst}^s \supseteq \text{Dst}^{s+1}. \quad (16)$$

Let $\text{height} : \mathbb{N}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be such that, for each i, j , and s ,

$$\text{height}_{i,j}^s = |\{\ell \mid \langle i, j, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s\}|. \quad (17)$$

It will be clear from the construction of ψ that, for each i, j, ℓ , and s ,

$$\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s \Rightarrow \ell < i. \quad (18)$$

Thus, for each i, j , and s ,

$$\text{height}_{i,j}^s \leq i. \quad (19)$$

Let $\text{num} : \mathbb{N}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be such that, for each i, j , and s ,

$$\text{num}_{i,j}^s = 2^{i-h}, \text{ where } h = \text{height}_{i,j}^s. \quad (20)$$

Let $f : \mathbb{N}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be such that, for each i, j , and k ,

$$f_{i,j}(k) = 2\langle i, j \cdot 2^{i+1} + k \rangle. \quad (21)$$

For each i, j, s , and $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^s$, let $E_{i,j,k}^s \in \mathcal{Fin}$ and $\bar{E}_{i,j,k}^s \in \mathcal{Fin}$ be as follows, with $h = \text{height}_{i,j}^s$.

$$E_{i,j,k}^s = \{f_{i,j}(k \cdot 2^{h+1}), \dots, f_{i,j}(k \cdot 2^{h+1} + 2^h - 1)\}. \quad (22)$$

$$\bar{E}_{i,j,k}^s = \{f_{i,j}(k \cdot 2^{h+1} + 2^h), \dots, f_{i,j}((k+1) \cdot 2^{h+1} - 1)\}. \quad (23)$$

Note that, for each i, j , and s , if one lets $h = \text{height}_{i,j}^s$, and it happens that $\text{height}_{i,j}^{s+1} = h+1$, then, for each $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{i,j,k}^{s+1} &= \{f_{i,j}(k \cdot 2^{h+2}), \dots, f_{i,j}(k \cdot 2^{h+2} + 2^{h+1} - 1)\} \\ &= \{f_{i,j}(k \cdot 2^{h+2}), \dots, f_{i,j}(k \cdot 2^{h+2} + 2^h - 1)\} \\ &\quad \cup \{f_{i,j}(k \cdot 2^{h+2} + 2^h), \dots, f_{i,j}(k \cdot 2^{h+2} + 2^{h+1} - 1)\} \\ &= \{f_{i,j}(2k \cdot 2^{h+1}), \dots, f_{i,j}(2k \cdot 2^{h+1} + 2^h - 1)\} \\ &\quad \cup \{f_{i,j}(2k \cdot 2^{h+1} + 2^h), \dots, f_{i,j}(2k \cdot 2^{h+1} + 2^{h+1} - 1)\} \\ &= \{f_{i,j}(2k \cdot 2^{h+1}), \dots, f_{i,j}(2k \cdot 2^{h+1} + 2^h - 1)\} \\ &\quad \cup \{f_{i,j}(2k \cdot 2^{h+1} + 2^h), \dots, f_{i,j}((2k+1) \cdot 2^{h+1} - 1)\} \\ &= E_{i,j,2k}^s \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,2k}^s. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

It can be shown that, under the same conditions,

$$\bar{E}_{i,j,k}^{s+1} = E_{i,j,2k+1}^s \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,2k+1}^s. \quad (25)$$

-
- STAGE $s = -1$. Do the following.
 - Set $R\text{-flags}^0 = \emptyset$.
 - Set $t\text{-flags}^0 = \emptyset$.
 - Set $\text{Src}^0 = \mathbb{N}$.
 - Set $\text{Dst}^0 = 2\mathbb{N} + 1$.
 - For each i, j , and $k < 2^i$, set $\psi_{f_{i,j}(2k)}^0 = \psi_{f_{i,j}(2k+1)}^0 = \langle i, j \rangle^{<k+1}$.
 - For each $p \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1$, set $\psi_p^0 = \lambda x. \uparrow$.
 - STAGE $s = \langle 0, \ell \rangle$. If $\ell \in \text{Src}^s$, then do the following.
 - Set $\text{Src}^{s+1} = \text{Src}^s \setminus \{\ell\}$.
 - Set $\text{Dst}^{s+1} = \text{Dst}^s \setminus \{\min \text{Dst}^s\}$.
 - Set $\psi_{\min \text{Dst}^s}^{s+1} = \alpha_\ell$.
 - STAGE $s = \langle i + 1, 0, - \rangle$. Determine whether there exist j and k satisfying conditions (a)-(c) just below.
 - (a) $i \notin R\text{-flags}^s$.
 - (b) $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^s$.
 - (c) $W_i^s \cap (E_{i,j,k}^s \times \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^s) \neq \emptyset$.
If such j and k exist, then do the following.
 - Set $R\text{-flags}^{s+1} = R\text{-flags}^s \cup \{i\}$.
 - Choose any $\ell, m \in \text{Src}^s$ such that $\ell \neq m$ and $\langle i, j \rangle^{<2^i} \subseteq \alpha_\ell \cap \alpha_m$.
 - Let $d : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any 1-1, computable function such that $\text{rng}(d)$ is computable, $\text{rng}(d) \subseteq \text{Dst}^s$, and $\text{Dst}^s \setminus \text{rng}(d)$ is infinite.
 - Set $\text{Src}^{s+1} = \text{Src}^s \setminus \{\ell, m\}$.
 - Set $\text{Dst}^{s+1} = \text{Dst}^s \setminus \text{rng}(d)$.
 - For each j , each $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^s$, and each $p \in E_{i,j,k}^s$, set $\psi_p^{s+1} = \alpha_\ell$.
 - For each j , each $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^s$, and each $q \in \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^s$, set $\psi_q^{s+1} = \alpha_m$.
 - For each j and $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^s$, set $\psi_{d(n+k)}^{s+1} = \langle i, j \rangle^{<(k+1) \cdot 2^h}$, where $n = \sum_{j < j} \text{num}_{i,j}^s$ and $h = \text{height}_{i,j}^s$.
 - STAGE $s = \langle i + 1, j + 1, \ell, - \rangle$. Let $h = \text{height}_{i,j}^s$. Determine whether conditions (i)-(iv) just below are satisfied.
 - (i) $\ell < i$.
 - (ii) $i \notin R\text{-flags}^s$.
 - (iii) $\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \notin t\text{-flags}^s$.
 - (iv) For each $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^s$, $\text{rng}(\varphi_\ell^s) \cap (E_{i,j,k}^s \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^s) \neq \emptyset$.
If so, then do the following.
 - Set $t\text{-flags}^{s+1} = t\text{-flags}^s \cup \{\langle i, j, \ell \rangle\}$. (Note that this implies $\text{height}_{i,j}^{s+1} = \text{height}_{i,j}^s + 1$.)
 - Let $n = \text{num}_{i,j}^{s+1}$. (Note that, by the just previous step, $n = \text{num}_{i,j}^s / 2$.)
 - Let $\{q_0 < q_1 < \dots < q_{n-1}\}$ be the n least elements of Dst^s .
 - Set $\text{Dst}^{s+1} = \text{Dst}^s \setminus \{q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{n-1}\}$.
 - For each $k < n$ and $p \in (E_{i,j,k}^{s+1} \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^{s+1})$, set $\psi_p^{s+1} = \langle i, j \rangle^{(2k+2) \cdot 2^h}$.
 - For each $k < n$, set $\psi_{q_k}^{s+1} = \langle i, j \rangle^{<(2k+1) \cdot 2^h}$.
-

Fig. 2. The construction of ψ in the proof of Theorem 7. The symbols height , num , f , E , and \bar{E} are defined in (17), (20), (21), (22), and (23), respectively.




Fig. 3. A depiction of what *could* happen in the proof of Theorem 7 with respect to the ψ -programs of the form $f_{3,j}(k)$, where j is arbitrary and $k < 16$ (see text).

The partial function ψ is constructed in Figure 2. To help to give some of the intuition behind the construction, Figure 3 depicts what *could* happen with respect to the ψ -programs of the form $f_{3,j}(k)$, where j is arbitrary and $k < 16$. In stage 0, the programs will form *eight* pairs of equivalence classes, where the k th pair computes $\langle 3, j \rangle^{<k+1}$ (the first such pair being the 0th). If, subsequently, the conditions of some stage s of the form $\langle 4, j + 1, \ell', - \rangle$ are satisfied, then, in stage $s + 1$, the programs will form *four* pairs of equivalence classes, where the k th pair computes $\langle 3, j \rangle^{<2k+2}$. If, similarly, the conditions of some stage s' of the form $\langle 4, j + 1, \ell'', - \rangle$ are satisfied (where $\ell' \neq \ell''$), then, in stage $s' + 1$, the programs will form *two* pairs of equivalence classes, where the k th pair computes $\langle 3, j \rangle^{<4k+4}$. If, finally, the conditions of some stage s'' of the form $\langle 4, 0, - \rangle$ are satisfied, then, in stage $s'' + 1$, the equivalence classes will alternate in computing α_ℓ and α_m , for some *distinct* ℓ and m .

Note that by (14), (17), and (19), the following function $\text{height}^\infty : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is well-defined. For each i and j ,

$$\text{height}_{i,j}^\infty = \max\{\text{height}_{i,j}^s \mid s \in \mathbb{N}\}. \quad (26)$$

For each i and j , let $\text{num}_{i,j}^\infty$ be defined in a manner analogous to (20), but with $h = \text{height}_{i,j}^\infty$. For each i, j , and $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^\infty$, let $E_{i,j,k}^\infty$ and $\bar{E}_{i,j,k}^\infty$ be defined in a manner analogous to (22) and (23) (respectively), but with $h = \text{height}_{i,j}^\infty$.

Claim 7.1 below establishes that ψ is an *eps*. Claim 7.7 below establishes that ψ satisfies (a) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., that ψ is minimal. Claim 7.8 below establishes that ψ satisfies (b) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., that for each *ceer* R , there exists a translation function t into ψ such that R does *not* weakly tie t into ψ .

Claim 7.1. ψ is an *eps*.

Proof of Claim. Clearly, ψ is partial computable. Thus, it suffices to show that, for each $\zeta \in \mathcal{PartComp}$, there exists a p such that $\psi_p = \zeta$. So, let $\zeta \in \mathcal{PartComp}$ be given. Consider the following cases.

CASE [$\zeta \in \mathcal{Aux}$]. Let ℓ be such that $\alpha_\ell = \zeta$, and let $s = \langle 0, \ell \rangle$. Then, the following are easily verifiable from the construction of ψ .

- If $\ell \notin \text{Src}^s$, then there exists a p of the form $f_{i,j}(k)$, for some i, j , and k , such that $\psi_p^s = \zeta$.

– If $\ell \in \text{Src}^s$, then $\psi_{\min \text{Dst}^s}^{s+1} = \zeta$.

CASE [$\zeta \notin \mathcal{A}u\mathcal{X}$]. Let i, j, k , and h be such that $\zeta = \langle i, j \rangle^{<(2k+1) \cdot 2^h}$. Then, the following are easily verifiable from the construction of ψ .

– If $\text{height}_{i,j}^\infty \leq h$ and $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$, then, for each p ,

$$p \in \{f_{i,j}((2k+1) \cdot 2^{h+1} - 2), f_{i,j}((2k+1) \cdot 2^{h+1} - 1)\} \Rightarrow \psi_p = \zeta. \quad (27)$$

– If $\text{height}_{i,j}^\infty > h$ or $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$, then there exists a $p \in \text{Dst}^0 (= 2\mathbb{N} + 1)$ such that $\psi_p = \zeta$.

□ (Claim 7.1)

Claim 7.2. Suppose that i is such that $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$. Then, for each j , each $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^\infty$, and each p ,

$$p \in (E_{i,j,k}^\infty \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^\infty) \Leftrightarrow \psi_p = \langle i, j \rangle^{(k+1) \cdot 2^h}, \quad (28)$$

where $h = \text{height}_{i,j}^\infty$.

Proof of Claim. Easily verifiable from the construction of ψ .

□ (Claim 7.2)

Claim 7.3. Suppose that i is such that $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$. Let s_{\min} be *least* such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}$. Then, there exist *distinct* ℓ and m such that (a) and (b) below.

(a) For each p ,

$$p \in \bigcup \{E_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge k < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s_{\min}}\} \Leftrightarrow \psi_p = \alpha_\ell. \quad (29)$$

(b) For each q ,

$$q \in \bigcup \{\bar{E}_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge k < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s_{\min}}\} \Leftrightarrow \psi_q = \alpha_m. \quad (30)$$

Proof of Claim. Easily verifiable from the construction of ψ .

□ (Claim 7.3)

Claim 7.4. For each $p \in \text{Dst}^0 (= 2\mathbb{N} + 1)$ and q , if $\psi_p = \psi_q$, then $p = q$.

Proof of Claim. Easily verifiable from the construction of ψ .

□ (Claim 7.4)

Claim 7.5. Suppose that i, j, ℓ , and s are such that $\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s$. Then,

$$\text{rng}(\varphi_\ell) \cap E_{i,j,k}^s \neq \emptyset \wedge \text{rng}(\varphi_\ell) \cap \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^s \neq \emptyset. \quad (31)$$

Proof of Claim. Suppose that i, j, ℓ , and s are as stated. Let s_{\min} be *least* such that

$$\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}. \quad (32)$$

Thus, $s > s_{\min}$. By the construction of ψ , for each $k' < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s_{\min}}$,

$$\text{rng}(\varphi_\ell) \cap (E_{i,j,k'}^{s_{\min}} \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k'}^{s_{\min}}) \neq \emptyset. \quad (33)$$

It follows from (24) and (32) that, for each $s > s_{\min}$ and $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^s$, there exists a $k' < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s_{\min}}$ such that

$$E_{i,j,k'}^{s_{\min}} \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k'}^{s_{\min}} \subseteq E_{i,j,k}^s. \quad (34)$$

Similarly, it follows from (25) and (32) that, for each $s > s_{\min}$ and $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^s$, there exists a $k' < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s_{\min}}$ such that

$$E_{i,j,k'}^{s_{\min}} \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k'}^{s_{\min}} \subseteq \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^s. \quad (35)$$

Formula (31) is implied by (33), (34), and (35).

□ (Claim 7.5)

For each i, j , and s , act according to the following computable conditions. (Note that cond. (a) is computable, in part, because there are only finitely many $i \leq \ell$.)

- COND. (a) $[\text{height}_{i,j}^s < \text{height}_{i,j}^{s+1} \wedge i \leq \ell \wedge (\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]]$. For each $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s+1}$ and

$$p, q \in (E_{i,j,k}^{s+1} \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^{s+1}),$$

list $\langle p, q \rangle$ into R .

- COND. (b) $[\text{height}_{i,j}^s < \text{height}_{i,j}^{s+1} \wedge i > \ell]$. For each $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s+1}$ and

$$p, q \in E_{i,j,k}^{s+1},$$

list $\langle p, q \rangle$ into R . Similarly, for each

$$p, q \in \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^{s+1},$$

list $\langle p, q \rangle$ into R .

For each i , act according to the following partial computable condition.

- COND. (c) $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$. Let s_{\min} be *least* such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}$, and do the following. For each

$$p, q \in \bigcup \{E_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge k < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s_{\min}}\},$$

list $\langle p, q \rangle$ into R . Similarly, for each

$$p, q \in \bigcup \{\bar{E}_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge k < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s_{\min}}\},$$

list $\langle p, q \rangle$ into R .

Fig. 4. The construction of R in the proof of Claim 7.7.

Claim 7.6. Suppose that i is such that $W_i \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$. Then, $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$.

Proof of Claim. The proof is by contrapositive. Suppose that i is such that $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$. Let s_{\min} be *least* such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}$. Then, by the construction of ψ , there exist j and k such that

$$W_i^{s_{\min}} \cap (E_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}} \times \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}}) \neq \emptyset. \quad (36)$$

Furthermore, by Claim 7.3(\Rightarrow), there exist *distinct* ℓ and m such that (a) and (b) below.

- (a) For each $p \in E_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}}$, $\psi_p = \alpha_\ell$.
- (b) For each $q \in \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}}$, $\psi_q = \alpha_m$.

Since α is 1-1 and $\ell \neq m$, $\alpha_\ell \neq \alpha_m$. Thus, by (36) and (a) and (b) just above, $W_i \not\subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$. \square (**Claim 7.6**)

Claim 7.7. ψ satisfies (a) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., ψ is minimal.

Proof of Claim. Let t be any translation function into ψ , and let ℓ be such that $\varphi_\ell = t$. To show the claim, a ceer R is exhibited such that R strongly ties t into ψ . Initially, R consists of $\{\langle p, p \rangle \mid p \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then, pairs are added to R as in Figure 4.

Clearly, R is a ceer. That $R \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$ follows from the (\Rightarrow) directions of Claims 7.2 and 7.3. It remains to show that, for each $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$, $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. It is straightforward to verify that each $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$ is of one of the following four types.

- TYPE I. E is of the form

$$E_{i,j,k}^\infty \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^\infty, \quad (37)$$

where: $i \leq \ell$, $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$, j is arbitrary, and $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^\infty$. (Intuitively, E is the result of one or more invocations of cond. (a) in Figure 4.)

– TYPE II. Either E is of the form

$$E_{i,j,k}^\infty \quad (38)$$

or E is of the form

$$\bar{E}_{i,j,k}^\infty \quad (39)$$

where: $i > \ell$, $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$, j is arbitrary, and $k < \text{num}_{i,j}^\infty$. (Intuitively, E is the result of one or more invocations of cond. (b) in Figure 4.)

– TYPE III. Either E is of the form

$$\bigcup \{E_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge k < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s_{\min}}\} \quad (40)$$

or E is of the form

$$\bigcup \{\bar{E}_{i,j,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge k < \text{num}_{i,j}^{s_{\min}}\} \quad (41)$$

where: i is such that $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$, and s_{\min} is *least* such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}$. (Intuitively, E is the result of zero or more invocations of cond. (b) in Figure 4, followed by a single invocation of cond. (c).)

– TYPE IV. $E = \{p\}$, for some $p \in \text{Dst}^0 (= 2\mathbb{N} + 1)$.

Let $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$ be given. If E is of type I, then it follows from Claim 7.2(\Leftarrow) that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. If E is of type III, then it follows from Claim 7.3(\Leftarrow) that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. If E is of type IV, then it follows from Claim 7.4 that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$.

So, suppose that E is of type II. Let i, j , and k be such that $E = E_{i,j,k}^\infty$ or $\bar{E} = \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^\infty$, as appropriate. Further suppose, by way of contradiction, that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E = \emptyset$. Thus,

$$\text{rng}(t) \cap E_{i,j,k}^\infty = \emptyset \vee \text{rng}(t) \cap \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^\infty = \emptyset. \quad (42)$$

Note that by Claim 7.2(\Leftarrow), for each $k' < \text{num}_{i,j}^\infty$ and p ,

$$\psi_p = \langle i, j \rangle^{(k'+1) \cdot 2^h} \Rightarrow p \in (E_{i,j,k'}^\infty \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k'}^\infty), \quad (43)$$

where $h = \text{height}_{i,j}^\infty$. Thus, since t is a translation function into ψ , it must be the case that, for each $k' < \text{num}_{i,j}^\infty$,

$$\text{rng}(t) \cap (E_{i,j,k'}^\infty \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k'}^\infty) \neq \emptyset. \quad (44)$$

Choose s such that s is of the form $\langle i+1, j+1, \ell, - \rangle$, $\text{height}_{i,j}^s = \text{height}_{i,j}^\infty$, and, for each $k' < \text{num}_{i,j}^\infty$,

$$\text{rng}(\varphi_\ell^s) \cap (E_{i,j,k'}^\infty \cup \bar{E}_{i,j,k'}^\infty) \neq \emptyset. \quad (45)$$

Note that by (42) and Claim 7.5, $\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \notin t\text{-flags}^s$. It follows that all of the conditions of stage s are satisfied. Thus, $\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^{s+1}$. But then

$$\text{height}_{i,j}^{s+1} > \text{height}_{i,j}^s = \text{height}_{i,j}^\infty \quad (46)$$

— a contradiction. □ (Claim 7.7)

Claim 7.8. ψ satisfies (b) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., for each ceer R , there exists a translation function t into ψ such that R does *not* weakly tie t into ψ .

Proof of Claim. Suppose that ceer R is such that

$$R \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi). \quad (47)$$

Let i be such that $W_i = R$. Note that by Claim 7.6,

$$(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]. \quad (48)$$

For each $\ell < i$, let J_ℓ be as follows.

$$J_\ell = \{j \mid (\exists s)[\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s]\}. \quad (49)$$

Clearly, for each $\ell < i$, J_ℓ is computably enumerable. Thus, by Lemma 10, there exists an infinite, computable set X , and a finite set $L \subseteq \{0, \dots, i-1\}$, such that, for each $x \in X$ and $\ell \in L$, $x \in J_\ell$ iff $\ell \in L$. Thus, for each $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \{\ell \mid x \in J_\ell\} \\ &= \{\ell \mid x \in \{j \mid (\exists s)[\langle i, j, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s]\}\} \\ &= \{\ell \mid (\exists s)[\langle i, x, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s]\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that, for each $x \in X$, $\text{height}_{i,x}^\infty = |L|$ and $\text{num}_{i,j}^\infty = 2^{i-|L|}$. Let t be any computable function such that

$$\text{rng}(t) = \mathbb{N} \setminus \bigcup \{E_{i,x,0}^\infty \mid x \in X\}.^4 \quad (50)$$

It is straightforward to show that that t is a translation function into ψ . On the other hand, it is clearly the case that, for each $x \in X$,

$$\text{rng}(t) \cap E_{i,x,0}^\infty = \emptyset. \quad (51)$$

Thus, to complete the proof, it suffices to show that, for each $E \in \text{Equiv}(R)$ and $x \in X$,

$$E \cap E_{i,x,0}^\infty \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow E \subseteq E_{i,x,0}^\infty. \quad (52)$$

By way of contradiction, suppose otherwise, as witnessed by E and x , i.e.,

$$E \cap E_{i,x,0}^\infty \neq \emptyset \wedge E \not\subseteq E_{i,x,0}^\infty. \quad (53)$$

By (47), (48), (53), and Claim 7.2 (both directions), it must be the case that

$$E \cap \bar{E}_{i,x,0}^\infty \neq \emptyset, \quad (54)$$

Thus, by the first conjunct of (53), and by (54), there exists a stage s of the form $\langle i+1, 0, - \rangle$ in which all of the conditions of that stage are satisfied. Thus, $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s+1}$. But this contradicts (48). \square (**Claim 7.8**)

\square (**Theorem 7**)

Theorem 8, restated just below, is our third main result. It establishes that the strong and weak notions of Definition 5 separate when one considers single equivalence relations.

Theorem 8. There exists an eps ψ and a ceer $R \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$ satisfying (a) and (b) below.

- (a) For each translation function t into ψ , R weakly ties t into ψ .
- (b) For each ceer R' , there exists a translation function t into ψ such that R' does *not* strongly tie t into ψ .

Proof. The proof is essentially a modification to the proof of Theorem 7. Intuitively, one eliminates all uses of j in that proof. So, for example, for each i , rather than start with infinitely many pairs of equivalence classes,

$$\{(E_{i,j,k}^0, \bar{E}_{i,j,k}^0) \mid j \in \mathbb{N} \wedge k < 2^i\}, \quad (55)$$

one instead starts with just 2^i many such pairs,

$$\{(E_{i,k}^0, \bar{E}_{i,k}^0) \mid k < 2^i\}. \quad (56)$$

This has the effect of invalidating Claim 7.8 (and of making Lemma 10 unnecessary).

Let $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\chi \subseteq \text{PartComp}$ be such that

$$\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\chi = \text{PartComp} \setminus \{i^{<k+1} \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \wedge k < 2^i\}. \quad (57)$$

Let $(\alpha_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a 1-1, effective numbering of $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\chi$.

In conjunction with ψ , four computable predicates are constructed: $\lambda i, s. [i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$, $\lambda i, \ell, s. [i, \ell \in t\text{-flags}^s]$, $\lambda \ell, s. [\ell \in \text{Src}^s]$, and $\lambda p, s. [p \in \text{Dst}^s]$. The purposes of these predicates are similar to those in the proof of Theorem 7. (Note, however, the difference in the type of the $t\text{-flags}$ predicate.)

Let $f : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be such that, for each i and k ,

$$f_i(k) = 2 \cdot (2^{i+1} + k - 2). \quad (58)$$

The following symbols are defined in a manner analogous to the proof of Theorem 7.

⁴ In (50), we chose to use $\bigcup \{E_{i,x,0}^\infty \mid x \in X\}$. But the proof can be completed using $\bigcup \{E_{i,x,k}^\infty \mid x \in X\}$ or $\bigcup \{\bar{E}_{i,x,k}^\infty \mid x \in X\}$, for any $k < \min\{\text{num}_{i,x}^\infty \mid x \in X\}$.

- $\text{height} : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $\text{height}^\infty : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$
- $\text{num} : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $\text{num}^\infty : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$

The following symbols are defined similarly, but with f as in (58).

- $E : \mathbb{N}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}in$ and $E^\infty : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}in$
- $\bar{E} : \mathbb{N}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}in$ and $\bar{E}^\infty : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}in$

Suppose that i and s are such that $\text{height}_i^{s+1} = \text{height}_i^s + 1$. Then, by reasoning in a manner analogous to (24), it can be shown that, for each $k < \text{num}_i^{s+1}$, the following.

$$\begin{aligned} E_{i,k}^{s+1} &= E_{i,2k}^s \cup \bar{E}_{i,2k}^s \quad . \\ \bar{E}_{i,k}^{s+1} &= E_{i,2k+1}^s \cup \bar{E}_{i,2k+1}^s. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

The partial function ψ is constructed in Figure 5. One can show Claims 8.1 through 8.6 below. The proofs are similar to those of Claims 7.1 through 7.6 (respectively).

Claim 8.1. ψ is an eps.

Claim 8.2. Suppose that i is such that $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$. Then, for each $k < \text{num}_i^\infty$, and each p ,

$$p \in (E_{i,k}^\infty \cup \bar{E}_{i,k}^\infty) \Leftrightarrow \psi_p = i^{(k+1) \cdot 2^h}, \quad (60)$$

where $h = \text{height}_i^\infty$.

Claim 8.3. Suppose that i is such that $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$. Let s_{\min} be *least* such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}$. Then, there exist *distinct* ℓ and m such that (a) and (b) below.

(a) For each p ,

$$p \in \bigcup \{E_{i,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid k < \text{num}_i^{s_{\min}}\} \Leftrightarrow \psi_p = \alpha_\ell. \quad (61)$$

(b) For each q ,

$$q \in \bigcup \{\bar{E}_{i,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid k < \text{num}_i^{s_{\min}}\} \Leftrightarrow \psi_q = \alpha_m. \quad (62)$$

Claim 8.4. For each $p \in \text{Dst}^0 (= 2\mathbb{N} + 1)$ and q , if $\psi_p = \psi_q$, then $p = q$.

Claim 8.5. Suppose that i , ℓ , and s are such that $\langle i, \ell \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s$. Then,

$$\text{rng}(\varphi_\ell) \cap E_{i,k}^s \neq \emptyset \wedge \text{rng}(\varphi_\ell) \cap \bar{E}_{i,k}^s \neq \emptyset. \quad (63)$$

Claim 8.6. Suppose that i is such that $W_i \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$. Then, $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$.

The relation R consists initially of $\{\langle p, p \rangle \mid p \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then, pairs are added to R as in Figure 6.

Clearly, R is a ceer. That $R \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$ follows from the (\Rightarrow) directions of Claims 8.2 and 8.3.

Claim 8.7 below establishes that ψ and R satisfy (a) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., that for each translation function t into ψ , R weakly ties t into ψ . Claim 8.8 below establishes that ψ satisfies (b) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., that for each ceer R' , there exists a translation function t into ψ such that R' does *not* strongly tie t into ψ .

-
- STAGE $s = -1$. Do the following.
 - Set $R\text{-flags}^0 = \emptyset$.
 - Set $t\text{-flags}^0 = \emptyset$.
 - Set $\text{Src}^0 = \mathbb{N}$.
 - Set $\text{Dst}^0 = 2\mathbb{N} + 1$.
 - For each i and $k < 2^i$, set $\psi_{f_i(2k)}^0 = \psi_{f_i(2k+1)}^0 = i^{<k+1}$.
 - For each $p \in 2\mathbb{N} + 1$, set $\psi_p^0 = \lambda x.\uparrow$.
 - STAGE $s = \langle 0, \ell \rangle$. If $\ell \in \text{Src}^s$, then do the following.
 - Set $\text{Src}^{s+1} = \text{Src}^s \setminus \{\ell\}$.
 - Set $\text{Dst}^{s+1} = \text{Dst}^s \setminus \{\min \text{Dst}^s\}$.
 - Set $\psi_{\min \text{Dst}^s}^{s+1} = \alpha_\ell$.
 - STAGE $s = \langle i + 1, 0, - \rangle$. Determine whether there exists a k satisfying conditions (a)-(c) just below.
 - (a) $i \notin R\text{-flags}^s$.
 - (b) $k < \text{num}_i^s$.
 - (c) $W_i^s \cap (E_{i,k}^s \times \bar{E}_{i,k}^s) \neq \emptyset$.

If such a k exists, then do the following.

 - Set $R\text{-flags}^{s+1} = R\text{-flags}^s \cup \{i\}$.
 - Choose any $\ell, m \in \text{Src}^s$ such that $\ell \neq m$ and $i^{<2^i} \subseteq \alpha_\ell \cap \alpha_m$.
 - Let $n = \text{num}_i^s$.
 - Let $\{p_0 < p_1 < \dots < p_{n-1}\}$ be the n least elements of Dst^s .
 - Set $\text{Src}^{s+1} = \text{Src}^s \setminus \{\ell, m\}$.
 - Set $\text{Dst}^{s+1} = \text{Dst}^s \setminus \{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}\}$.
 - For each $k < n$ and $p \in E_{i,k}^s$, set $\psi_p^{s+1} = \alpha_\ell$.
 - For each $k < n$ and $q \in \bar{E}_{i,k}^s$, set $\psi_q^{s+1} = \alpha_m$.
 - For each $k < n$, set $\psi_{p_k}^{s+1} = i^{<(k+1) \cdot 2^h}$, where $h = \text{height}_i^s$.
 - STAGE $s = \langle i + 1, \ell + 1, - \rangle$. Let $h = \text{height}_i^s$. Determine whether conditions (i)-(iv) just below are satisfied.
 - (i) $\ell < i$.
 - (ii) $i \notin R\text{-flags}^s$.
 - (iii) $\langle i, \ell \rangle \notin t\text{-flags}^s$.
 - (iv) For each $k < \text{num}_i^s$, $\text{rng}(\varphi_\ell^s) \cap (E_{i,k}^s \cup \bar{E}_{i,k}^s) \neq \emptyset$.

If so, then do the following.

 - Set $t\text{-flags}^{s+1} = t\text{-flags}^s \cup \{\langle i, \ell \rangle\}$. (Note that this implies $\text{height}_i^{s+1} = \text{height}_i^s + 1$.)
 - Let $n = \text{num}_i^{s+1}$. (Note that, by the just previous step, $n = \text{num}_i^s / 2$.)
 - Let $\{q_0 < q_1 < \dots < q_{n-1}\}$ be the n least elements of Dst^s .
 - Set $\text{Dst}^{s+1} = \text{Dst}^s \setminus \{q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{n-1}\}$.
 - For each $k < n$ and $p \in (E_{i,k}^{s+1} \cup \bar{E}_{i,k}^{s+1})$, set $\psi_p^{s+1} = i^{(2k+2) \cdot 2^h}$.
 - For each $k < n$, set $\psi_{q_k}^{s+1} = i^{<(2k+1) \cdot 2^h}$.
-

Fig. 5. The construction of ψ in the proof of Theorem 8.

For each i and s , act according to the following computable condition.

- COND. (a) [$\text{height}_i^s < \text{height}_i^{s+1}$]. For each $k < \text{num}_i^{s+1}$ and

$$p, q \in E_{i,k}^{s+1},$$

list $\langle p, q \rangle$ into R . Similarly, for each

$$p, q \in \bar{E}_{i,k}^{s+1},$$

list $\langle p, q \rangle$ into R .

For each i , act according to the following partial computable condition.

- COND. (b) $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$. Let s_{\min} be *least* such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}$, and do the following. For each

$$p, q \in \bigcup \{E_{i,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid k < \text{num}_i^{s_{\min}}\},$$

list $\langle p, q \rangle$ into R . Similarly, for each

$$p, q \in \bigcup \{\bar{E}_{i,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid k < \text{num}_i^{s_{\min}}\},$$

list $\langle p, q \rangle$ into R .

Fig. 6. The construction of R in the proof of Theorem 8.

Claim 8.7. ψ and R satisfy (a) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., for each translation function t into ψ , R weakly ties t into ψ .

Proof of Claim. It is straightforward to verify that each $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$ is of one of the following three types.

- TYPE I. Either E is of the form

$$E_{i,k}^{\infty} \tag{64}$$

or E is of the form

$$\bar{E}_{i,k}^{\infty} \tag{65}$$

where: i is such that $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$, and $k < \text{num}_i^{\infty}$. (Intuitively, E is the result of one or more invocations of cond. (a) in Figure 6.)

- TYPE II. Either E is of the form

$$\bigcup \{E_{i,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid k < \text{num}_i^{s_{\min}}\} \tag{66}$$

or E is of the form

$$\bigcup \{\bar{E}_{i,k}^{s_{\min}} \mid k < \text{num}_i^{s_{\min}}\} \tag{67}$$

where: i is such that $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$, and s_{\min} is *least* such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}$. (Intuitively, E is the result of zero or more invocations of cond. (a) in Figure 6, followed by a single invocation of cond. (b).)

- TYPE III. $E = \{p\}$, for some $p \in \text{Dst}^0 (= 2\mathbb{N} + 1)$.

Let t be any translation function into ψ , and let ℓ be such that $\varphi_{\ell} = t$. Note that there are only finitely many $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$ of type I for which $i \leq \ell$, where i is such that $E = E_{i,k}^{\infty}$ or $E = \bar{E}_{i,k}^{\infty}$, as appropriate. Thus, to show the claim, it suffices to show that, for each $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$: if E is of type II or III, then $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$; whereas, if E is of type I, then $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$ or $i \leq \ell$ (where i is as just mentioned).

So, let $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$ be given. If E is of type II, then it follows from Claim 8.3(\Leftarrow) that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. If E is of type III, then it follows from Claim 8.4 that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$.

So, suppose that E is of type I, and that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E = \emptyset$. Let i and k be such $E = E_{i,k}^{\infty}$ or $E = \bar{E}_{i,k}^{\infty}$, as appropriate. To show that $i \leq \ell$, one first assumes otherwise, by way of contradiction. One then proceeds in a manner analogous to the proof of Claim 7.7, beginning just before (42). \square (**Claim 8.7**)

Claim 8.8. ψ satisfies (b) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., for each ceer R' , there exists a translation function t into ψ such that R' does *not* strongly tie t into ψ .

Proof of Claim. Suppose that $\text{ceer } R' \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$. Let i be such that $W_i = R'$. Let t be any computable function such that

$$\text{rng}(t) = \mathbb{N} \setminus E_{i,0}^\infty. \quad (68)$$

It is straightforward to show that t is a translation function into ψ . On the other hand, it is clearly the case that

$$\text{rng}(t) \cap E_{i,0}^\infty = \emptyset. \quad (69)$$

Thus, to complete the proof, it suffices to show that, for each $E \in \text{Equiv}(R)$,

$$E \cap E_{i,0}^\infty \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow E \subseteq E_{i,0}^\infty. \quad (70)$$

This can be shown in a manner analogous to the proof of Claim 7.8, beginning just after (52).

□ (Claim 8.8)

□ (Theorem 8)

Theorem 9, restated just below, is our final main result. It establishes that there can exist a single *ceer* that strongly ties each translation function into an *eps*, yet that *eps*'s program equivalence relation can fail to be computably enumerable.

Theorem 9. There exists an *eps* ψ and a *ceer* $R \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$ satisfying (a) and (b) below.

- (a) For each translation function t into ψ , R strongly ties t into ψ .
- (b) $\text{Equiv}(\psi)$ is *not* computably enumerable.

Proof. The *eps* ψ is constructed below, following some necessary definitions. Let $\mathcal{A}\mu\chi \subseteq \text{PartComp}$ be such that

$$\mathcal{A}\mu\chi = \text{PartComp} \setminus (\{i^{<j+1} \mid i, j \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{\lambda x.i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}). \quad (71)$$

Let $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a 1-1, effective numbering of $\mathcal{A}\mu\chi$.

In conjunction with ψ , the following six computable predicates are constructed.

- $\lambda i, s. [i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$
- $\lambda i, j, s. [(i, j) \in t\text{-flags}^s]$
- $\lambda j, s. [j \in \text{Src}^s]$
- $\lambda p, s. [p \in \text{Dst}^s]$
- $\lambda p, i, s. [p \in E_i^s]$
- $\lambda q, i, s. [q \in \bar{E}_i^s]$

The purposes of these predicates are similar to those in the proofs of Theorems 7 and 8. Note, however, that in the proofs of Theorems 7 and 8, the E and \bar{E} predicates were *calculated*; whereas, in this proof, they are *constructed*. The following will be clear from the construction of ψ , for each i and s .

$$E_i^s \subseteq E_i^{s+1}. \quad (72)$$

$$\bar{E}_i^s \subseteq \bar{E}_i^{s+1}. \quad (73)$$

For each i , let E_i^∞ and \bar{E}_i^∞ be as follows.

$$E_i^\infty = \bigcup \{E_i^s \mid s \in \mathbb{N}\}. \quad (74)$$

$$\bar{E}_i^\infty = \bigcup \{\bar{E}_i^s \mid s \in \mathbb{N}\}. \quad (75)$$

The partial function ψ is constructed in Figure 7. Claim 9.1 below establishes that ψ is an *eps*.

Claim 9.1. ψ is an *eps*.

Proof of Claim. Clearly, ψ is partial computable. Thus, it suffices to show that, for each $\zeta \in \text{PartComp}$, there exists a p such that $\psi_p = \zeta$. So, let $\zeta \in \text{PartComp}$ be given. Consider the following cases.

CASE $[\zeta \in \mathcal{A}\mu\chi]$. Let k be such that $\alpha_k = \zeta$, and let $s = \langle 0, k \rangle$. Then, the following are easily verifiable from the construction of ψ .

-
- STAGE $s = -1$. Do the following.
 - Set $R\text{-flags}^0 = \emptyset$.
 - Set $t\text{-flags}^0 = \emptyset$.
 - Set $\text{Src}^0 = \mathbb{N}$.
 - Set $\text{Dst}^0 = 3\mathbb{N} + 2$.
 - For each i , set $E_i^0 = \bar{E}_i^0 = \emptyset$.
 - For each i and j , set $\psi_{3\langle i, j \rangle}^0 = i^{<2j+1}$.
 - For each i and j , set $\psi_{3\langle i, j \rangle + 1}^0 = i^{<2j+2}$.
 - For each $p \in 3\mathbb{N} + 2$, set $\psi_p^0 = \lambda x. \uparrow$.
 - STAGE $s = \langle 0, k \rangle$. If $k \in \text{Src}^s$, then do the following.
 - Set $\text{Src}^{s+1} = \text{Src}^s \setminus \{k\}$.
 - Set $\text{Dst}^{s+1} = \text{Dst}^s \setminus \{\min \text{Dst}^s\}$.
 - Set $\psi_{\min \text{Dst}^s}^{s+1} = \alpha_k$.
 - STAGE $s = \langle i + 1, 0, - \rangle$. If $i \notin R\text{-flags}^s$ and $W_i^s \cap (E_i^s \times \bar{E}_i^s) \neq \emptyset$, then do the following.
 - Set $R\text{-flags}^{s+1} = R\text{-flags}^s \cup \{i\}$.
 - Let n be *least* such that, for each $p \in (E_i^s \cup \bar{E}_i^s)$, $\psi_p \subseteq i^{<n}$.
 - Choose any $k, \ell \in \text{Src}^s$ such that $k \neq \ell$ and $i^{<n} \subseteq \alpha_k \cap \alpha_\ell$.
 - Set $\text{Src}^{s+1} = \text{Src}^s \setminus \{k, \ell\}$.
 - Set $\text{Dst}^{s+1} = \text{Dst}^s \setminus \{\min \text{Dst}^s\}$.
 - For each $p \in E_i^s$, set $\psi_p^{s+1} = \alpha_k$.
 - For each $q \in \bar{E}_i^s$, set $\psi_q^{s+1} = \alpha_\ell$.
 - Set $\psi_{\min \text{Dst}^s}^{s+1} = \lambda x. i$.
 - STAGE $s = \langle i + 1, j + 1, - \rangle$. Determine whether conditions (i)-(iii) just below are satisfied.
 - (i) $i \notin R\text{-flags}^s$.
 - (ii) $\langle i, j \rangle \notin t\text{-flags}^s$.
 - (iii) $\{3\langle i, j \rangle, 3\langle i, j \rangle + 1\} \subseteq \text{rng}(\varphi_j^s)$.
 If so, then do the following.
 - Set $t\text{-flags}^{s+1} = t\text{-flags}^s \cup \{\langle i, j \rangle\}$.
 - Set $E_i^{s+1} = E_i^s \cup \{3\langle i, j \rangle\}$.
 - Set $\bar{E}_i^{s+1} = \bar{E}_i^s \cup \{3\langle i, j \rangle + 1\}$.
 - Let n be *least* such that, for each $p \in (E_i^{s+1} \cup \bar{E}_i^{s+1})$, $\psi_p^{s+1} \subseteq i^{<n}$.
 - For each $p \in (E_i^{s+1} \cup \bar{E}_i^{s+1})$, set $\psi_p = i^{<n}$.
 - Let $\{q_0 < q_1\}$ be the two *least* elements of Dst^s .
 - Set $\text{Dst}^{s+1} = \text{Dst}^s \setminus \{q_0, q_1\}$.
 - Set $\psi_{q_0}^{s+1} = i^{<2j+1}$.
 - Set $\psi_{q_1}^{s+1} = i^{<2j+2}$.
-

Fig. 7. The construction of ψ in the proof of Theorem 9.

- If $k \notin \text{Src}^s$, then there exists a p of the form $3\langle i, j \rangle$ or $3\langle i, j \rangle + 1$, for some i and j , such that $\psi_p^s = \zeta$.
- If $k \in \text{Src}^s$, then $\psi_{\min \text{Dst}^s}^{s+1} = \zeta$.

CASE $[\zeta \notin \mathcal{Aux} \wedge (\exists i, j)[\zeta = i^{<2j+1}]]$. Let i and j be as in the case. Then, the following are easily verifiable from the construction of ψ .

- If $(\forall s)[\langle i, j \rangle \notin t\text{-flags}^s]$, then $\psi_{3\langle i, j \rangle} = \zeta$.
- If $(\exists s)[\langle i, j \rangle \in t\text{-flags}^s]$, then there exists a $p \in \text{Dst}^0 (= 3\mathbb{N} + 2)$ such that $\psi_p = \zeta$.

CASE $[\zeta \notin \mathcal{Aux} \wedge (\exists i, j)[\zeta = i^{<2j+2}]]$. Similar to the previous case. □ (Claim 9.1)

The relation R is defined as follows.

$$R = \begin{aligned} & \{ \langle p, p \rangle \mid p \in \mathbb{N} \} \\ & \cup \{ \langle p, q \rangle \mid p, q \in E_i^\infty \wedge i \in \mathbb{N} \} \\ & \cup \{ \langle p, q \rangle \mid p, q \in \bar{E}_i^\infty \wedge i \in \mathbb{N} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Clearly, R is a ceer. That $R \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$ follows from the (\Rightarrow) directions of Claims 9.2 and 9.3.

Claim 9.6 below establishes that ψ and R satisfy (a) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., that for each translation function t into ψ , R strongly ties t into ψ . Claim 9.7 below establishes that ψ satisfies (b) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., that $\text{Equiv}(\psi)$ is *not* computably enumerable.

Claim 9.2. Suppose that i is such that $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$. Then, (a) and (b) below.

- (a) Each of E_i^∞ and \bar{E}_i^∞ is infinite.
- (b) For each $p, p \in (E_i^\infty \cup \bar{E}_i^\infty) \Leftrightarrow \psi_p = \lambda x. i$.

Proof of Claim. Suppose that i is such that $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$. Note that there exist infinitely many j such that $\text{rng}(\varphi_j) = \mathbb{N}$. Thus, there exist infinitely many j such that $\{3\langle i, j \rangle, 3\langle i, j \rangle + 1\} \subseteq \text{rng}(\varphi_j^s)$, for all but finitely many s . It follows that there exist infinitely many stages of the form $\langle i + 1, j + 1, - \rangle$ such that all of the conditions of those stages are satisfied. Given this fact, both (a) and (b) are easily verifiable from the construction of ψ . □ (Claim 9.2)

Claim 9.3. Suppose that i is such that $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$. Let s_{\min} be *least* such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}$. Then, (a) and (b) below.

- (a) $E_i^\infty = E_i^{s_{\min}}$ and $\bar{E}_i^\infty = \bar{E}_i^{s_{\min}}$.
- (b) There exist *distinct* k and ℓ such that (i) and (ii) below.
 - (i) For each $p, p \in E_i^\infty \Leftrightarrow \psi_p = \alpha_k$.
 - (ii) For each $q, q \in \bar{E}_i^\infty \Leftrightarrow \psi_q = \alpha_\ell$.

Proof of Claim. Easily verifiable from the construction of ψ . □ (Claim 9.3)

Claim 9.4. For each p such that

$$p \notin \bigcup \{ E_i^\infty \cup \bar{E}_i^\infty \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \}, \quad (77)$$

and, for each q , if $\psi_p = \psi_q$, then $p = q$.

Proof of Claim. Easily verifiable from the construction of ψ . □ (Claim 9.4)

Claim 9.5. Suppose that i is such that $W_i \subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$. Then, $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$.

Proof of Claim. The proof is by contrapositive. Suppose that i is such that $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$. Let s_{\min} be *least* such that $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s_{\min}+1}$. Then, by the construction of ψ ,

$$W_i^{s_{\min}} \cap (E_i^{s_{\min}} \times \bar{E}_i^{s_{\min}}) \neq \emptyset. \quad (78)$$

Furthermore, by Claim 9.3(\Rightarrow), there exist *distinct* k and ℓ such that (a) and (b) below.

- (a) For each $p \in E_i^{s_{\min}}$, $\psi_p = \alpha_k$.
- (b) For each $q \in \bar{E}_i^{s_{\min}}$, $\psi_q = \alpha_\ell$.

Since α is 1-1 and $k \neq \ell$, $\alpha_k \neq \alpha_\ell$. Thus, by (78) and (a) and (b) just above, $W_i \not\subseteq \text{Equiv}(\psi)$. □ (Claim 9.5)

Claim 9.6. ψ and R satisfy (a) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., for each translation function t into ψ , R strongly ties t into ψ .

Proof of Claim. It is straightforward to verify that each $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$ is of one of the following three types.

- TYPE I. Either E is of the form E_i^∞ or E is of the form \bar{E}_i^∞ where: i is such that $(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]$.
- TYPE II. Either E is of the form E_i^∞ or E is of the form \bar{E}_i^∞ where: i is such that $(\exists s)[i \in R\text{-flags}^s]$.
- TYPE III. $E = \{p\}$, for some p such that

$$p \notin \bigcup \{E_i^\infty \cup \bar{E}_i^\infty \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}. \quad (79)$$

Let t be any translation function into ψ , and let $E \in \text{Classes}(R)$ be given. If E is of type I, then it follows from Claim 9.2(\Leftarrow) that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. If E is of type II, then it follows from Claim 9.3(\Leftarrow) that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. If E is of type III, then it follows from Claim 9.4 that $\text{rng}(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset$. \square (**Claim 9.6**)

Claim 9.7. ψ satisfies (b) in the statement of the theorem, i.e., $\text{Equiv}(\psi)$ is *not* computably enumerable.

Proof of Claim. By way of contradiction, let i be such that

$$W_i = \text{Equiv}(\psi). \quad (80)$$

By (80) and Claim 9.5,

$$(\forall s)[i \notin R\text{-flags}^s]. \quad (81)$$

By (81) and Claim 9.2(a), each of E_i^∞ and \bar{E}_i^∞ is infinite, and, thus,

$$\text{each of } E_i^\infty \text{ and } \bar{E}_i^\infty \text{ is non-empty.} \quad (82)$$

By (81) and Claim 9.2(b)(\Rightarrow), for each $p \in (E_i^\infty \cup \bar{E}_i^\infty)$,

$$\psi_p = \lambda x . i. \quad (83)$$

By (80), (82), and (83),

$$W_i \cap (E_i^\infty \times \bar{E}_i^\infty) \neq \emptyset. \quad (84)$$

By (81) and (84), there exists a stage s of the form $\langle i + 1, 0, - \rangle$ in which all of the conditions of that stage are satisfied. But then $i \in R\text{-flags}^{s+1}$, contradicting (81). \square (**Claim 9.7**)

\square (**Theorem 9**)

References

- Ers68. Y. L. Ershov. On computable enumerations. *Algebra and Logic*, 7(5):330–346, 1968.
- FKW82. R. Freivalds, E. B. Kinber, and R. Wiehagen. Inductive inference and computable one-one numberings. *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, 28(27-32):463–479, 1982.
- Fri58. R. M. Friedberg. Three theorems on recursive enumeration. I. Decomposition. II. Maximal Set. III. Enumeration without duplication. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 23(3):309–316, 1958.
- GG01. S. Gao and P. Gerdes. Computably enumerable equivalence relations. *Studia Logica*, 67(1):27–59, 2001.
- GY93. S. Goncharov, A. Yakhnis, and V. Yakhnis. Some effectively infinite classes of enumerations. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 60(3):207–235, 1993.
- HK94. E. Herrmann and M. Kummer. Diagonals and D-maximal sets. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 59(1):60–72, 1994.
- JST11. S. Jain, F. Stephan, and J. Teutsch. Index sets and universal numberings. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 77(4):760–773, 2011.
- Khu69a. A. B. Khutoretskii. On the reducibility of computable numerations. *Algebra and Logic*, 8(2):145–151, 1969.
- Khu69b. A. B. Khutoretskii. Two existence theorems for computable numerations. *Algebra and Logic*, 8(4):277–282, 1969.
- Kum89. M. Kummer. A note on direct sums of Friedbergnumberings. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 54(3):1009–1010, 1989.
- Kum90. M. Kummer. An easy priority-free proof of a theorem of Friedberg. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 74(2):249–251, 1990.

- Lav77. I. A. Lavrov. Computable numberings. In *Logic, Foundations of Mathematics and Computability Theory*, pages 195–206, 1977.
- Mal65. A. I. Mal'cev. Positive and negative numerations. *Proceedings of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, 160(2):278–280, 1965.
- Mal71. A. I. Mal'cev. Positive and negative numberings. In *The Metamathematics of Algebraic Systems*, volume 66 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages 379–383. Elsevier, 1971. Translated by B. F. Wells III.
- Moe12. S. E. Moelius III. Characteristics of minimal effective programming systems. In *Proceedings of Computability in Europe 2012 (CiE 2012) - How the World Computes*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2012. To appear.
- MWY78. M. Machtey, K. Winklmann, and P. Young. Simple Gödel numberings, isomorphisms, and programming properties. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 7(1):39–60, 1978.
- PE64. M. B. Pour-El. Gödel numberings versus Friedberg numberings. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 15(2):252–256, 1964.
- Ric81. G. A. Riccardi. The independence of control structures in abstract programming systems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 22(2):107–143, 1981.
- Rog58. H. Rogers, Jr. Gödel numberings of partial recursive functions. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 23(3):331–341, 1958.
- Rog67. H. Rogers, Jr. *Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability*. McGraw Hill, 1967. Reprinted, MIT Press, 1987.
- Roy87. J. S. Royer. *A Connotational Theory of Program Structure*, volume 273 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 1987.
- Sch82. B. Schinzel. On decomposition of Gödelnumberings into Friedbergnumberings. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 47(2):267–274, 1982.
- Spr90. D. Spreen. Computable one-to-one enumerations of effective domains. *Information and Computation*, 84(1):26–46, 1990.