

Fixed Point Theorems in Computability Theory

Sebastiaan A. Terwijn

Radboud University Nijmegen
Department of Mathematics
P.O. Box 9010, 6500 GL Nijmegen
the Netherlands
terwijn@math.ru.nl

Abstract. We give a quick survey of the various fixed point theorems in computability theory, partial combinatory algebra, and the theory of numberings, as well as generalizations based on those. We also point out several open problems connected to these.

1 Introduction

Let φ_e denote the e -th partial computable (p.c.) function. Then Kleene's recursion theorem simply states that for every computable function f there exists a number $e \in \omega$ such that

$$\varphi_{f(e)} = \varphi_e.$$

We can think of e as a fixed point of f , not literally in the sense that $f(e) = e$, but at the level of codes of p.c. functions.

The proof of the recursion theorem is very short, and it has an air of mystery. In Kleene's original paper [18], which is about ordinal notations, it is somewhat hidden at the end of section 2, where it only occupies two cryptic lines, but even when written out it can be done in three or four lines (taking the S - m - n -theorem for granted). The fact that the proof is not very illuminating is perhaps due to the fact that it does not occur naturally in the context of p.c. functions. Kleene found the fixed point theorem in the lambda calculus, where it does occur in a natural way, and then translated it to computability theory to obtain the recursion theorem.¹ The following analogy between lambda calculus and computability theory may be helpful. To simplify matters we write $n \sim m$ for $\varphi_n = \varphi_m$, and we define (partial) application of numbers as $nm = \varphi_n(m)$. The left part of the following table follows Barendregt [6, 2.1.5].

¹ Explanations of the recursion theorem, elaborating on its short proof, are given in Owings [25] and Odifreddi [23].

λ-calculus	computability
λ -terms	$n \in \omega$
FG	$nm = \varphi_n(m)$
<u>fixed point theorem:</u>	<u>recursion theorem:</u>
$\forall F \exists X FX = X$	$\forall f \exists x fx \sim x$
<i>Proof:</i> $W = \lambda x.F(xx)$	<i>Proof:</i> $bx \sim f(xx)$
$WW = F(WW) \quad \square$	$bb \sim f(bb) \quad \square$

That there exists b such that $bx \sim f(xx)$ (i.e. $\varphi_{\varphi_b(x)} = \varphi_{f(\varphi_x(x))}$) follows from the S - m - n -theorem.

The recursion theorem is a fundamental result of computability theory that has found many applications, even extending beyond pure computability theory, e.g. in set theory. The first application was to develop a theory of constructive ordinals, for which the recursion theorem is indispensable. The theorem and its many applications were excellently reviewed by Kleene's student Yiannis Moschovakis in [22]. The present quick survey is by no means intended to replace that much larger one, but we have a slightly different focus, especially with the view from combinatory algebra, and we will also discuss more recent results. We will not be including any proofs (apart from the proof above of the recursion theorem itself, and some short arguments), but mainly pointers to the literature. We will also not discuss applications, which is the main focus of [22].

Our notation for basic notions in computability theory is mostly standard. As already mentioned, φ_e denotes the e -th partial computable (p.c.) function, in some standard numbering of the p.c. functions. P.c. functions are denoted by lower case Greek letters, and (total) computable functions by lower case Roman letters. ω denotes the natural numbers. W_e denotes the e -th computably enumerable (c.e.) set, which is defined as the domain of φ_e . We write $\varphi_e(n) \downarrow$ if this computation is defined, and $\varphi_e(n) \uparrow$ otherwise. \emptyset' denotes the halting set. For unexplained notions we refer to Odifreddi [23] or Soare [28]. Our presentation of partial combinatory algebra follows van Oosten [24].

2 The second recursion theorem

The simple version of the recursion theorem stated at the beginning of this paper is fully effective, which means that we can compute the fixed point e effectively from a code of f . One way to state this is as follows: Let $h(x, n)$ be a computable binary function. By the recursion theorem, for every choice of n there exists e such that $\varphi_e = \varphi_{h(e, n)}$, and by Skolemization we can see e as a function $f(n)$ of n . Now the effectiveness means that we can choose f to be *computable*, so that

$$\varphi_{f(n)} = \varphi_{h(f(n), n)}$$

for every n . This is called the recursion theorem with parameters, or the *second* recursion theorem.² Another way to phrase this is as follows:³

Theorem 2.1. (The second recursion theorem, Kleene [18]) *There exists a computable function f such that for every n , if $\varphi_n(f(n)) \downarrow$ then*

$$\varphi_{\varphi_n(f(n))} = \varphi_{f(n)}.$$

3 Partial combinatory algebra

Partial combinatory algebra was first introduced in the literature by Feferman [12] as an abstract axiomatic model of computation, though the concept had been known and discussed before. A *partial combinatory algebra* (pca) is a set \mathcal{A} with a partial application operator \cdot from $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ to \mathcal{A} . Instead of $a \cdot b$ we often simply write ab . We write $ab \downarrow$ if this is defined. By convention application associates to the left, so abc should be read as $(ab)c$. We call $f \in \mathcal{A}$ *total* if $fa \downarrow$ for every a . For terms (i.e. expressions built from elements of \mathcal{A} , variables, and application) t and s we write $t \simeq s$ if either both sides are undefined, or defined and equal. The defining property of a pca is that it should be *combinatory complete*, that is, for any term $t(x_1, \dots, x_n, x)$, $n \geq 0$, there exists a $b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for all $a_1, \dots, a_n, a \in \mathcal{A}$,

- (i) $ba_1 \cdots a_n \downarrow$,
- (ii) $ba_1 \cdots a_n a \simeq t(a_1, \dots, a_n, a)$.

Combinatory completeness is equivalent to the existence of the combinators s and k , familiar from combinatory algebra, cf. van Oosten [24].

Feferman proved the following version of the recursion theorem in pcas:

Theorem 3.1. (Feferman [12]) *Let \mathcal{A} be a pca.*

- (1) *There exists $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for all $g \in \mathcal{A}$, $g(fg) \simeq fg$.*
- (2) *There exists a total $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $g(fg)a \simeq fga$ for every g and $a \in \mathcal{A}$.*

The prime example of a pca is ω , with application $nm = \varphi_n(m)$ as already defined above. From this we immediately recognize Theorem 3.1 (2) as a generalization of Theorem 2.1. However, there is a rich variety of other examples of pcas, drawing from lambda calculus, constructive mathematics, realizability, and computability theory. Examples and references may be found for example in van Oosten [24], Cockett and Hofstra [10], Longley and Normann [20], and Golov and Terwijn [14].

² The term second recursion theorem is from Rogers, and advocated by Moschovakis. Confusingly, Kleene called this form the first recursion theorem, a term which is now mostly used to refer to the simple version without parameters (also following Rogers).

³ The two forms of the recursion theorem with parameters are equivalent because the numbering $n \mapsto \varphi_n$ of the p.c. functions is *precomplete*, cf. footnote 4.

4 The theory of numberings

A *numbering* of a set S is a surjection $\gamma: \omega \rightarrow S$. For every numbering we have an equivalence relation on ω defined by $n \sim_\gamma m$ if $\gamma(n) = \gamma(m)$. A numbering γ is *precomplete* if for every p.c. function ψ there exists a computable function f such that for every n

$$\psi(n)\downarrow \implies f(n) \sim_\gamma \psi(n). \quad (1)$$

Following Visser, we say that f *totalizes* ψ modulo \sim_γ .

Ershov [11] proved that the recursion theorem holds for every precomplete numbering: If γ is precomplete, then for every computable function f there exists $e \in \omega$ such that

$$f(e) \sim_\gamma e. \quad (2)$$

The recursion theorem is obtained from this by simply taking the numbering $n \mapsto \varphi_n$ of the p.c. functions. This numbering is easily seen to be precomplete by the S - m - n -theorem.

As for the recursion theorem, we have a version of Ershov's recursion theorem with parameters, which shows that the theorem is effective. The following formulation from Andrews, Badaev, and Sorbi [3] is completely analogous to Theorem 2.1 above.⁴

Theorem 4.1. (Ershov's recursion theorem [11]) *Let γ be a precomplete numbering. There exists a computable function f such that for every n , if $\varphi_n(f(n))\downarrow$ then*

$$\varphi_n(f(n)) \sim_\gamma f(n).$$

In order to combine the theorems of Feferman and Ershov, we consider *generalized numberings* $\gamma: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow S$, having as a base a pca \mathcal{A} instead of ω . We call such numberings *precomplete*⁵ if every $b \in \mathcal{A}$ can be totalized modulo \sim_γ , similarly to the definition of precompleteness (1) for ordinary numberings, namely if for every $b \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a total element $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$ba\downarrow \implies fa \sim_\gamma ba.$$

⁴ An alternative way to state Ershov's recursion theorem is: For every computable function $h(x, n)$ there is a computable function f such that for all n ,

$$f(n) \sim_\gamma h(f(n), n).$$

The two forms are equivalent for *precomplete numberings*, see the discussion in Barendregt and Terwijn [7, Section 3]. Question 3.4 there asks if for arbitrary numberings γ the equivalence implies that γ is precomplete. This question is still open. A partial answer was obtained in [13], where it was shown that the answer for the relativized version of this question is negative.

⁵ In [7] precompleteness was defined using terms instead of elements $b \in \mathcal{A}$, but the two definitions are equivalent by [7, Lemma 6.4].

Theorem 4.2. (Barendregt and Terwijn [7]) *Suppose \mathcal{A} is a pca, and that $\gamma: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow S$ is a precomplete generalized numbering. Then there exists a total $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for all $g \in \mathcal{A}$, if $g(fg) \downarrow$ then*

$$g(fg) \sim_\gamma fg.$$

5 Overview

In this section we list the various forms of the recursion theorem discussed so far. To ease the comparison, we write them as succinctly as possible.

First consider the natural numbers ω as a pca, with application $nm = \varphi_n(m)$.

Kleene 1 $\forall n \exists m \forall a (nma \simeq ma)$.

Kleene 2 $\exists f \text{ total } \forall n \forall a (n(fn)a \simeq fna)$.

Let $\gamma: \omega \rightarrow S$ be a precomplete numbering.

Ershov $\exists f \text{ total } \forall n (n(fn) \downarrow \implies n(fn) \sim_\gamma fn)$.

Let \mathcal{A} be a pca.

Feferman 1 $\exists f \forall g (g(fg) \simeq fg)$.

Feferman 2 $\exists f \text{ total } \forall g \forall a (g(fg)a \simeq fga)$.

Let $\gamma: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow S$ be a precomplete generalized numbering.

BT $\exists f \text{ total } \forall g (g(fg) \downarrow \implies g(fg) \sim_\gamma fg)$.

We have the following relations between these.

Kleene 2 \implies **Kleene 1**: This is obvious, since fn provides the fixed point.

Ershov \implies **Kleene 2**: The numbering $\gamma: n \mapsto \varphi_n$ is precomplete by the S - m - n -theorem, and $n(fn) \sim_\gamma fn$ iff $\forall a (n(fn)a \simeq fna)$.

Feferman 2 \implies **Kleene 2**: Immediate from the fact that ω is a pca.

BT \implies **Ershov**: This is trivial.

BT \implies **Feferman 2**: Let $a \sim_e b$ if $\forall x \in \mathcal{A} (ax \simeq bx)$. Then the natural map $\gamma: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\sim_e$ is a precomplete generalized numbering by [8, Proposition 4.2]. Applying BT to this numbering gives Feferman 2.

Feferman 1 by itself is very weak, and does not directly imply anything.

The implications above are summarized in Figure 1.




Fig. 1. The relation between various forms of the recursion theorem

6 Fixed point free functions and Arslanov's completeness criterion

Recall that W_n is the n -th c.e. set. A function f is called *fixed point free*, or simply FPF, if $W_{f(n)} \neq W_n$ for every n . Note that by the recursion theorem no FPF function is computable. We will also consider *partial* functions without fixed points. Extending the above definition, we call a partial function δ FPF if for every n ,

$$\delta(n) \downarrow \implies W_{\delta(n)} \neq W_n. \quad (3)$$

Below, by FPF function we will always mean a total function, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

The standard tool in computability theory to measure the complexity of sets is the notion of a Turing reduction. Informally, $B \leq_T A$ means that A can compute B . Here we are interested in the complexity of computing FPF functions. The following fact is well-known:

Proposition 6.1. (Jockusch et al. [15]) *The following are equivalent for any set A :*

- (i) A computes a FPF function,
- (ii) A computes a function h such that $\varphi_{h(e)} \neq \varphi_e$ for every e .

Proof. (i) \implies (ii) is trivial. We give a direct proof of (ii) \implies (i), avoiding the detour via DNC functions as in Soare [28, p90].

Let ψ be p.c. such that $W_e \neq \emptyset \implies \psi(e) \in W_e$. Let p totalize ψ , i.e. p is computable such that $\varphi_{p(e)} = \varphi_{\psi(e)}$ for every e with $\psi(e) \downarrow$. (As mentioned before, every p.c. function can be totalized in this way.) Now suppose that h is as in (ii), and let f be A -computable such that $W_{f(e)} = \{h(p(e))\}$.

Suppose that $W_{f(e)} = W_e$. Then $\psi(e) \downarrow = h(p(e))$, hence

$$\varphi_{h(p(e))} = \varphi_{\psi(e)} = \varphi_{p(e)},$$

contradicting (ii). Hence f is a FPF function. \square

Arslanov (building on earlier work of Martin and Lachlan) extended the recursion theorem from computable functions to functions computable from an incomplete c.e. Turing degree. The Arslanov completeness criterion states that a c.e. set is Turing complete if and only if it computes a fixed point free function.

Theorem 6.2. (Arslanov completeness criterion [4]) *Suppose A is c.e. and A is Turing incomplete, i.e. $A <_T \emptyset'$. If f is an A -computable function, then f has a fixed point, i.e. an $e \in \omega$ such that $W_{f(e)} = W_e$.*

Note that Theorem 6.2 implies the recursion theorem by Proposition 6.1. Without the requirement that A is c.e. the theorem fails, as FPF functions can have low Turing degree (i.e. $A' \leq_T \emptyset'$) by the low basis theorem of Jockusch and Soare [16].

The Arslanov completeness criterion has been extended in various ways, by considering relaxations of the type of fixed point. For example, instead of requiring that $W_{f(e)} = W_e$, we can merely require $W_{f(e)}$ to be a finite variant of W_e (Arslanov), or for them to be Turing equivalent (Arslanov), or for the n -th jumps of these sets to be Turing equivalent (Jockusch). In this way the completeness criterion can be extended to all levels of the arithmetical hierarchy. For a discussion of these results we refer the reader to Soare [28, p270 ff] and Jockusch, Lerman, Soare, and Solovay [15]. The latter paper also contains an extension of Theorem 6.2 from c.e. degrees to d.c.e. degrees.

7 Further generalizations

In this section we discuss several other generalizations of the recursion theorem.

Visser proved an extension called the ADN theorem (for “anti diagonal normalization theorem”), motivated by Rosser’s extension of Gödel’s incompleteness theorem.

Theorem 7.1. (ADN theorem, Visser [32]) *Suppose that δ is a partial computable fixed point free function. Then for every partial computable function ψ there exists a computable function f such that for every n ,*

$$\psi(n) \downarrow \implies W_{f(n)} = W_{\psi(n)} \tag{4}$$

$$\psi(n) \uparrow \implies \delta(f(n)) \uparrow \tag{5}$$

Note that (4) expresses that f totalizes ψ modulo the numbering $n \mapsto W_n$ of the c.e. sets. Also note that the ADN theorem implies the recursion theorem: The function δ cannot be total, for otherwise $f(n)$ could not exist when $\psi(n) \uparrow$. It follows that there can be no computable FPF function. By Proposition 6.1 this is equivalent to the statement of the recursion theorem.

For discussion about the motivation and applications of the ADN theorem we refer the reader to Visser [32] and Barendregt and Terwijn [7]. For example, it has interesting applications in the theory of ceers (c.e. equivalence relations), see Bernardi and Sorbi [9]. For recent results about diagonal functions for ceers see Badaev and Sorbi [1].

The following result simultaneously generalizes Arslanov's completeness criterion (Theorem 6.2) and the ADN theorem.

Theorem 7.2. (Joint generalization, Terwijn [29]) *Suppose A is a c.e. set such that $A <_T \emptyset'$, and suppose that δ is a partial A -computable fixed point free function. Then for every partial computable function ψ there exists a computable function f totalizing ψ avoiding δ , i.e. such that for every n ,*

$$\psi(n) \downarrow \implies W_{f(n)} = W_{\psi(n)} \quad (6)$$

$$\psi(n) \uparrow \implies \delta(f(n)) \uparrow \quad (7)$$

Note that the statement of Theorem 7.2 is identical to that of the ADN theorem, except that δ is now partial A -computable for A c.e. and incomplete, instead of just p.c. So Theorem 7.2 generalizes the ADN theorem in the same way that Arslanov's completeness criterion generalizes the recursion theorem. Theorem 7.2 implies Arslanov's completeness criterion, since in general f as in the theorem cannot satisfy (7) if δ is total. In particular, any total A -computable δ cannot be FPF, hence must have a fixed point.




Fig. 2. Generalizations of the recursion theorem

Visser actually proved the ADN theorem for arbitrary precomplete numberings, so that the ADN theorem also generalizes Ershov's recursion theorem.⁶ Arslanov's completeness criterion also holds for precomplete numberings, as was proved by Selivanov [26]. So the obvious question at this point is whether this is also true for the joint generalization Theorem 7.2. This is currently open ([7, Question 5.2]). Since it is true for the two theorems that the joint generalization generalizes, the evidence seems to point in the positive direction. However, the proof of the joint generalization uses specific properties of c.e. sets that we do not have in general, so that the answer may still be negative.

⁶ Not exactly the version with parameters Theorem 4.1, but the simpler statement (2) without parameters stated before it. That the ADN theorem with parameters fails was shown in Terwijn [30].

8 Effectiveness and other remarks

We discuss the extent to which the various fixed point theorems discussed above are effective. As mentioned in section 2, the recursion theorem is effective, which is the content of Theorem 2.1. On the other hand, the proof of Arslanov's Theorem 6.2 does not effectively produce a fixed point, but rather an infinite c.e. set of numbers, at least one of which is a fixed point. That this is necessarily the case was discussed in Terwijn [30], where it was shown that Theorem 6.2 indeed is not effective, so that there is no version with parameters analogous to Theorem 2.1. This raises the question of exactly how noneffective Theorem 6.2 is. The matter of the complexity of the corresponding Skolem functions was discussed in Golov and Terwijn [13], and independently in Arslanov [5].

We already mentioned that the ADN theorem (Theorem 7.1) is not effective, although there is uniformity in some of its parameters. This was shown in [30]. Since neither the Arslanov completeness criterion nor the ADN theorem are effective, a fortiori the same holds for the joint generalization Theorem 7.2.

It is not known whether the Arslanov completeness criterion (appropriately formulated) holds for pcas in general. See Terwijn [31, Question 10.1] for a precise statement of this.

The role that the recursion theorem plays in the theory of pcas is interesting. For example it plays an important part in results about *embeddings* between pcas, see Shafer and Terwijn [27] and Golov and Terwijn [14]. (Note that [27] also contains results about another kind of fixed points, namely closure ordinals, but these are of a different kind than the ones that we have been discussing here.)

We should also mention here the various forms of the recursion theorem in descriptive set theory, cf. Kechris [17, p289] and Moschovakis [21, p383]. These are formulated for the various pointclasses Γ occurring in descriptive set theory (effective or not) for which the Γ -computable functions on Polish spaces can be suitably parameterized, e.g. by reals in ω^ω . For these an analog of the S - m - n -theorem is available ([21, 7A.1]), which makes the proof of the recursion theorem work. Note that the idea of encoding continuous functions by reals is the same as the basic idea underlying Kleene's pca \mathcal{K}_2 (cf. [24]).

Finally we mention categorical approaches to the subject of diagonalization and fixed point theorems, starting with Lawvere [19]. Examples of Lawvere's basic scheme are discussed in Yanofsky [33] and Bauer [2], among others. Note, however, that these do not capture the more complex results such as Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 7.2, as these do not follow Lawvere's scheme.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dan Frumin and Anton Golov for discussions about the categorical view on the subject of fixed points.

References

1. S. A. Badaev and A. Sorbi, *Weakly precomplete computably enumerable equivalence relations*, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 62(1–2) (2016) 111–127.
2. A. Bauer, *On fixed-point theorems in synthetic computability*, *Tbilisi Mathematical Journal* 10(3) (2017) 167–181.
3. U. Andrews, S. Badaev, and A. Sorbi, *A survey on universal computably enumerable equivalence relations*, in: A. Day et al. (eds), R. Downey Festschrift, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 10010, Springer, 2017, 418–451.
4. M. M. Arslanov, *On some generalizations of the fixed point theorem*, *Soviet Mathematics (Izvestiya VUZ. Matematika)* 25(5) (1981) 1–10 (English translation)
5. M. M. Arslanov, *Fixed-point selection functions*, *Lobachevskii Journal of Mathematics* 42 (2021) 685–692.
6. H. P. Barendregt, *The lambda calculus*, *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics Vol. 103*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984 (2nd edition).
7. H. P. Barendregt and S. A. Terwijn, *Fixed point theorems for precomplete numberings*, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 170 (2019) 1151–1161.
8. H. P. Barendregt and S. A. Terwijn, *Partial combinatory algebra and generalized numberings*, *Theoretical Computer Science* 925 (2022) 37–44.
9. C. Bernardi and A. Sorbi, *Classifying positive equivalence relations*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 48(3) (1983) 529–538.
10. J.R.B. Cockett and P.J.W. Hofstra, *Introduction to Turing categories*, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 156 (2008) 183–209
11. Y. L. Ershov, *Theorie der Numerierungen II*, *Zeitschrift für mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 21 (1975) 473–584.
12. S. Feferman, *A language and axioms for explicit mathematics*, in: J. N. Crossley (ed.), *Algebra and Logic*, Springer, 1975, 87–139.
13. A. Golov and S. A. Terwijn, *Fixpoints and relative precompleteness*, *Computability* 11(2) (2022) 135–146.
14. A. Golov and S. A. Terwijn, *Embeddings between partial combinatory algebras*, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 64(1) (2023) 129–158.
15. C. G. Jockusch, jr., M Lerman, R. I. Soare, and R. M. Solovay, *Recursively enumerable sets modulo iterated jumps and extensions of Arslanov’s completeness criterion*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 54(4) (1989) 1288–1323.
16. C. G. Jockusch jr. and R. I. Soare, Π_1^0 *classes and degrees of theories*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 173 (1972) 33–56.
17. A. S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Springer-Verlag, 1995.
18. S. C. Kleene, *On notation for ordinal numbers*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 3 (1938) 150–155.
19. F. W. Lawvere, *Diagonal arguments and cartesian closed categories*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 92, 134–145, 1969. Republished in: *Reprints in Theory and Applications of Categories*, No. 15 (2006) 1–13.
20. J. Longley and D. Normann, *Higher-order computability*, Springer, 2015.
21. Y. N. Moschovakis, *Descriptive set theory*, North-Holland, 1980.
22. Y. N. Moschovakis, *Kleene’s amazing second recursion theorem*, *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 16(2) (2010) 189–239.
23. P. G. Odifreddi, *Classical recursion theory*, Vol. 1, *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics Vol. 125*, North-Holland, 1989.
24. J. van Oosten, *Realizability: An introduction to its categorical side*, *Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics Vol. 152*, Elsevier, 2008.

25. J. C. Owings, *Diagonalization and the recursion theorem*, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic 14 (1973) 95–99.
26. V. Selivanov, *Index sets of quotient objects of the Post numeration*, Algebra i Logika 27(3) (1988) 343–358. (English translation 1989.)
27. P. Shafer and S. A. Terwijn, *Ordinal analysis of partial combinatory algebras*, Journal of Symbolic Logic 86(3) (2021) 1154–1188.
28. R. I. Soare, *Recursively enumerable sets and degrees*, Springer-Verlag, 1987.
29. S. A. Terwijn, *Generalizations of the recursion theorem*, Journal of Symbolic Logic 83(4) (2018) 1683–1690.
30. S. A. Terwijn, *The noneffectivity of Arslanov’s completeness criterion and related theorems*, Archive for Mathematical Logic 59(5) (2020) 703–713.
31. S. A. Terwijn, *Computability in partial combinatory algebras*, Bulletin of Symbolic Logic 26(3-4) (2020) 224–240.
32. A. Visser, *Numerations, λ -calculus, and arithmetic*, in: J. P. Seldin and J. R. Hindley (eds.), *To H. B. Curry: Essays on Combinatory Logic, Lambda Calculus and Formalism*, Academic Press, 1980, 259–284.
33. N. S. Yanofsky, *A universal approach to self-referential paradoxes, incompleteness and fixed points*, Bulletin of Symbolic Logic 9(3) (2003) 362–386.