Pacific Journal of Mathematics

MANY-ONE DEGREES OF THE PREDICATES $H_a(x)$

YIANNIS (JOHN) NICOLAS MOSCHOVAKIS

Vol. 18, No. 2 April 1966

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 18, No. 2, 1966

MANY-ONE DEGREES OF THE PREDICATES $H_a(x)$

YIANNIS N. MOSCHOVAKIS

Spector proved in his Ph. D. Thesis that if $|a| = |b|$ $(a, b \in O)$, then $H_a(x)$ and $H_b(x)$ have the same degree of unsolvability; Davis had already shown that if $|a| = |b| < \omega^2$, then $H_a(x)$ and $H_b(x)$ are in fact recursively isomorphic, i.e.,

$$(1) \qquad H_a(x) \equiv H_b(f(x)) ,$$

where $f(x)$ is a recursive permutation.

In this note we prove that if $|a| = |b| = \xi$, then $H_a(x)$ and $H_b(x)$ need not have the same many-one degree, unless $\xi = 0$ or is of the form $\eta + 1$ or $\eta + \omega$; if $\xi \neq 0$ is not of the form $\eta + 1$ or $\eta + \omega$, then the partial ordering of the many-one degrees of the predicates $H_a(x)$ with $|a| = \xi$ contains well-ordered chains of length ω_1 as well as incomparable elements. The proof rests on a combinatorial result which relates the many-one degree of $H_{a'}(x)$ $(a' = 3.5^a \in O)$ to the rate with which the sequence of ordinals $|a_n|$ approaches $|a'|$.

Summary of results. We denote the relations of many-one and one-one reducibility by $\leqq_m$ and $\leqq_1$. By a result of Myhill [5], if $P(x) \leqq_1 Q(x)$ and $Q(x) \leqq_1 P(x)$, then $P(x)$ and $Q(x)$ are recursively isomorphic.

Let $a' = 3.5^a$ and $b' = 3.5^b$ be names in O of the same limit ordinal $|a| = |b'| = \xi$. We say that a' is *recursively majorized* by b' and write $a' \prec b'$, if there is a recursive function $f(n)$ such that for all n,

$$(2) \qquad |a_n| \leqq |b_{f(n)}| .$$

(Here $a_n \simeq \{a\}(n_O)$; in dealing with constructive ordinals and hyperarithmetic predicates we use without apologies and sometimes without reference the notations of Kleene's [2] and [3].) If $a' \prec b'$ and $b' \prec a'$, a' and b' are *equivalent*, $a' \sim b'$; if neither $a' \prec b'$, nor $b' \prec a'$, a' and b' are incomparable, $a' | b'$. Notations such as $a' \precsim\!\!\!\!/\; b'$ are self-explanatory.

THEOREM 1. *Let $a' = 3.5^a \in O$, $b' = 3.5^b \in O$, $|a'| = |b'| = \xi$. Then $H_{a'}(x) \leqq_m H_{b'}(x)$ if and only if $H_{a'}(x) \leqq_1 H_{b'}(x)$ if and only if $a' \prec b'$.*

THEOREM 2. *If ξ is of the form $\eta + 1$ or $\eta + \omega$ and $|a| = |b| = \xi$, then $H_a(x)$ and $H_b(x)$ are recursively isomorphic.*

For each constructive ordinal ξ, let $\mathscr{L}(\xi)$ be the partial ordering of the many-one degrees of the predicates $H_{a'}(x)$ with $|a'| = \xi$.

THEOREM 3. *If $\xi \neq 0$ is not of the form $\eta + 1$ or $\eta + \omega$, then $\mathscr{L}(\xi)$ contains well-ordered chains of length ω_1.*

THEOREM 4. *If $\xi \neq 0$ is not of the form $\eta + 1$ or $\eta + \omega$, then $\mathscr{L}(\xi)$ contains incomparable elements.*

2. Proof of Theorem 1.

LEMMA 1. (*Kleene's Lemma* 3 *in* [2]). *There is a partial recursive function $\sigma_1(a, b, x)$, such that*

$$\text{(3)} \qquad \textit{if} \quad a \leqq_O b\,, \quad \textit{then} \quad H_a(x) \equiv H_b(\sigma_1(a, b, x))\,.$$

Let $P'(x)$ denote the *jump* of the predicate $P(x)$,

$$\text{(4)} \qquad P'(x) \equiv (Ey) T_1^P(x, x, y)\,.$$

LEMMA 2. (a) *There is a primitive recursive $\sigma_2(e, x)$ such that if $Q(x)$ is recursive in $P(x)$ with Gödel number e, then*

$$\text{(5)} \qquad Q(x) \equiv P'(\sigma_2(e, x))\,.$$

(b) *There is a primitive recursive $\sigma_3(e)$ such that*

$$\text{(6)} \qquad \begin{aligned} &\textit{if} \quad t = \sigma_3(e) \quad \textit{and} \quad \{e\}(t) \quad \textit{is defined}\,, \\ &\qquad \textit{then} \quad P'(t) \not\equiv P(\{e\}(t))\,. \end{aligned}$$

(Both of these facts are implicit in Section 1.4 of [4] and the references given there to [1] and [6].)

LEMMA 3. *There is a partial recursive $\sigma_4(a, b, c, x)$ such that for a, b, c in O,*

$$\text{(7)} \quad \textit{if} \quad |a| \leqq |b| \quad \textit{and} \quad b <_O c\,, \quad \textit{then} \quad H_a(x) \equiv H_c(\sigma_4(a, b, c, x))\,.$$

Proof. By Spector's Uniqueness Theorem in [7], if $|a| \leqq |b|$, then $H_a(x)$ is recursive in $H_b(x)$ with Gödel number $\tau(a, b)$ (τ recursive). Since $b <_O c$ implies $2^b \leqq_O c$, Lemma 1 together with Lemma 2(a) imply that

$$H_a(x) \equiv H_{2^b}(\sigma_2(\tau(a, b), x)) \equiv H_c(\sigma_1(2^b, c, \sigma_2(\tau(a, b), x)))$$

and we can define σ_4 as the argument of H_c in this equivalence.

LEMMA 4. *There is a partial recursive $\sigma(a, b, e)$, such that if $a <_O b$, then $\sigma(a, b, e)$ is defined and*

(8) $$\textit{if} \quad t = \sigma(a, b, e) \quad \textit{and} \quad \{e\}(t) \quad \textit{is defined}, \quad \textit{then} \quad H_b(t) \not\equiv H_a(\{e\}(t)) .$$

Proof is by induction on $b \in O$ for fixed $a \in O$ and the recursion theorem, utilizing Lemma 2 (b).

Case 1. $b = 2^a$. Set $\sigma(a, b, e) = \sigma_3(e)$.

Case 2. $b = 2^c$ and $c \neq a$. In this case, if $a <_O b$ we must have $a <_O c$ and the Ind. Hyp. applies to a and c. Put

(9) $$y \simeq \sigma(a, c, \Lambda x\{e\}(\sigma_1(c, b, x))) ,$$

and

(10) $$\sigma(a, b, e) \simeq \sigma_1(c, b, y) .$$

(For a partial recursive $f(x_1, \cdots, x_n, y)$, $\Lambda y f(x_1, \cdots, x_n, y)$ is a primitive recursive function of $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ and a Gödel number of f such that

$$\{\Lambda y f(x_1, \cdots, x_n, y)\}(y) \simeq f(x_1, \cdots, x_n, y) ;$$

see [1], Section 65.)

Since $c <_O b$, $\sigma_1(c, b, x)$ is totally defined; since $a <_O c$, the induction hypothesis implies that y is defined, hence $\sigma(a, b, e)$ is defined. We now derive a contradiction from the assumption

(11) $$\text{for} \quad t = \sigma(a, b, e), \{e\}(t) \quad \text{is defined and} \quad H_b(t) \equiv H_a(\{e\}(t)) .$$

Since

$$H_c(y) \equiv H_b(\sigma_1(c, b, y)) \equiv H_b(t) ,$$

we have

$$H_c(y) \equiv H_a(\{e\}(t)) ;$$

but

$$\{e\}(t) \simeq \{e\}(\sigma_1(c, b, y)) \simeq \{\Lambda x\{e\}(\sigma_1(c, b, x))\}(y) ,$$

hence

$$H_c(y) \equiv H_a(\{\Lambda x\{e\}(\sigma_1(c, b, x))\}(y))$$

which by induction hypothesis is false if y is given by (9).

Case 3. $b = 3.5^z$. In this case $a <_O b$ implies $a \leqq_O z_{\iota(a,z)}$, where $\iota(a, z)$ is partial recursive ([2], Lemma 2). Now the definition and proof of Case 2 apply if we substitute $\iota(a, z)$ for c throughout.

The proof is completed by securing via the recursion theorem a partial recursive function $\sigma(a, b, e)$ such that

$$\sigma(a, b, e) \simeq \begin{cases} \sigma_3(e) \quad \text{if} \quad b = 2^a , \\ \sigma_1((b)_0, b, \sigma(a, (b)_0, \Lambda x\{e\}(\sigma_1((b)_0, b, x)))) \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad b = 2^{(b)_0}, (b)_0 \neq a , \\ \sigma_1(\iota(a, (b)_2), b, \sigma(a, \iota(a, (b)_2), \Lambda x\{e\}(\sigma_1(\iota(a, (b)_2), b, x)))) \\ \qquad\qquad \text{if} \quad b = 3.5^{(b)_2} , \\ 0 \quad \text{otherwise} . \end{cases}$$

LEMMA 5. *Let* $a' = 3.5^a$, $b' = 3.5^b \in O$, $|a'| = |b'|$. *If* $H_{a'}(x) \leqq_m H_{b'}(x)$, *then* $H_{a'}(x) \leqq_1 H_{b'}(x)$.

Proof. Suppose that $H_{a'}(x) \equiv H_{b'}(f(x))$, with $f(x)$ general recursive, possibly many-one. Put

$$g(x) = 2^u 3^v ,$$

where

$$u = 2^x 3^{(f(x))_0} , \quad v = \sigma_1(b_{(f(x))_0}, b_u, (f(x))_1)$$

and σ_1 is the partial recursive function of Lemma 1. It is clear that $g(x)$ is general recursive and one-one. To complete the proof we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{b'}(g(x)) &\equiv H_{b_u}(v) \equiv H_{b_u}(\sigma_1(b_{(f(x))_0}, b_u, (f(x))_1)) \\ &\equiv H_{b_{(f(x))_0}}((f(x))_1) \equiv H_{b'}(f(x)) \equiv H_{a'}(x) . \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1. First assume that $a' \prec b'$, i.e., for some general recursive $f(n)$ we have $|a_n| \leqq |b_{f(n)}|$, all n. Since, for each n, $b_{f(n)} <_O b_{f(n)+1}$, Lemma 3 yields

$$H_{a_n}(x) \equiv H_{b_{f(n)+1}}(\sigma_4(a_n, b_{f(n)}, b_{f(n)+1}, x)) .$$

Hence

$$H_{a'}(x) \equiv H_{b'}(2^{u(x)} \cdot 3^{v(x)}) ,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &= f((x_0)) + 1 , \\ v(x) &= \sigma_4(a_{(x)_0}, b_{f((x)_0)}, b_{f((x)_0)+1}, (x)_1) , \end{aligned}$$

which implies $H_{a'}(x) \leqq_m H_{b'}(x)$; by Lemma 5 this is equivalent to $H_{a'}(x) \leqq_1 H_{b'}(x)$.

To prove the converse assume that for all x

$$H_{a'}(x) \equiv H_{b'}(\{e\}(x)) , \tag{12}$$

with $\{e\}(x)$ general recursive. For fixed n we compute:

$$(13) \qquad H_{a_{n+2}}(x) \equiv H_{a'}(2^{n+2}\cdot 3^x) \equiv H_{b'}(\{e\}(2^{n+2}\cdot 3^x)) \equiv H_{b_{x_0}}(x_1)\ ,$$

where

$$(14) \qquad x_0 = (\{e\}(2^{n+2}\cdot 3^x))_0\ ,$$

$$(15) \qquad x_1 = (\{e\}(2^{n+2}\cdot 3^x))_1\ .$$

Now assume that for a fixed x

$$(16) \qquad |\, b_{x_0} | \leqq |\, a_n |\ ;$$

this implies that for each y

$$(17) \qquad H_{b_{x_0}}(y) \equiv H_{a_{n+1}}(\sigma_4(b_{x_0}, a_n, a_{n+1}, y))\ ,$$

which for $y = x_1$ yields

$$(18) \qquad H_{a_{n+2}}(x) \equiv H_{a_{n+1}}(\sigma_4(b_{x_0}, a_n, a_{n+1}, x_1))\ .$$

Equivalence (18) however is impossible if

$$(19) \qquad x = \sigma(a_{n+1}, a_{n+2}, \Lambda x \sigma_4(b_{x_0}, a_n, a_{n+1}, x_1))$$

by Lemma 4, hence for this x the negation of (16) must be true. Thus to prove $a' \prec b'$ it is enough to set

$$(20) \qquad f(n) = x_0\ ,$$

where x is given by (19) and x_0 by (14).

3. **Proof of Theorem 2.** It is implicit in [4], Section 1.4, that if $P(x)$ is recursive in $Q(x)$, then $P'(x) \leqq_1 Q'(x)$. Thus if $|\, a| = |\, b| = \eta + 1$, Spector's Uniqueness Theorem implies that $H_a(x)$ and $H_b(x)$ are one-one reducible to each other and hence recursively isomorphic. The case $|\, a'| = |\, b'| = \eta + \omega$ is settled by the following Lemma in view of Theorem 1.

LEMMA 6. *If* $|\, a'| = |\, b'| = \eta + \omega$, *then* $a' \prec b'$.

Proof. It is easy to define primitive recursive functions $L(x)$ and $N(x)$ so that for $x \in O$,

$$(21) \qquad x = L(x) +_O N(x)\ ,$$

where $L(x) = 1$ or $|\, L(x)|$ is a limit ordinal and $|\, N(x)| < \omega$ (with these requirements $L(x)$ and $N(x)$ are uniquely determined on members of O).

Let a^0 and b^0 be the uniquely determined elements of O such that

$$(22) \qquad a^0 <_O a'\ , \quad |\, a^0| = \eta\ ; \qquad b^0 <_O b'\ , \quad |\, b^0| = \eta\ .$$

Set

$$f(n) = \mu y[b^0 +_O N(a_n) \leqq_O b_y] \,. \tag{23}$$

That $f(n)$ is totally defined follows from the fact that if z is any ordinal notation for an integer (in particular if $z = N(a_n)$), then $b^0 +_O z <_O b'$ and hence there is a y so that $b' +_O z \leqq_O b_y$. That $f(n)$ is recursive follows from the fact that $\leqq_O$ is recursive on the $<_O$-predecesors of b' (see [3], Section 21.).

If $|a_n| \leqq \eta$, then $|a_n| \leqq |b_{f(n)}|$, since for each n, $|b_{f(n)}| \geqq \eta$. If $|a_n| > \eta$, then $L(a_n) = a^0$, hence $|a_n| = |a^0 +_O N(a_n)| = |a^0| + |N(a_n)| = |b^0| + |N(a_n)| = |b^0 +_O N(a_n)| \leqq |b_{f(n)}|$, which completes the proof.

4. Proof of Theorem 3 for special ordinals. Call an ordinal ξ *special* if $\xi > \omega$ and whenever $\eta, \eta' < \xi$, then $\eta + \eta' < \xi$.

LEMMA 7. *There is a primitive recursive* $\rho_1(a')$ *such that if* $a' \in O$ *and* $|a'|$ *is special, then* $\rho_1(a') \in O$, $|\rho_1(a')| = |a'|$ *and* $a' \precnsim \rho_1(a')$.

Proof. Define $f(n, t)$ by the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} f(n, 0) &\simeq a_n \\ f(n, t+1) &\simeq \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if} \quad \bar{T}_1(n, n, t+1) \\ a_{\{n\}(n)} & \text{otherwise}\,. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

It is clear that if $a' = 3.5^a \in O$, then $f(n, t)$ is general recursive and its range is a subset of O. Moreover:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |f(n, t)| = \begin{cases} |a_n| + \omega & \text{if} \quad \{n\}(n) \quad \text{is not defined}\,, \\ |a_n| + |a_{\{n\}(n)}| + \omega & \text{if} \quad \{n\}(n) \quad \text{is defined}\,. \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

Put

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_0 &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |f(0, t)|\,, \\ \xi_{n+1} &= \xi_n + \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |f(n+1, t)|\,. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Since ξ is special, for each n, $\xi_n < \xi$; since for each n, $|a_n| < \xi_n$, $\{\xi_n\}$ is a fundamental sequence converging to ξ.

By an elementary construction one can define a primitive recursive $\rho(a')$ such that if $a' = 3.5^a \in O$, then $\rho(a') = b' = 3.5^b \in O$ and for each n, $|b_n| = \xi_n$.

Since, for each n, $|a_n| < \Sigma_t |f(n, t)| < \xi_n$, it is trivial that $a' \prec b'$. To show that the converse is impossible assume that for all n $|b_n| = \xi_n \leqq |a_{\{m\}(n)}|$; this is absurd for $n = m$, since

$$\xi_m = \xi_{m-1} + \Sigma_t |f(m, t)| = \xi_{m-1} + |a_m| + |a_{\{m\}(m)}| + \omega > |a_{\{m\}(m)}| .$$

This lemma already shows that for each a' with $|a'| = \omega^2$ there is a b', $|b'| = \omega^2$ such that the many-one degree of $H_{b'}(x)$ is strictly greater than the many-one degree of $H_{a'}(x)$.

LEMMA 8. *Let $a' = 3.5^a \in O$, $|a'|$ be special. There is a primitive recursive $\rho_2(e)$ such that if for each t, $\{e\}(t) \in O$ and $|\{e\}(t)| = |a'|$, then $\rho_2(e) \in O$, $|\rho_2(e)| = |a'|$ and for each t, $\{e\}(t) \prec \rho_2(e)$.*

Proof. If e satisfies the hypothesis, then for each t, $\{e\}(t) = 3.5^{m(t)}$ and $|m(t)_0|, |m(t)_1|, \cdots$, is a fundamental sequence converging to $|a'|$. Put

$$\begin{aligned} f(0) &= m(0)_0 \\ f(t+1) &= f(t) +_O m(0)_{t+1} +_O m(1)_{t+1} +_O \cdots +_C m(t)_{t+1} \\ &\qquad +_O m(t+1)_0 +_O m(t+1)_1 +_O \cdots +_O m(t+1)_{t+1} , \end{aligned}$$

where the association is to the left; since by [3], XVII if $x \in O$ and $y >_O 1$, then $x <_O x +_O y$, we have for each t,

$$f(t) <_O f(t+1) .$$

Since $|a'|$ is special, for each t, $|f(t)| < |a'|$; since for each t $|m(0)_t| \leqq |f(t)|$, the sequence $|f(0)|, |f(1)|, \cdots$, is fundamental and converges to $|a'|$.

It is easy to construct a primitive recursive $\rho_2(e)$ such that if the hypotheses are fulfilled then $\rho_2(e) = 3.5^b$ and for each t, $b_t = f(t)$. Now $\rho_2(e) \in O$, $|\rho_2(e)| = |a'|$ and for each t, n

$$|m(t)_n| \leqq |m(t)_{n+t}| \leqq |f(n+t)| = |b_{n+t}| ,$$

which proves that $\{e\}(t) \prec 3.5^b$.

LEMMA 9. *Let $a' = 3.5^a \in O$, $|a'|$ be special. There is a primitive recursive $\rho(x)$ such that*

(i) $\rho(1) = a'$
(ii) *if $x \in O$, then $\rho(x) \in O$ and $|\rho(x)| = |a'|$,*
(iii) *if $x <_O y$, then $\rho(x) \precnsim \rho(y)$.*

Proof. Using the recursion theorem we obtain a $\rho(x)$ satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(1) &= a' , \\ \rho(2^x) &= \rho_1(\rho(x)) , \\ \rho(3.5^z) &= \rho_2(\Lambda t \rho(z_t)) . \end{aligned}$$

Proof that $\rho(x)$ is the required function is by induction on $x \in O$. To treat the case $x = 3.5^z$—here the induction hypothesis is that for each t, $\rho(z_t) \in O$, $|\rho(z_t)| = |a'|$ and $\rho(z_t) \not\succsim \rho(z_{t+1})$. Lemma 8 assures us that for each t $\rho(z_t) \prec \rho(3.5^z)$; if for some t $\rho(3.5^z) \prec \rho(z_t)$, the transitivity of $\prec$ would imply that $\rho(z_{t+1}) \prec \rho(z_t)$, violating the induction hypothesis.

Theorem 3 for special ordinals follows from Lemma 9 by letting A be a subset of O, linearly ordered under $<_O$ and containing a notation for each constructive ordinal and considering $\rho(A)$.

5. Proof of Theorem 4 for special ordinals. Let $\xi = |3.5^a|$ be a special ordinal. In the proof of Lemma 6 we constructed a notation $b' = 3.5^b$ of ξ determined by a fundamental sequence $\{\xi_n\}$ which was in turn defined from a double sequence $f(n, t)$ by equations (26). Here we will define two such double sequences, $f(n, t)$ and $g(n, t)$, such that the notations $b' = 3.5^b$ and $c' = 3.5^c$ for sequences $\{\xi_n\}$ and $\{\zeta_n\}$ determined as in equations (26) from $f(n, t)$ and $g(n, t)$ respectively will be incomparable.

We define the functions $f(n, t)$ and $g(n, t)$ in stages; at stage $2s$ we will define $f(n, t)$ for $n, t \leqq s$ and at stage $2s + 1$ we will define $g(n, t)$ for $n, t \leqq s$. At each stage s we will also define finite sets F_s and G_s of pairs $\langle m, k\rangle$ of integers which will determine partial functions —i.e., if $\langle m, k\rangle \in F_s$ and $\langle m, k'\rangle \in F_s$, then $k = k'$, and similarly for G_s. We give the definitions informally, but it is a routine matter to derive Herbrand-Gödel-Kleene equations for f and g from our instructions.

Basis 0. $s = 0$. Put $f(0, 0) = a_0$; $F_0 = \{\langle 0, 0\rangle\}$; $G_0 = \{\langle 0, 0\rangle\}$.

Basis 1. $s = 1$. Put $g(0, 0) = a_0$; $F_1 = F_0 \cup \{\langle 1, 1\rangle\}$; $G_1 = G_0 \cup \{\langle 1, 1\rangle\}$.

Even Induction Step $2s + 2$.

Case 1. For every pair $\langle m, k\rangle \in F_{2s+1}$ and for every $y \leqq 2s + 1$, $\bar{T}_1(m, k, y)$. In this case set:

$$(27) \qquad \begin{cases} f(n, s+1) = 2 & (n \leqq s)\,, \\ f(s+1, 0) = a_{s+1}\,, & \\ f(s+1, t) = 2 & (1 \leqq t \leqq s+1)\,. \end{cases}$$

Put $F_{2s+2} = F_{2s+1} \cup \{\langle 2s + 2, k'\rangle\}$ where k' is the smallest integer larger than all the second members of the pairs in F_{2s+1}; put $G_{2s+2} = G_{2s+1} \cup \{\langle 2s + 2, k'\rangle\}$ where k' is the smallest integer larger than all the second members of the pairs in G_{2s+1}.

Case 2. Otherwise. Let m be the smallest integer such that some k, $\langle m, k\rangle \in F_{2s+1}$ and for some $y \leqq 2s + 1$, $T_1(m, k, y)$; let k and y be the corresponding (unique) k and y.

Subcase 2a. $U(y) = z \leqq s$.

For any stage (in particular $2s+1$) and any $x \leqq s$ (in particular z) consider the array of values of $g(u, v)$ with $u \leqq x$ and $v \leqq s$. Put

$$(28)\quad J_g(x, s) = \begin{cases} g(0, 0) +_O g(0, 1) +_O \cdots +_O g(0, s) +_O \omega_O \\ +_O g(1, 0) +_O g(1, 1) +_O \cdots +_O g(1, s) +_O \omega_O \\ +_O \cdots \\ \qquad\qquad \cdots \\ +_O g(x, 0) +_O g(x, 1) +_O \cdots +_O g(x, s) +_O \omega_0 , \end{cases}$$

where ω_O is some fixed ordinal notation of ω and the association in the sum is to the left. It is clear that if all the values of $g(u, v)$ for $u \leqq x$, $v \leqq x$ are elements of O, then so is $J_g(x, s)$. Put

$$(29)\quad \begin{cases} f(n, s+1) = 2 & (n \leqq s, n \neq k) , \\ f(k, s+1) = J_g(z, s) , \\ f(s+1, 0) = a_{s+1} , \\ f(s+1, t) = 2 & (1 \leqq t \leqq s+1) . \end{cases}$$

Put $F_{2s+2} = F_{2s+1} - \{\langle m, k\rangle\} \cup \{\langle 2s+2, k'\rangle\}$, where k' is the smallest integer larger than all the second members of the pairs in F_{2s+1}.

To define G_{2s+2}, first remove from G_{2s+1} all pairs $\langle m', k'\rangle$ with $m' \geqq m$; then introduce one pair $\langle m', k'\rangle$ for each m', $m \leqq m' \leqq 2s+2$ in some systematic way, so that if $m' \neq m''$, then $k' \neq k''$, and all the second members of the new pairs are larger than all the second members of the pairs in G_{2s+1} and also larger than z.

Subcase 2b. $U(y) = z > s$. Give exactly the same definitions as in Subcase 2a, except for the second equation of (29) for which we substitute

$$(30)\quad f(k, s+1) = J_g(s, s) +_O a_{s+1} +_O \omega_O +_O a_{s+2} +_O \omega_O +_O \cdots +_O a_z +_O \omega_O .$$

(Remark: the last conditions on the definition of G_{2s+2}, that all new second members be larger than z, will be utilized for this subcase.)

Odd Induction Step $2s+3$. The definitions are symmetric to those in the Even Ind. Step, except for the following differences:

(i) In Subcase 2a we put $J_g(z, s+1)$ where complete symmetry would suggest $J_f(z, s)$.

(ii) In Subcase 2b we put $g(k, s+1) = J_f(s+1, s+1) +_O \omega_O +_O \cdots +_O a_z +_O \omega_O$.

(iii) In Case 2 we define F_{2s+3} by removing from and reintroducing in F_{2s+2} all pairs with first members $m' > m$ (rather than $m' \geqq m$).

It is easy to prove by induction on s that for all n, t $f(n, t)$, $g(n, t) \in O$ and $|f(n, t)| < \xi$, $|g(n, t)| < \xi$. Put

$$
(31)\qquad
\begin{aligned}
\xi_0 &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |f(0, t)| , & \zeta_0 &= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |g(0, t)| , \\
\xi_{n+1} &= \xi_n + \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |f(n+1, t)| , & \zeta_{n+1} &= \zeta_n + \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |g(n+1, t)| .
\end{aligned}
$$

By a routine construction numbers $b' = 3.5^b$ and $c' = 3.5^c$ can be defined such that $b' \in O$, $c' \in O$ and for all n,

$$
|b_n| = \xi_n , \qquad |c_n| = \zeta_n .
$$

We will prove that $|b'| = |c'| = \xi$ and that b' and c' are incomparable.

Say that m *F-joins* k at stage s if $\langle m, k\rangle \in F_s$ but $\langle m, k\rangle \notin F_{s-1}$; m *F-leaves* k at stage s if $\langle m, k\rangle \notin F_s$ but $\langle m, k\rangle \in F_{s-1}$. (Similarly with G in place of F throughout.)

Clearly at each stage s, some m F-joins some k. Using this we can show by an induction on s that if m F-joins k at stage s, then k is larger than all the second members of all the pairs in F_t, with $t < s$. This in turn implies that for a fixed k and in the course of the whole computation there is at most one stage s at which some m F-joins k, and consequently at most one stage s at which some m F-leaves k. Hence for each k there is a t_0 such that for $t \geqq t_0$, $f(k, t) = 2$, since only if $t = 0$ or some m F-leaves k at stage t is $f(k, t) \neq 2$, and we have

$$
\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |f(k, t)| = |f(k, t_0)| + \omega < \xi , \tag{32}
$$

since ξ is special. Now a simple induction on n shows that for each n, $\xi_n < \xi$, and since clearly $|a_n| < \xi_n$, we have proved that $\lim \xi_n = |b'| = \xi$.

(Exactly the same considerations for g prove that $|c'| = \xi$.)

We prove by induction the following proposition depending on m: m F-joins only finitely many k's, and G-joins only finitely many k's.

If $m = 0$ this is trivial since $\{0\}(x)$ is the totally undefined function.

If m F-joins k at stage s either $m = s$ or there is an $m' < m$ such that m' G-leaves some k' at stage s; by ind. hyp. each $m' < m$ G-joins some k' only for finitely many x's, hence each $m' < m$ G-leaves some k' only for finitely many s's, which completes the proof of half the induction step.

If m G-joins k at stage s, either $m = s$ or there is an $m' \leqq m$ such that m' F-leaves some k' at stage s; we now use the ind. hyp. and the first half of the ind. step which has been already proved to see that this can only happen finitely often.

For a fixed m, let k be the largest integer such that m F-joins k and assume that $\{m\}(k) \simeq z$ is defined. An easy induction on m shows that there must be some stage $2s + 2$ where Case 2 applies with this

m and k, and $z = U(y)$. We prove that $\xi_k > \zeta_z$.

Subcase 2a. Since $f(k, s + 1) = J_g(z, s)$, $\xi_k > |J_g(z, s)|$. We assert that if $u \leqq z$, $v > s$, then $g(u, v) = 2$. Because if $g(u, v) \neq 2$, then some m' G-leaves u at stage $2v + 1 > 2s + 2$; since at stage $2s + 2$ each $m'' \geqq m$ G-joins some $k'' > z$, we must have $m' < m$; but this implies that m F-joins some $k' > k$, contrary to hyp. that k is the largest integer that m F-joins.

Now the above implies that $\zeta_z = |J_g(z, s)| < \xi_k$.

Subcase 2b. Now we can prove that if $u \leqq s$ and $v > s$ or $s < u \leqq z$ and $v > 0$, then $g(u, v) = 2$, by exactly the same argument. Hence $\zeta_z = |f(k, s + 1)| < \xi_k$.

For a fixed m let k be the largest integer such that m G-joins k and assume that $\{m\}(k) \simeq z$ is defined. As before there must be some stage $2s + 3$ where case 2 applies for this m and this k. We give one of the cases of the proof that $\zeta_k > \xi_z$.

Subcase 2a. We assert that if $u \leqq z$, $v > s + 1$, then $f(u, v) = 2$. Because if $f(u, v) \neq z$, then some m' F-leaves u at stage $2v > 2s + 3$; since at stage $2s + 3$ each $m'' > m$ F-joins some $k'' > z$, we must have $m' \leqq m$; but this implies that m G-joins some $k' > k$, contrary to hyp. that k is the largest integer that m G-joins.

The above remarks complete the proof that b' and c' are incomparable. Because if $b' \prec c'$, then there is an m such that for each k, $|b_k| \leqq |c_{\{m\}(k)}|$, i.e., $\xi_k < \zeta_{\{m\}(k)}$, which we showed to be false if k is the largest integer that m F-joins, and similarly for $c' \prec b'$.

6. Reduction of the general to the special case. In this section we prove that if $\xi = \eta + \zeta\,(\zeta \neq 0)$, then $\mathscr{L}(\xi)$ and $\mathscr{L}(\zeta)$ are similar and that if ξ is $\neq 0$ and not of the form $\eta + 1$ or $\eta + \omega$, then there is a unique special ordinal ζ such that for some η, $\xi = \eta + \zeta$.

LEMMA 10. *There is a primitive recursive* $\delta(a, b)$ *such that if* $a \leqq_O b$, *then* $\delta(a, b) \in O$ *and*

$$|a| + |\delta(a, b)| = |b|\,. \tag{33}$$

Proof. We obtain via the recursion theorem a primitive recursive $\delta(a, b)$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(a, a) &= 1\,, \\ \delta(a, 2^b) &= 2^{\,(a,b)}\,, \\ \delta(a, 3.5^z) &= 3.5^y\,, \quad \text{where for each } t,\ y_t \simeq \delta(a, z_{\iota(a,z)+t})\,, \\ \delta(a, x) &= 0 \qquad \text{otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

(recall that $\iota(a, z)$ is partial recursive and such that if $a <_O 3.5^z$, then $a \leqq_O z_{\iota(a,z)}$).

We prove by induction on $b \in O$ the following statement: if $a \leqq_O b$, then $\delta(a, b) \in O$ and for each x, if $a \leqq_O x <_O b$, then $\delta(a, x) <_O \delta(a, b)$. The following cases arise: (1) $b = a$, (2) $b = 2^a$, (3) $b = 2^c$ and $a <_O c$ and (4) $b = 3.5^z$ and for some t, $a \leqq_O z_t$.

Case 3. By Ind. Hyp. $\delta(a, c) \in O$, hence $\delta(a, b) = 2^{\delta(a,c)} \in O$. If $x <_O b$, either $x = c$ or $x <_O c$; in the first case it is clear that $\delta(a, c) <_O \delta(a, b)$, while in the second case the Ind. Hyp. implies that $\delta(a, x) <_O \delta(a, c)$, hence $\delta(a, x) <_O \delta(a, b)$.

Case 4. Since $a <_O 3.5^z$, $\iota(a, z)$ is defined and for each t, $a <_O z_{\iota(a,z)+t}$. Thus the Ind. Hyp. implies that for each t, y_t is defined, $y_t \in O$ and $y_t <_O y_{t+2}$, hence $\delta(a, b) \in O$. If $x <_O 3.5^z$, then for some t, $x <_O z_{\iota(a,z)+t}$, hence by Ind. Hyp. $\delta(a, x) <_O \delta(a, z_{\iota(a,z)+t}) = y_t <_O \delta(a, b)$.

Equation (33) is proved easily by induction on $|b|$, using the continuity of ordinal addition, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} |a| + |\delta(a, 3.5^z)| &= |a| + \lim_t |\delta(a, z_{\iota(a,z)+t})| \\ &= \lim_t (|a| + |\delta(a, z_{\iota(a,z)+t})|) \\ &= \lim_t |z_{\iota(a,z)+t}| \\ &= |3.5^z| . \end{aligned}$$

This lemma allows us to represent a constructive limit ordinal as an infinite sum of smaller ordinals,

$$|3.5^z| = |z_0| + |\delta(z_0, z_1)| + |\delta(z_1, z_2)| + \cdots .$$

LEMMA 11. *Assume that $\xi = \eta + \zeta$, where ζ is a limit ordinal. Then $\mathscr{L}(\xi)$ and $\mathscr{L}(\zeta)$ are similar.*

Proof. Let u be a fixed notation in O for η. For each $a' = 3.5^a \in O$ we define by induction

$$\begin{aligned} g(0) &= u +_O a_0 \\ g(n+1) &= g(n) +_O \delta(a_n, a_{n+1}) . \end{aligned}$$

A routine construction yields a primitive recursive $\tau(a')$ such that if $a' = 3.5^a \in O$, then $\tau(a') = 3.5^x \in O$ and for each n, $x_n = g(n)$. Notice that by the definition of δ,

$$|x_n| = \eta + |a_n| . \tag{34}$$

It is clear that if $|a'| = \zeta$, then $|x'| = \lim_n |x_n| = \eta + \zeta = \xi$.

Assume that $|b'| = \zeta$ and $a' \prec b'$, i.e., there is a general recursive

$f(n)$ such that for each n, $|a_n| \leqq |b_{f(n)}|$. Now if $\tau(b') = 3.5^y$,

$$|x_n| = \eta + |a_n| \leqq \eta + |b_{f(n)}| = |y_{f(n)}| ,$$

hence $\tau(a') \prec \tau(b')$.

Assume that $\tau(a') \prec \tau(b')$, i.e., there is a general recursive $f(n)$ such that for each n, $|x_n| \leqq |y_{f(n)}|$. Then $\eta + |a_n| \leqq \eta + |b_{f(n)}|$, i.e., $|a_n| \leqq |b_{f(n)}|$ which proves that $a' \prec b'$.

We have shown that $\tau(a')$ induces a mapping from $\mathscr{L}(\zeta)$ into $\mathscr{L}(\xi)$ which is a similarity imbedding. To complete the proof we must show that this mapping is onto, i.e., that given y', $|y'| = \xi$, there is an a', $|a'| = \zeta$, such that if $\tau(a') = x'$, then $x' \sim y'$.

If $|y'| = \xi$, there is a unique $v <_O y'$ such that $|v| = \eta$, and some t such that $v <_O y_t$. Put

$$h(0) = \delta(v, y_t) ,$$
$$h(n+1) = h(n) +_O \delta(y_{t+n}, y_{t+n+1})$$

and choose $a' = 3.5^a$ so that for each n, $a_n = h(n)$. Surely $a' \in O$ and since for each n, $\eta + |a_n| = |y_{t+n}|$, we have $|a'| = \lim_n |a_n| = \zeta$. If $x' = \tau(a')$, then for each n we have

$$|x_n| = \eta + |a_n| = |y_{t+n}|$$

which implies $x' \sim y'$, which completes the proof.

LEMMA 12. *Let $\xi > 0$ be given and assume that ξ is not of the form $\eta + 1$ or $\eta + \omega$. Then there is a unique special ordinal ζ such that for some η, $\xi = \eta + \zeta$.*

Proof. Let ζ be the smallest nonzero ordinal for which there is an η such that $\xi = \eta + \zeta$. Our assumptions imply that $\zeta > \omega$. If ζ is not special, there exist $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 < \zeta$ such that $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 \geqq \zeta$. The continuity of ordinal addition implies that there exist $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 < \zeta$ such that $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 = \zeta$ (hence $\zeta_2 \neq 0$); but this is turn implies that $\xi = \eta + \zeta_1 + \zeta_2$ with $0 < \zeta_2 < \zeta$, which violates the defining condition of ζ.

To prove that ζ is unique assume that $\xi = \eta_1 + \zeta_1 = \eta_2 + \zeta_2$ and without loss of generality further assume $\eta_1 \leqq \eta_2$. Then there is a θ such that $\eta_1 + \theta = \eta_2$ which implies $\eta_1 + \zeta_1 = \eta_1 + \theta + \zeta_2$, i.e., $\zeta_1 = \theta + \zeta_2$. Now if ζ_1 is special we must have $\zeta_1 = \zeta_2$, which completes the proof.

7. Open problems. We do not have answers for the following questions:

1. Is $\mathscr{L}(\xi)$ for special ξ an upper semi-lattice, a lower semi-lattice or a lattice?

2. Does $\mathscr{L}(\xi)$ have a minimum for each special ξ? It is easy to show that $\mathscr{L}(\omega^2)$ has a minimum; we conjecture that $\mathscr{L}(\omega^3)$ does not.

3. If ξ and ζ are special and $\xi \neq \zeta$, is it possible that $\mathscr{L}(\xi)$ and $\mathscr{L}(\zeta)$ are similar? We conjecture that it is not.

References

1. S. C. Kleene, *Introduction to metamathematics*, Van Nostrand, New York and Toronto, North-Holland, Amsterdam, and Noordhoff, Groningen, 1952.
2. ———, *Arithmetical predicates and function quantifiers*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **79** (1955), 312-340.
3. ———, *On the forms of the predicates in the theory of constructive ordinals* (*second paper*), Amer. J. Math. **77** (1955), 405-428.
4. S. C. Kleene and E. L. Post, *The upper semi-lattice of degrees of recursive unsolvability*, Ann. of Math. (2) **59** (1954), 379-407.
5. John Myhill, *Creative sets*, Z. Math. Logik Grundlagen Math. **1** (1955), 97-108.
6. E. L. Post, *Recursively enumerable sets of positive integers and their decision problems*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **50** (1944), 284-316.
7. C. Spector, *Recursive well-orderings*, J. Symb. Logic **20** (1955), 151-163.

Received December 26, 1964.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be typewritten (double spaced). The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. It should not contain references to the bibliography. Manuscripts may be sent to any one of the four editors. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Richard Arens at the University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

50 reprints per author of each article are furnished free of charge; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published monthly. Effective with Volume 16 the price per volume (3 numbers) is \$8.00; single issues, \$3.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: \$4.00 per volume; single issues \$1.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley 8, California.

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), No. 6, 2-chome, Fujimi-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 18, No. 2 April, 1966