

Distribution by language:

Volume	English	French	German	Italian	Russian	Total
1-32	129	609	169	8	—	915
33-100	1488	158	45	—	44	1735
1-100	1617	767	214	8	44	2650

These statistics give some indication of the number of papers and authors, their classification and the changes that have taken place. There is, however, a certain arbitrariness in the calculation of the figures. Classification is, in itself, partly subjective. Equally, too, the assignation of an author's nationality is doubtful, especially as his status is liable to change due to emigration. Real difficulties were caused by papers written jointly by authors coming from different countries. Consequently the statistical data above should be treated with reservations.

As we mentioned before, Professor Mazurkiewicz (d. 1945) and Professor Sierpiński (d. 1969) were the editors of "Fundamenta Mathematicae" from the moment of the appearance of its first volume. Since 1952 the publishing of the journal is in the hands of the authors of the present note — Kazimierz Kuratowski, Editor in Chief, and Karol Borsuk, Deputy Editor.

## Parametric inductive definitions and recursive operators over the continuum \*

by

Douglas Cenzer (Gainesville, Fla.)

**Abstract.** In this paper we consider the possible closure ordinals  $|\Gamma|$  and sets  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma)$  of non-monotone recursive inductive operators  $\Gamma$  which define subsets of the continuum  $N^N$ . For an upper bound, we show that any  $\mathcal{A}_1^1$  operator has  $\mathcal{A}_1^1$  closure; it is well-known that  $|\Gamma| \leq \aleph_1$  even for  $\Sigma_1^1$  operators. On the other hand, we construct a recursive operator  $\Gamma$  with  $|\Gamma| = \aleph_1$  and show that any  $\Pi_1^1$  or  $\Sigma_1^1$  set is reducible to the closure of some recursive operator. Using the notion of a *parametric* operator (essentially a class of operators, one for each real parameter, over the natural numbers  $N$ ), we extend this last result in several ways.

**Introduction.** A great deal of research has been done in recent years on the general subject of inductive definability. The volume *Generalized Recursion Theory* cited in [3] is an excellent source for background in this area.

Briefly, an inductive operator  $\Gamma$  over a set  $X$  is a map from  $P(X)$  to  $P(X)$  such that for all  $A$ ,  $A \subseteq \Gamma(A)$ .  $\Gamma$  determines a transfinite sequence  $\{\Gamma^\sigma: \sigma \text{ an ordinal}\}$ , where for all  $\sigma$ ,  $\Gamma^\sigma = \bigcup \{\Gamma(\Gamma^\tau): \tau < \sigma\}$ . The closure ordinal  $|\Gamma|$  of  $\Gamma$  is the least ordinal  $\sigma$  such that  $\Gamma^{\sigma+1} = \Gamma^\sigma$ ; clearly  $|\Gamma|$  always has cardinality less than or equal to  $\text{Card}(X)$ . The closure  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma)$  is  $\Gamma^{|\Gamma|}$ , the set inductively defined by  $\Gamma$ .

For a class  $C$  of operators, the closure ordinal  $|C|$  is the supremum of the  $|\Gamma|$  for  $\Gamma$  in  $C$  and the inductive closure  $\text{Cl}(C)$  is the class of subsets  $A$  of  $X$  which are reducible to  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma)$  for some  $\Gamma$  in  $C$ . (The precise notion of reducibility depending on  $X$ .)

The general problem in the field of inductive definitions is to characterize, for a given class  $C$  of operators, the ordinal  $|C|$  and the class  $\text{Cl}(C)$ .

A common restriction placed on an inductive operator  $\Gamma$  is that it be *monotone*, that is, for any  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $A \subseteq B$  implies  $\Gamma(A) \subseteq \Gamma(B)$ . This is a strong condition and makes monotone inductive operators easier to deal with than their non-monotone counterparts. Monotone inductive definitions over the continuum were studied in some detail in [2]. (We follow the usual convention of identifying the continuum with the Baire space  ${}^\omega\omega$ .)

For operators over the natural numbers, monotone and non-monotone  $\Pi_1^0$  inductive definitions led to the same closure ordinal ( $\omega_1$ , the first non-recursive ordinal)

\* Some of the results of this paper were announced in [1].

and the same inductive closure ( $\Pi_1^1$ ). It was therefore quite surprising when Richter [4] demonstrated the great differences that arose at the  $\Pi_2^0$  level. Richter's results actually generalize at the  $\Pi_1^1$  level for operators over the continuum.

But in fact, interesting things start happening right at the recursive level. It was shown in [2] that the class of positive  $\Sigma_1^0$  operators has closure ordinal  $\omega$  and inductive closure  $\Sigma_1^0$  itself. As the following principal theorem indicates, the class of non-monotone recursive operators over the continuum is much richer.

**THEOREM.** (a)  $|A_1^0| = \aleph_1$ ; (b)  $\Pi_1^1 \cup \Sigma_1^1 \subseteq \text{Cl}(A_1^0) \subseteq A_2^1$ .

One direction of (a) is a corollary to a simple cardinality argument showing  $|\Sigma_1^1| \leq \aleph_1$ . The other direction of part (a) and the first half of (b) will be proven in § 1. The latter result will be strengthened in § 2 with the introduction of the concept of parametric inductive definitions. Finally, § 3 will conclude the proof of the Theorem; we show in fact that  $\text{Cl}(A_1^0) \subseteq A_2^1$ .

**1. The operator  $\Theta$ .** In this section we define an operator  $\Theta$  over the continuum with the following properties:

- (1)  $\Theta^\omega = \{\alpha : (\exists p)\alpha(p) = 0\}$ .  
(2) There is a recursive relation  $P$  such that  $P(\Theta^\omega)$  but for all  $n < \omega$ ,  $\neg R(\Theta^n)$ .

The existence of such an operator  $\Theta$  leads to the following general result which says that the class of recursive operators effectively includes all arithmetic operators.

**PROPOSITION 1.1.** (a)  $|A_1^0| \geq |A_\omega^0|$ ; (b)  $\text{Cl}(A_1^0) \supseteq \text{Cl}(A_\omega^0)$ .

Combining this with the result from [2] that  $|\Pi_1^0\text{-monotone}| = \aleph_1$  and  $\text{Cl}(\Pi_1^0\text{-monotone}) = \Pi_1^1$ , we have the main conclusion of this section.

**PROPOSITION 1.2.** (a)  $|A_1^0| = \aleph_1$ ; (b)  $\text{Cl}(A_1^0) \supseteq \Pi_1^1$ .

The definition of the operator  $\Theta$  is quite simple.

**DEFINITION 1.3.**  $\alpha \in \Theta(A) \leftrightarrow \alpha(0) = 0 \vee (\lambda p)\alpha(p+1) \in A$ .

The following lemma is easily verified.

**LEMMA 1.4.** For all  $n \leq \omega$ ,  $\Theta^n = \{\alpha : (\exists p < n)\alpha(p) = 0\}$ . ■

Before defining the desired relation  $P$  of (2) we need to consider the sequence of reals  $\{\gamma_n : n \leq \omega\}$ , given by

$$\gamma_n(p) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } p \geq n; \\ 1, & \text{if } p < n. \end{cases}$$

These make up a canonical set of reals for differentiating the levels  $\Theta^n$  in the following sense:

- (3) For all  $m, n \leq \omega$ ,  $\gamma_m \in \Theta^n$  iff  $m < n$ .

Now let  $F: \omega \times P(\omega) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be given by  $F(m, A) = \chi_A(\gamma_{m+1})$  and let  $f_n(m) = F(m, \Theta^n)$  for  $n > 0$ . Then  $f_n(m) = 1$  iff  $\gamma_{m+1} \in \Theta^n$  iff  $m+1 < n$  iff  $m < n-1$

(for  $n < \omega$ ). Thus for  $0 < n < \omega$ ,  $f_n = \gamma_{n-1}$  and therefore  $f_n \in \Theta^n$ , whereas  $f_\omega = \gamma_\omega$  and therefore  $f_\omega \notin \Theta^\omega$ .

But this provides the desired relation  $P$ . Just let  $P(A) \leftrightarrow \gamma_\omega \in A \wedge (\lambda m)F(m, A) \notin A$ . It is immediate from the above discussion that  $P(\Theta^\omega)$  but for all  $n < \omega$ ,  $\neg P(\Theta^n)$ . (Note: it is instructive in considering the above argument to look at the "membership table" for the  $\{\gamma_m\}$  and  $\{\Theta^n\}$ . This will consist of  $\omega+1$  rows and columns with 0's (for  $\notin$ ) on the main diagonal and below and 1's above. The relation  $\neg P(\Theta^n)$  can be seen along the super-diagonal.)

Having now established (1) and (2), we give the following as an example of their use.

**PROPOSITION 1.5.**  $|A_1^0| > \omega$ .

**Proof.** Just let  $\Gamma$  be defined by the following:

$$\alpha \in \Gamma(A) \leftrightarrow \alpha \in \Theta(A) \vee P(A).$$

It is clear that  $|\Gamma| = \omega+1$  and  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma) = {}^\omega\omega$ . ■

We now present the proof of Proposition 1.1 that any arithmetic operator can be duplicated by a  $A_1^0$  operator.

**Proof of Proposition 1.1.** For simplicity's sake we consider only  $\Pi_1^0$  operators; the proof generalizes easily to arbitrary arithmetic operators. Let  $T$  be given by  $\alpha \in T(A) \leftrightarrow (\forall p)F(p, \alpha, A) = 1$ , where  $F$  is a recursive mapping. For any set  $A$  and any  $n < \omega$ , let  $(A)_n = \{\alpha : \langle n, \alpha \rangle \in A\}$ . Define an operator  $\Gamma$  by putting

$$\langle 0, \alpha \rangle \in \Gamma(A) \leftrightarrow \alpha \in \Theta((A)_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle 1, \alpha \rangle \in \Gamma(A) \leftrightarrow P((A)_0) \wedge \alpha \in T((A)_1).$$

It is clear that for all ordinals  $\sigma$ ,  $T^\sigma = (T^{\omega+\sigma})_1$ , so that  $|\Gamma| = \omega+|T|$  and  $\text{Cl}(T)$  is reducible to  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma)$ . But  $\Gamma$  is a  $A_1^0$  operator, since under the assumption  $P((A)_0)$  we have  $\alpha \in T((A)_1)$  iff  $(\forall p)F(p, \alpha, A) \neq 0$  iff  $(\lambda p)F(p, \alpha, (A)_1) \notin (A)_0$ . ■

Proposition 1.2 now follows, so we see that  $\text{Cl}(A_1^0)$  is a fairly large. This fact can be demonstrated further after the introduction of the concept of parametric inductive definitions in the next section.

**2. Parametric inductive definitions.** The simplest type of inductive definition over the reals would be one in which the real variable appeared only as a parameter. For example, if  $R$  is a  $\Pi_1^0$  relation such that for all  $\alpha$ ,  $\Gamma_\alpha$ , defined by  $n \in \Gamma_\alpha(A) \leftrightarrow R(n, \alpha, A)$ , is an inductive operator over  $\omega$ , then there is an obvious  $\Pi_1^0$  operator  $\Gamma$  such that for all  $n$  and  $\alpha$ ,  $n \in \text{Cl}(\Gamma_\alpha)$  iff  $\langle n, \alpha \rangle \in \text{Cl}(\Gamma)$ . A similar fact holds if  $\Pi_1^0$  is replaced by any standard definability class.

It turns out that for  $\Pi_1^0$ -monotone this process can be reversed: If  $\Gamma$  is a  $\Pi_1^0$ -monotone operator over  ${}^\omega\omega$ , then there is a  $\Pi_1^0$  relation  $R$  such that for all  $\alpha$ ,  $\Gamma_\alpha$ , defined by  $n \in \Gamma_\alpha(A) \leftrightarrow R(n, \alpha, A)$ , is a monotone operator over  $\omega$  and  $\alpha \in \text{Cl}(\Gamma)$  iff  $1 \in \text{Cl}(\Gamma_\alpha)$ . We say that the  $\Gamma_\alpha$  parametrize  $\Gamma$ .

This follows from the previously mentioned result that any  $\Pi_1^0$  monotone operator over the continuum has  $\Pi_1^1$  closure and from the following lemma (see [3], p. 233).

LEMMA 2.1. *If  $Q$  is a  $\Pi_1^1$  relation on  ${}^\omega\omega$ , then there is a uniformly  $\Pi_1^0$  class of operators  $\Gamma_\alpha$  over  $\omega$  such that for all  $\alpha$ ,  $Q(\alpha)$  iff  $1 \in \text{Cl}(\Gamma_\alpha)$ ; furthermore,  $0 \notin \text{any Cl}(\Gamma_\alpha)$ . ■*

In general, we say that  $A \subset {}^\omega\omega$  can be *inductively parametrized* in  $C$  if there is a  $\{\Gamma_\alpha: \alpha \in {}^\omega\omega\}$  in  $C$  and a recursive  $F$  such that for all  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in A$  iff  $F(\alpha) \in \text{Cl}(\Gamma_\alpha)$ . For any definability class  $C$ , let  $\text{PCI}(C)$  be the class of subsets of  ${}^\omega\omega$  which can be inductively parametrized in  $C$ .

By the above remarks,  $\text{PCI}(\Pi_1^0) = \Pi_1^1 = \text{Cl}(\Pi_1^0\text{-monotone})$ . Lemma 2.1 can also be applied to obtain  $\Sigma_1^1$  sets.

Given a  $\Pi_1^1$  set  $Q$  and a class of operators  $\Gamma_\alpha$  as in Lemma 2.1, it is important to notice that for any fixed  $\alpha$ , the operator  $\Gamma_\alpha$  has a countable closure ordinal. Thus we can obtain the typical  $\Sigma_1^1$  set  ${}^\omega\omega - Q$  with the following operator  $T$ , defined by:

$$\langle m, \alpha \rangle \in T(A) \leftrightarrow m \in \Gamma_\alpha((A)_\alpha) \vee [m = 0 \wedge \Gamma_\alpha((A)_\alpha) = (A)_\alpha \wedge \langle 1, \alpha \rangle \notin A],$$

where  $(A)_\alpha = \{p: \langle p, \alpha \rangle \in A\}$ .

For each  $\alpha$ ,  $T$  constructs  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma_\alpha)$  in code with  $\alpha$  and then puts in  $\langle 0, \alpha \rangle$  if and only if  $1 \notin \text{Cl}(\Gamma_\alpha)$ , i.e., iff  $\alpha \notin Q$ . By Proposition 1.1  $T$  can essentially be duplicated by a  $\Delta_1^0$  operator. We have thus proven the following.

PROPOSITION 2.2.  $\Sigma_1^1 \subseteq \text{Cl}(\Delta_1^0)$ . ■

Hopefully the proof of Proposition 2.2 provides some insight into the rather more complicated proof of the following central result of this section.

THEOREM 2.3.  $\text{PCI}(\Pi_1^1) \cup \text{PCI}(\Sigma_1^1) \subseteq \text{Cl}(\Delta_1^0)$ .

Proof. We are given a set  $D$  of reals and uniformly  $\Pi_1^1$  class of operators  $\{A_\alpha: \alpha \in {}^\omega\omega\}$  such that for any  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in D \leftrightarrow 1 \in \text{Cl}(A_\alpha)$ . Let  $A_\alpha$  be given by the  $\Pi_1^1$  relation  $Q$ , so that  $m \in A_\alpha(B) \leftrightarrow Q(m, \alpha, B)$  for all  $m < \omega$ ,  $\alpha \in {}^\omega\omega$  and  $B \subseteq \omega$ . Generalizing Lemma 2.1, there is a uniformly  $\Pi_1^0$  set of operators  $\Gamma_{\alpha B}$  such that for all  $m, \alpha, B$ :

$$(1) \quad m \in A_\alpha(B) \leftrightarrow Q(m, \alpha, B) \leftrightarrow \langle m, 1 \rangle \in \text{Cl}(\Gamma_{\alpha B}).$$

We want to construct an operator  $T$  satisfying

$$(2) \quad \alpha \in D \leftrightarrow 1 \in \text{Cl}(A_\alpha) \leftrightarrow \langle 1, \alpha \rangle \in \text{Cl}(T).$$

Recall that  $(A)_\alpha = \{m: \langle m, \alpha \rangle \in A\}$ ; now fix  $\alpha$  and let  $A_0 = (A)_\alpha$  and  $A_1 = \{n: \langle n, \alpha, A_0 \rangle \in A\}$ . The desired operator  $T$  is given by the following:

$$\langle n, \alpha, A_0 \rangle \in T(A) \leftrightarrow n \in \Gamma_{\alpha A_0}(A_1)$$

and

$$\langle m, \alpha \rangle \in T(A) \leftrightarrow \Gamma_{\alpha A_0}(A_1) = A_1 \wedge \langle m, 1 \rangle \in A_1.$$

The operator  $T$  builds successively the levels  $A_\alpha^{\sigma+1}$  in code with  $\alpha$  and  $A_\alpha^\sigma$  by applying the operator  $\Gamma_{\alpha A_0}$  repeatedly. It is not difficult to show that

$$(3) \quad \text{Cl}(T) = \{\langle n, \alpha, A^\sigma \rangle: n \in A^{\sigma+1}\} \cup \{\langle m, \alpha \rangle: m \in \text{Cl}(A_\alpha)\}.$$

From this it follows immediately that  $T$  satisfies (2).

For a set of  $\Sigma_1^1$  operators  $A_\alpha$ , the definition of  $T$  should be modified slightly to read  $\langle m, 1 \rangle \notin A_1$  at the end instead of  $\langle m, 1 \rangle \in A_1$ .

This theorem can be extended to include compositions of  $\Pi_1^1$  and  $\Sigma_1^1$  operators as described in [3], p. 243.

PROPOSITION 2.4. *For any  $n$ ,  $\text{PCI}((\Pi_1^1)^n) \cup \text{PCI}((\Sigma_1^1)^n) \subseteq \text{Cl}(\Delta_1^0)$ . ■*

These results give some idea of the extent of  $\text{Cl}(\Delta_1^0)$ , although we do not as yet have an exact characterization of the entire class. In the final section of this paper we establish an upper bound on  $\text{Cl}(\Delta_1^0)$ .

**3. All  $\Delta_1^0$  operators have  $\Delta_2^1$  closure.** In this section we prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.1.  $\text{Cl}(\Delta_1^0) \subseteq \Delta_2^1$ .

Let  $\Gamma$  be an arbitrary  $\Delta_1^0$  operator, given by:

$$\alpha \in \Gamma(A) \leftrightarrow (\forall \gamma)(\exists n)\{a_0\}(n, \gamma, \alpha, \chi_A) \cong 0$$

and

$$\alpha \notin \Gamma(A) \leftrightarrow (\forall \gamma)(\exists n)\{a_1\}(n, \gamma, \alpha, \chi_A) \cong 0.$$

Although  $\Gamma$  itself is not necessarily monotone, we will define a  $\Pi_1^1$  monotone operator  $\Gamma_\Pi$  and a  $\Sigma_1^1$  monotone operator  $\Gamma_\Sigma$  both of which can be used to obtain the action of  $\Gamma$ . For any  $B \subseteq \{0, 1\} \times {}^\omega\omega$ , let  $F_B$  be the (multiple-valued) partial function having  $B$  for its graph. Now define

$$\Gamma_\Pi(B) = \{\langle i, \alpha \rangle: (\forall \gamma)(\exists n)\{a_i\}(n, \gamma, \alpha, F_B) \cong 0\};$$

$\Gamma_\Sigma$  is obtained similarly from  $\Sigma_1^1$  definitions of  $\Gamma$ .

It is important to note that these operators are not inclusive (that is,  $\Gamma_\Pi(B)$  does not necessarily include  $B$ ) but *are* monotone since making  $B$  larger simply increases the probability that the functions  $\{a_i\}$  will converge to 0 when applied to the indicated arguments (and similarly for  $\Gamma_\Sigma$ ).

The following lemma is easily verified.

LEMMA 3.2. *For any  $A$  and  $B$ , if  $B = \{1\} \times A \cup \{0\} \times ({}^\omega\omega - A)$ , then  $\Gamma_\Pi(B) = \Gamma_\Sigma(B) = \{1\} \times \Gamma(A) \cup \{0\} \times ({}^\omega\omega - \Gamma(A))$ . ■*

We want to use the operator  $\Gamma_\Pi$  to define another  $\Pi_1^1$  monotone operator  $T$  (this one to be inclusive) which will keep track of all of the levels of  $\Gamma$  simultaneously. To do this, we need to code ordinals as reals in the usual fashion. Let  $W$  be the set of reals  $\delta$  which are the characteristic functions of well-orderings of subsets of  $\omega$ , and let  $|\delta|$  be the length of the ordering given by such a  $\delta$ . For any  $p < \omega$ , let  $\delta \upharpoonright p$  give the ordering of  $\delta$  restricted to numbers preceding  $p$  in the ordering.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *The relation  $E$ , defined by  $E(\alpha, \delta) \leftrightarrow W(\delta) \wedge \alpha \in \Gamma^{|\delta|}$ , is  $\Pi_1^1$ .*

Proof. In fact, if we let  $E^* = \{\langle \alpha, \delta, 1 \rangle: W(\delta) \wedge \alpha \in \Gamma^{|\delta|}\} \cup \{\langle \alpha, \delta, 0 \rangle: \alpha \notin \Gamma^{|\delta|}\}$ , then  $E^*$  can be given by a  $\Pi_1^1$  monotone inductive definition  $T$  and is therefore  $\Pi_1^1$  by a basic result of [2]. Define the required operator  $T$  by

$$T(B) = \{\langle \alpha, \delta, i \rangle: (\exists p)[\langle i, \alpha \rangle \in \Gamma_\Pi(\{\langle j, \beta \rangle: \langle \beta, \delta \upharpoonright p, j \rangle \in B\})] \wedge W(\delta)\}.$$

Notice that the  $(\exists p)$  is just an effective version of the  $\cup$  in our original convention that  $\Gamma^\sigma = \cup \{\Gamma(\Gamma^\tau) : \tau < \sigma\}$ . It now follows rather easily from Lemma 3.2 that  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma) = E^*$ , completing the proof of the proposition. ■

COROLLARY 3.4.  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma)$  is  $\Sigma_2^1$ .

Proof.  $\alpha \in \text{Cl}(\Gamma) \leftrightarrow (\exists \delta) E(\alpha, \delta)$ .

It remains to be shown that  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma)$  is also  $\Pi_2^1$ . We make use of the fact that since  $\Gamma_x$  is a  $\Sigma_1^1$  operator, checking for a particular  $\beta$  and  $B$  whether  $\beta$  is in  $\Gamma_x(B)$  will depend only on some countable subset of  $B$ . Specifically, we have the following improvement of Lemma 3.2. ■

LEMMA 3.5. For any real  $\alpha$  and any  $A$ ,  $\alpha \notin \Gamma(A)$  iff there exist countable  $B_1 \subseteq A$  and  $B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - A$  such that  $\langle 0, \alpha \rangle \in \Gamma_x(\{1\} \times B_1 \cup \{0\} \times B_0)$ . ■

Call  $B \subseteq \{0, 1\} \times {}^\omega\omega$  self-sustaining (abbreviated  $S(B)$ ) if for all  $\alpha \in B_0$ ,  $\langle 0, \alpha \rangle \in \Gamma_x(B)$ . The relation  $S$  is clearly  $\Sigma_1^1$ . Its significance is given by the following lemma:

LEMMA 3.6. For any ordinal  $\sigma$  and any set  $B$  with  $B_1 \subseteq \Gamma^\sigma$  and  $B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - \Gamma^\sigma$ , if  $S(B)$  then  $B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - \text{Cl}(\Gamma)$ .

Proof. We actually show by induction on  $\tau$  that for all  $\tau \geq \sigma$ ,  $B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - \Gamma^\tau$ . This is true for  $\tau = \sigma$  by assumption. Now suppose that for all  $\xi$  with  $\sigma \leq \xi < \tau$ ,  $B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - \Gamma^\xi$ ; for all such  $\xi$  we also have  $B_1 \subseteq \Gamma^\xi \subseteq \Gamma^\tau$ . Since  $S(B)$ , for any  $\alpha \in B_0$  we have  $\langle 0, \alpha \rangle \in \Gamma_x(B)$ ; but  $\Gamma_x$  is monotone, so by the preceding sentence

$$\langle 0, \alpha \rangle \in \Gamma_x(\{1\} \times \Gamma^\xi \cup \{0\} \times {}^\omega\omega - \Gamma^\xi).$$

Now by Lemma 3.2 it follows that for all such  $\xi$  ( $\sigma \leq \xi < \tau$ ),  $\alpha \notin \Gamma(\Gamma^\xi)$  and therefore that  $\alpha \notin \Gamma^\tau$ . As this is true for any  $\alpha \in B_0$ , we now have  $B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - \Gamma^\tau$  as promised. ■

PROPOSITION 3.7. For any real  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \notin \text{Cl}(\Gamma)$  iff

$$(\exists \sigma < \aleph_1) (\exists \text{ countable } B) [B_1 \subseteq \Gamma^\sigma \wedge B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - \Gamma^\sigma \wedge S(B) \wedge \alpha \in B_0].$$

Proof. The direction  $(\leftarrow)$  is immediate from Lemma 3.6. Now let  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma) = C = \Gamma(C)$  and suppose that  $\alpha \notin C$ . For any real  $\beta \notin C$  and  $i = 0$  or  $1$ , let  $B_i(\beta)$  be the countable set whose existence is given by Lemma 3.5. Let  $D_0 = B_0(\alpha)$  and for any  $n$  let  $D_{n+1} = \cup \{B_0(\beta) : \beta \in D_n\}$ . It is clear that for any  $n$ ,  $\{0\} \times D_n \subseteq \Gamma_x(\{0\} \times D_{n+1} \cup \{1\} \times C)$ . If we now let  $B_0 = \cup \{D_n : n < \omega\}$  and let  $B_1 = \cup \{B_1(\beta) : \beta \in B_0\}$ , then  $B = (\{0\} \times B_0) \cup (\{1\} \times B_1)$  is countable and it follows by the monotonicity of  $\Gamma_x$  that  $\{0\} \times B \subseteq \Gamma_x(B)$ , i.e.,  $S(B)$ . It is clear that  $B_1 \subseteq C$ ,  $B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - C$  and  $\alpha \in B_0$ . Finally, pick  $\sigma$  large enough so that  $B_1 \subseteq \Gamma^\sigma$ ; since  $\Gamma^\sigma \subseteq C$ , it is automatic that  $B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - \Gamma^\sigma$ . ■

COROLLARY 3.8.  $\text{Cl}(\Gamma)$  is  $\Pi_2^1$ .

Sketch of proof. The ordinal  $\sigma$  can be coded as a real from  $\mathcal{W}$ , the countable set  $B$  can be coded as a single real, and the relation  $E$  of (3.3) can be used to represent " $B_1 \subseteq \Gamma^\sigma$ " in  $\Pi_1^1$  form and  $B_0 \subseteq {}^\omega\omega - \Gamma^\sigma$  in  $\Pi_1^1$  form. (A similar proof is given in detail for Corollary 4.5 of [2].) ■

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1. It is an interesting open problem whether  $\text{Cl}(A_1^1)$  is a strict subset of  $A_1^1$ . It would also be nice to have a similar result for the class of semirecursive operators; the techniques of this section do not seem to lend themselves to this class.

#### References

- [1] D. Cenzer, *Inductively defined sets of reals*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 80 (1974), pp. 485–487.
- [2] — *Monotone inductive definitions over the continuum*, J. Symbolic Logic 41 (1976), pp. 188–198.
- [3] — *Ordinal recursion and inductive definitions*, in J. Fenstad and P. Hinman (Ed.), Generalized Recursion Theory, Amsterdam 1974, pp. 221–264.
- [4] W. Richter, *Recursively Mahlo ordinals and inductive definitions*, Logic Colloquium 69, Amsterdam 1971, pp. 273–288.