$$z = \overline{\chi_P}(y) \longmapsto Seq(z) \& lh(z) = y \& (\forall i < y)((z)_i = \chi_P(i)).$$

Hence by the table, it will suffice to show that  $w = \chi_P(i)$  is  $\Sigma_{n+1}^0$ . Since P is  $\Pi_n^0$ , this follows from

$$w = \chi_P(i) \mapsto (w = 1 \& P(i)) \lor (w = 0 \& \neg P(i))$$

and the table.  $\square$ 

14.9. COROLLARY. A relation is  $\Delta_{n+1}^0$  iff it is recursive in  $\Pi_n^0$ .

**Proof.** A relation R is  $\Delta_{n+1}^0$  iff both R and  $\neg R$  are  $\Sigma_{n+1}^0$ ; hence, by Post's Theorem, iff both R and  $\neg R$  are RE in  $\prod_n^0$ . By the relativized version of 14.6, this holds iff R is recursive in  $\prod_{n=1}^{0} \square$ 

Since  $\neg R$  is recursive in R and  $R = \neg \neg R$  is recursive in  $\neg R$ , 12.4 and the table show that we can replace  $\prod_{n=1}^{0} p \sum_{n=1}^{0} p$  in both Post's Theorem and its corollary.

## 15. Degrees

If F and G are total functions, we let  $F \leq_{\mathbf{R}} G$  mean that F is recursive in G. By 12.5,

(1)  $F \leq_{\mathbf{R}} F;$ 

and by the Transitivity Theorem

(2) 
$$F \leq_{\mathbf{R}} G \& G \leq_{\mathbf{R}} H \to F \leq_{\mathbf{R}} H.$$

Let  $F \equiv_{\mathbb{R}} G$  mean  $F \leq_{\mathbb{R}} G \& G \leq_{\mathbb{R}} F$ . It follows from (1) and (2) that  $\equiv_{\mathbb{R}}$  is an equivalence relation. The equivalence class of F is called the <u>degree</u> of F and is designated by dg F. By a <u>degree</u>, we mean the degree of some total function. We use small boldface letters, usually **a**, **b**, **c**, and **d**, for degrees.

We let  $dg(F) \leq dg(G)$  if  $F \leq_{\mathbf{R}} G$ . By (2), this depends only on dg(F) and dg(G), not on the choice of F and G in these equivalence classes. It follows from (1) and (2) that  $\leq$  is a partial ordering of the degrees, i.e., that

## a ≤ a,

$$\mathbf{a} \leq \mathbf{b} \& \mathbf{b} \leq \mathbf{a} \rightarrow \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b},$$