VARIATIONS ON $\Delta^1_1$ DETERMINACY AND $\mathsf{N}_{\omega_1}$
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ABSTRACT. We consider a weaker form of $\Delta^1_1$ Turing determinacy. Let $2 \leq \rho < \omega_1^{CK}$, Weak-Turing-Det$_\rho(\Delta^1_1)$ is the statement:

- Every $\Delta^1_1$ set of reals cofinal in the Turing degrees contains two Turing distinct $\Delta^0_{\rho}$-equivalent reals.

We show in $\mathsf{ZF}^-$:

- Weak-Turing-Det$_\rho(\Delta^1_1)$ implies for every $\nu < \omega_1^{CK}$ there is a transitive model: $M \models \mathsf{ZF}^- + \lnot \mathsf{N}_\nu$ exists$^*$.

As a corollary:

- If every cofinal $\Delta^1_1$ set of Turing degrees contains both a degree and its jump, then for every $\nu < \omega_1^{CK}$, there is a transitive model: $M \models \mathsf{ZF}^- + \lnot \mathsf{N}_\nu$ exists$^*$.

- With a simple proof, this improves upon a well-known result of Harvey Friedman on the strength of Borel determinacy (though not assessed level-by-level).

- Invoking Tony Martin’s proof of Borel determinacy, Weak-Turing-Det$_\rho(\Delta^1_1)$ implies $\Delta^1_1$ determinacy.

- We show further that, assuming $\Delta^1_1$ Turing determinacy, or Borel Turing determinacy, as needed:
  - Every cofinal $\Sigma^1_1$ set of Turing degrees contains a “hyp-Turing cone$: $x \in D \mid d_0 \leq_T x \leq_T d_0$. 
  - For a sequence $(A_n)_{n < \omega}$ of analytic sets of Turing degrees, cofinal in $D$, $\bigcap A_n$ is cofinal in $D$.

INTRODUCTION

A most important result in the study of infinite games is Harvey Friedman’s [Fri-1971], where it is shown that a proof of determinacy, for Borel games, would require $\mathsf{N}_1$ iterations of the power set operation — and this is precisely what Tony Martin used in his landmark proof [Mar-1975].

Our focus here is on the Turing determinacy results of [Fri-1971], concentrating on the theory $\mathsf{ZF}^-$ rather than Zermelo’s $\mathsf{Z}$. In the $\Delta^1_1$ realm, Friedman essentially shows that the determinacy of Turing closed $\Delta^1_1$ games [henceforth Turing-Det($\Delta^1_1$)] implies the consistency of the theories $\mathsf{ZF}^- + \lnot \mathsf{N}_\nu$ exists, for all recursive ordinals $\nu$. Friedman does produce a level-by-level analysis entailing, e.g., that the determinacy of Turing closed $\Sigma^0_{n+6}$ games implies the consistency of $\mathsf{ZF}^- + \lnot \mathsf{N}_\nu$ exists$^*$.1,2

Importantly, it was further observed by Friedman (unpublished) that these results extend to produce transitive models, rather than just consistency results. See Martin’s forthcoming [Mar-20xx] for details, see also Van Wesep’s [VanW-20xx].

We forego in this paper the level-by-level analysis to provide, in §3, a simple proof of the existence of transitive models of $\mathsf{ZF}^-$ with uncountable cardinals, from Turing-Det($\Delta^1_1$). In so doing, we show that the full force of Turing determinacy isn’t needed. The main result is Theorem 3.1, with a simply stated corollary.

For context, by Martin’s Lemma (see 1.1), Turing-Det($\Delta^1_1$) is equivalent to:

- Every cofinal $\Delta^1_1$ set of Turing degrees contains a cone of degrees — i.e., a set $\{x \in D \mid d_0 \leq_T x \}$. 

Theorem (3.1). Let $2 \leq \rho < \omega_1^{CK}$, and assume every $\Delta^1_1$ set of reals, cofinal in the Turing degrees, contains two Turing distinct, $\Delta^0_{\rho}$-equivalent reals. For every $\nu < \omega_1^{CK}$, there is a transitive model: $M \models \mathsf{ZF}^- + \lnot \mathsf{N}_\nu$ exists$^*$.

Corollary (3.2). If every cofinal $\Delta^1_1$ set of Turing degrees contains both a degree and its jump, then for every $\nu < \omega_1^{CK}$, there is a transitive model: $M \models \mathsf{ZF}^- + \lnot \mathsf{N}_\nu$ exists$^*$.

1 Improved by Martin to $\Sigma^0_{n+5}$.
2 In [MS-2012] Montalbán and Shore considerably refine the analysis of the proof theoretic strength of Det($\Gamma$), for classes $\Gamma$, where $\Pi^0_3 \subseteq \Gamma \subseteq \Delta^0_4$. 
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In §4 several results are derived, showing that Turing-Det(Δ^1_1) imparts weak determinacy properties to the class Σ^1_1, such as [4.4]:

- Every cofinal Σ^1_1 set of degrees includes a set \{x ∈ D | d_0 ≤_T x & x ≤_h d_0\}, for some d_0 ∈ D.

Or, from Borel Turing determinacy, [4.3]:

- If (A_k)_{k<ω} is a sequence of analytic sets of degrees each cofinal in D, then \bigcap_k A_k is cofinal in D.

I wish to thank Tony Martin for inspiring conversations on the present results. He provided the argument for Remark 2.3, below, and observed that my first proof of Theorem 4.6 (used for an early version of the main result) was needlessly complex. Parts of §4 go back to the author’s dissertation [Sam-1976], it is a pleasure to acknowledge Robert Solovay’s direction.

1. Preliminaries and Notation

The effective descriptive set theory we shall need, as well as basic hyperarithmetic theory, is from Moschovakis’ [Mos-2009], whose terminology and notation we follow. For the theory of admissible sets, we refer to Barwise’s [Bar-1975]. Standard facts about the 1-hierarchy are used without explicit mention: see Devlin’s [Dev-1977], or Van Wesep’s [VanW-20xx].

\( N = \omega^\omega = \omega^\omega \) denotes Baire’s space (the set of reals), and \( D \) the set of Turing degrees. Subsets of D shall be identified with the corresponding (Turing closed) sets of reals. \( ≤_T, ≤_h \) and \( ≡_T, ≡_h \) denote, respectively, Turing and hyperarithmetic (or \( Δ^1_1 \)) reducibility, and equivalence.

1.1. Turing determinacy. A set of reals \( A ⊆ N \) is said to be **cofinal in the Turing degrees** if for all \( x ∈ N \) there is \( y ∈ A \), such that \( x ≤_T y \). For \( c ∈ N \), the *Turing cone* with vertex \( c \) is the set

\[ \text{Cone}(c) = \{ x ∈ N | c ≤_T x \}. \]

For a class of sets of reals \( Γ \), Det(\( Γ \)) is the statement that infinite games \( G_\omega(A) \) where \( A ∈ Γ \) are determined, whereas Turing-Det(\( Γ \)) stands for the determinacy of games \( G_\omega(A) \) restricted to Turing closed sets \( A ∈ Γ \). Recall the following easy yet central:

**Martin’s Lemma** [Mar-1968]. For a Turing closed set \( A ⊆ N \), the infinite game \( G_\omega(A) \) is determined if, and only if, \( A \) or its complement contains a cone of Turing degrees.

1.2. The ambient theories. Our base theory is \( ZF^- \), Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory stripped of the Power Set axiom.3 \( N \) or \( D \) may be proper classes in this context, yet speaking of their “subsets” (\( Δ^1_1, Σ^1_1 \), Borel or analytic) can be handled as usual, as these sets are codable by integers, or reals.

Amenities such as \( N_1 \) or \( L_{ω_1} \) aren’t available but, since our results here are global (i.e., \( Δ^1_1 \)) rather than local, the reader may use instead the more comfortable \( ZF^- + \{\text{P}^2(\omega) \text{ exists}\} \).

\( KP_ω \) denotes the theory Kripke-Platek + Infinity. Much of the argumentation below takes place inside \( ω \)-models of \( KP_ω \) — familiarity with their properties is assumed.

1.3. Constructibility and condensation. For an ordinal \( λ > 0 \), and \( X ⊆ L_λ \), \( L^{λ-}(X) \) denotes the set of elements of \( L_λ \) definable from parameters in \( X \), and \( L^{λ-}(X) \) its transitive collapse. For \( X = \emptyset \), one simply writes \( L^{λ-} \) and \( L^{λ-}(λ) \). Gödel’s Condensation Lemma is the relevant tool here. Note that, since \( L_λ = L^{λ-}(λ) = L^{λ-}(λ) \), all elements of \( L_λ \) are definable in \( L_λ \) from ordinal parameters.

1.4. Reflection. The following reflection principle will be used a few times, to make for shorter proofs.4 A property \( Φ(X) \) of subsets \( X ⊆ N \) is said to be **‘\( Π^1_1 \) on \( Σ^1_1 \)”** if, for any \( Σ^1_1 \) relation \( U ⊆ N × N \), the set \( \{ x ∈ N | Φ(U_x) \} \) is \( Π^1_1 \).

**Theorem.** Let \( Φ(X) \) be a \( Π^1_1 \) on \( Σ^1_1 \) property. For any \( Σ^1_1 \) set \( S ⊆ N \) such that \( Φ(S) \) there is a \( Δ^1_1 \) set \( D ⊆ S \) such that \( Φ(D) \).

**Proof.** See Kechris’ [Kec-1995, §35.10] for a boldface version, easily transcribed to lightface. □

---

3 All implicit instances of Choice, here, are \( ZF^- \)-provable.

4 Longer ones can always be produced using \( Δ^1_1 \) selection + \( Σ^1_1 \) separation.
2. Weak Turing Determinacy

Examining what’s needed to derive the existence of transitive models from Turing determinacy hypotheses, it is possible to isolate a seemingly weaker statement. For $1 < \rho < \omega_1^{CK}$, let $x \equiv_{\rho} y$ denote $\Delta^0_{\rho}$-equivalence on $\mathcal{N}$, that is: $x \in \Delta^0_{\rho}(y) \& y \in \Delta^0_{\rho}(x)$. $\equiv_{1}$ is just Turing equivalence.

2.1. Definition. For a class $\Gamma$, and $2 < \rho < \omega_1^{CK}$, $\text{Weak-Turing-Det}_{\rho}(\Gamma)$ is the statement:

For every set of reals $A \in \Gamma$ cofinal in the degrees, there are two Turing distinct $x, y \in A$ such that $x \equiv_{\rho} y$.

For any recursive $\rho \geq 2$, $\text{Weak-Turing-Det}_{\rho}(\Delta^1_1)$ will suffice to derive the existence of transitive models. The property lifts from $\Delta^1_1$ to $\Sigma^1_1$ — note that it is, a priori, asymmetric.

2.2. Theorem. Let $2 < \rho < \omega_1^{CK}$. $\text{Weak-Turing-Det}_{\rho}(\Delta^1_1)$ implies $\text{Weak-Turing-Det}_{\rho}(\Sigma^1_1)$.

Proof. Assume $\text{Weak-Turing-Det}_{\rho}(\Delta^1_1)$. Let $S \in \Sigma^1_1$ and suppose there are no Turing distinct $x, y \in S$ such that $x \equiv_{\rho} y$, that is

$$\forall x, y (x, y \in S \& x \equiv_{\rho} y \Rightarrow x \equiv_T y).$$

This is a statement $\Phi(S)$, where $\Phi(X)$ is a $\Pi^1_1$ on $\Sigma^1_1$ property. Reflection yields a $\Delta^1_1$ set $D \supseteq S$ such that $\Phi(D)$. By $\text{Weak-Turing-Det}_{\rho}(\Delta^1_1)$, $D$ is not cofinal in the degrees; a fortiori, $S$ isn’t either. □

2.3. Remark. One may be tempted to substitute for $\text{Weak-Turing-Det}_{\rho}(\Delta^1_1)$ a simpler hypothesis: Every $\Delta^1_1$ set of reals cofinal in the degrees contains two Turing distinct reals $x, y$ such that $x \equiv_h y$.

It turns out to be too weak and, indeed, provable in Analysis. (Tony Martin, private communication: Building on his [Mar-1976], he shows that every uncountable $\Delta^1_1$ set of reals contains two Turing distinct reals, in every hyperdegree $\geq$ Kleene’s $O$.) The weaker statement does suffice however, when asserted about the class $\Sigma^1_1$, see Theorem 3.13, below.

3. Transitive Models from Weak Turing Determinacy

We now state the main result, and a simple special case. The proof is postponed towards the end of the present section.

3.1. Theorem. Let $2 < \rho < \omega_1^{CK}$, and assume $\text{Weak-Turing-Det}_{\rho}(\Delta^1_1)$. For every $\nu < \omega_1^{CK}$, there is a transitive model: $M \models \text{ZF}^- + "\text{\mathcal{N}_\nu exists}"$.

3.2. Corollary. If every cofinal $\Delta^1_1$ set of Turing degrees contains both a degree and its jump, then for every $\nu < \omega_1^{CK}$, there is a transitive model: $M \models \text{ZF}^- + "\text{\mathcal{N}_\nu exists}"$. □

* Term models.

Given a complete\(^5\) theory $U \supseteq \text{KP}_{\omega} + (\forall = \bot)$, one constructs its term model. To be specific, owing to the presence of the axiom $\forall = \bot$, to every formula $\psi(v)$ is associated $\bar{\psi}(v)$ such that $U \models \exists v \psi(v) \Rightarrow \exists ! \bar{\psi}(v)$. Just take for $\bar{\psi}(v)$ the formula $\psi(v) \land (\forall \nu < \nu \nu \neg \psi(w)$.

Let $\langle \varphi_n(v) \rangle_{n < \omega}$ be a recursive in $U$ enumeration of the formulas $\varphi(v)$, in the single free variable $v$, having $U \models \exists ! v \varphi(v)$. Using, as metalinguistic device, $(iv)\varphi(v)$ for “the unique $\nu$ such that $\varphi(v)$”, set:

$$M_U = \{ n \in \omega \mid \forall i < n, U \models (iv)\varphi_n \neq (iv)\varphi_i \},$$

and define on $M_U$ the relation $e_U$:

$$m \in_U n \iff U \models (iv)\varphi_{m} \equiv (iv)\varphi_{n}.$$ 

$(M_U, e_U)$ is a prime model of $U$ and, $U$ being complete, $(M_U, e_U)$ is recursive in $U$. Using the canonical enumeration $\omega \rightarrow M_U$, substitute $\omega$ for $M_U$ and remap $e_U$ accordingly. The resulting model $M_U = (\omega, e^{M_U})$ shall be called the term model of $U$. The function $U \mapsto M_U$ is recursive.

---

\(^5\) Complete extensions are always meant to be consistent.
Whenever \( M_U \) is an \( \omega \)-model, we say that \( a \subseteq \omega \) is realized in \( M_U \) if there is \( \dot{a} \in \omega \) such that \( a = \{ k \in \omega \mid k^{M_U} \in M_U \ \dot{a} \} \). We state, for later reference, a couple of standard facts.

3.3. Proposition. Let \( U \) be as above. If \( M_U \) is an \( \omega \)-model, and \( a \subseteq \omega \) realized in \( M_U \), then:

1. For all \( x \leq_T a \): \( x \) is realized in \( M_U \).
2. \( a \leq_T U \). Hence \( U \) is not realized in \( M_U \), lest the jump \( U' \) be realized in \( M_U \), and \( U' \leq_T U \). \( \square \)

Note that if \( U = \text{Th}(L_{\alpha}) \), where \( \alpha \) is admissible, then \( M_U \) is a copy of \( H^{\beta \omega} \). Hence \( M_U \cong L_\beta \), for some \( \beta \leq \alpha \). The following easy proposition is quite familiar.

3.4. Proposition. Assume \( V = L \). For cofinally many countable admissible \( \alpha \)'s, \( L_\alpha = H^{\beta \omega} \), equivalently, \( \text{Th}(L_{\alpha}) \cong L_\beta \).

Proof. Suppose not. Let \( \lambda \) be the sup of the admissible \( \alpha \)'s having \( L_\alpha = H^{\beta \omega} \), and let \( \kappa > \lambda \) be the first admissible such that \( \lambda \) is countable in \( L_\kappa \). Since \( \lambda \) is definable and countable in \( L_\kappa \), \( \lambda \cup \{ \lambda \} \subseteq H^{\beta \omega} \). It follows readily that \( L_\kappa = H^{\kappa \omega} = H^{\lambda \omega} \): a contradiction. \( \square \)

- **Cardinality in the constructible levels.**

Set theory within the confines of \( L_\lambda \), \( \lambda \) an arbitrary limit ordinal, imposes some contortions. For technical convenience, the notion of cardinal needs to be slightly twisted — for a time only.

3.5. Definition.

1. For an ordinal \( \alpha \), \( \text{Card}(\alpha) = \min_{\xi < \alpha} (\text{there is a surjection } \xi \to \alpha) \).
2. \( \alpha \) is a cardinal if \( \alpha = \text{Card}(\alpha) \).
3. \( \text{Card}_\lambda \subseteq L_\lambda \) is the class of infinite cardinals as computed in \( L_\lambda \).

3.6. Note that, for any limit \( \lambda \), from a surjection \( g : \gamma \to \alpha \) in \( L_\lambda \), one can extract \( a \subseteq \gamma \) and \( r \subseteq \gamma \times \gamma \) such that \( g | a : (a, r) \cong (\alpha, \in) \), and both \( (a, r) \) are in \( L_\lambda \). Further, if \( \lambda \) is admissible, in \( L_\lambda \) the altered notion of cardinality coincides with the standard one.

3.7. Convention. For simplicity’s sake, the assertion “\( \mathbb{N}_\nu \) exists in \( L_\lambda \)” should be understood as:

*There is an isomorphism \( \nu + 1 \cong I \), where \( I \) is an initial segment of \( \text{Card}_\lambda \).*

Its negation is equivalent in \( \text{KP}_\infty \) to: \( \text{There is } \kappa \in \nu \text{ such that } \text{Card}_\lambda \equiv \kappa \). The notation \( \mathbb{N}^{L_\lambda}_\nu \) carries the obvious meaning.

We need the following, presumably “folklore”, result. A proof is provided in the Appendix, for lack of a convenient reference.

3.8. Proposition. For \( \lambda \) a limit ordinal, \( L_\lambda \models "\mu > \omega \text{ is a successor cardinal}" \) implies \( L_\mu \models \text{ZF}^- \).

- **The theories \( T_\nu \).**

For \( \nu < \omega_1^{CK} \), pick \( e_\nu \in \omega \) a recursive index for a wellordering \( <_{e_\nu} \) of a subset of \( \omega \), of length \( \nu \).

Using \( e_\nu \), statements about \( \nu \) can tentatively be expressed in \( \text{KP}_\infty \). In an \( \omega \)-model \( M \) of \( \text{KP}_\infty \), the truth of such statements is independent of the choice of \( e_\nu \). Indeed, \( <_{e_\nu} \) is realized in \( M \), and its realization is isomorphic in \( M \) to the \( M \)-ordinal of order-type \( \nu \), to be denoted \( \nu^M \).

3.9. Definition. For \( \nu < \omega_1^{CK} \), \( T_\nu \) is the theory

\[ \text{KP}_\infty + (\forall \nu \in L \) + "For all limit } \lambda \), \( \mathbb{N}_{\nu+1} \text{ doesn’t exist in } L_\lambda \)".\]

This definition is clearly lacking: a recursive index \( e_\nu \) coding the ordinal \( \nu \) is not made explicit. This is immaterial, as we shall be interested only in \( \omega \)-models of \( T_\nu \). They possess the following rigidity property.
3.10. **Lemma.** Let \( \nu < \omega_1^{CK} \) and \( M_1, M_2 \) be \( \omega \)-models of \( T_\nu \). Let \( u \in \mathbb{On}^{M_1} \), and \( w, w^* \in \mathbb{On}^{M_2} \), for any two isomorphisms \( f : \mathbb{L}^M_\nu \cong \mathbb{L}^M_\omega \) and \( f^* : \mathbb{L}^{M_1}_\nu \cong \mathbb{L}^{M_2}_\omega \), \( f = f^* \).

**Proof.** By an easy reduction, it suffices to prove this for \( u \), a limit \( M_1 \)-ordinal.

Set \( C_u = \{ c <^{M_1} u \mid M_1 \models c \in \text{Card}_u \} \). The relevant point here is that \( C_u \) is wellordered by \( <^{M_1} \). Indeed, since \( M_1 \models \text{\( \mathbb{N} \)}_{\nu + 1} \) doesn’t exist in \( \mathbb{L}^M_\nu \), there is \( \kappa \leq \nu + 1 \) such that \( M_1 \models \text{Card}_u \equiv \kappa^{M_1} \) (see 3.7), and consequently \( (C_u, <^{M_1}) \equiv (\kappa, \in) \).

We check first that \( f \) and \( f^* \) agree on the \( M_1 \)-ordinals \( o <^{M_1} u \). Set \( \kappa_u(o) = \text{Card}(o) \), evaluated in \( \mathbb{L}^M_\nu \). Evidently \( f(o) = f^*(o) \) for \( o \leq o \) in \( M_1 \), next show by transfinite induction on \( c \in C_u \) :

\[
\text{for all } o <^{M_1} u : \quad \kappa_u(o) \leq^{M_1} c \Rightarrow f(o) = f^*(o). 
\]

The inductive hypothesis yields, for all \( o <^{M_1} c \), \( f(o) = f^*(o) \), hence \( f(c) = f^*(c) \). Let now \( o <^{M_1} u \) have \( \kappa_u(o) = c \). Inside \( \mathbb{L}^M_\nu \), \( (o, \in) \) is isomorphic to an ordering \( s = (a, r) \), where \( a \subseteq c \) and \( r \subseteq c \times c \), (see 3.6). Since \( f \) and \( f^* \) agree on the \( M_1 \)-ordinals up to \( c \), one readily gets \( f(s) = f^*(s) \). In \( M_2 \), the ordering \( f(s) \) is isomorphic to both the ordinals \( f(o) \) and \( f^*(o) \), hence \( f(o) = f^*(o) \).

This entails \( w = w^* \). Now for \( x \in \mathbb{L}^M_\nu \), \( x \) is definable in \( \mathbb{L}^M_\nu \) from \( M_1 \)-ordinals (see 1.3), thus \( f(x) \) and \( f^*(x) \) satisfy in \( \mathbb{L}^M_\nu \) the same definition from equal parameters, hence \( f(x) = f^*(x) \). □

**Pseudo-wellfounded models.**

A relation \( < \subseteq \omega \times \omega \) is said to be **pseudo-wellfounded** if every nonempty \( \Delta^1_1(<) \) subset of \( \omega \) has a \( \omega \)-minimal element. By the usual computation, this is a \( \Sigma^1_1 \) property.

3.11. **Definition.** For \( \nu < \omega_1^{CK} \), \( S_\nu \) is the set of theories:

\[
S_\nu = \{ U \mid U \text{ is a complete extension of } T_\nu, \text{ and } M_U \text{ is pseudo-wellfounded} \}.
\]

The first clause in the definition of \( S_\nu \) is arithmetical, while the “pseudo-wellfounded” clause can be written as:

\[
\forall x \leq_\nu M_U (x \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \exists k \in x \forall m \in x (m \in^{M_U} k)).
\]

Since \( M_U \) is uniformly \( \Delta^1_1(U) \), \( S_\nu \) is \( \Sigma^1_1 \). Further, for \( U \in S_\nu \), \( M_U \) is an \( \omega \)-model. The sets \( S_\nu \) play the central role in the proof. They are sparse, in the following sense.

3.12. **Proposition.** For \( \nu < \omega_1^{CK} \), no two distinct members of \( S_\nu \) have the same hyperdegree.

**Proof.** Let \( U_1, U_2 \in S_\nu \) have \( U_1 \equiv_U U_2 \), and let \( M_1, M_2 \) stand for \( M_{U_1}, M_{U_2} \). We will obtain \( U_1 = U_2 \) by showing \( M_1 \cong M_2 \). Define a relation between ‘ordinals’ \( u \in M_1 \) and \( w \in M_2 \).

\[
u \equiv w \iff \mathbb{L}^{M_1}_\nu \equiv \mathbb{L}^{M_2}_\nu.
\]

Set \( I_1 = \text{Dom}(\equiv) \) and \( I_2 = \text{Im}(\equiv) \). \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \) are initial segments of \( \mathbb{On}^{M_1} \) and \( \mathbb{On}^{M_2} \), respectively. Using Lemma 3.10, the relation “\( u \equiv w \)” defines a bijection \( I_1 \rightarrow I_2 \) which is, indeed, the restriction of an isomorphism \( F : \bigcup_{u \in I_1} \mathbb{L}^{M_1}_u \cong \bigcup_{w \in I_2} \mathbb{L}^{M_2}_w \). By the same lemma, it can be expressed as:

\[
u \equiv w \iff \exists f (f : \mathbb{L}^{M_1}_\nu \cong \mathbb{L}^{M_2}_\nu)
\]

\[
\exists ! f (f : \mathbb{L}^{M_1}_\nu \equiv \mathbb{L}^{M_2}_\nu).
\]

The expression on the last RHS reads \( \exists ! f \bar{I}(f, U_1, u, U_2, w) \), where \( \bar{I} \) is a \( \Delta^1_1 \) predicate, thus

\[
u \equiv w \iff \exists f \leq_h U_1 \oplus U_2 (f : \mathbb{L}^{M_1}_\nu \equiv \mathbb{L}^{M_2}_\nu).
\]

By the usual computation, the relation “\( u \equiv w \)” is \( \Delta^1_1(U_1 \oplus U_2) \) \( \equiv \Delta^1_1(U_1) \equiv \Delta^1_1(U_2) \). Consequently, \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \) are also \( \Delta^1_1 \) (non-empty), \( \Delta^1_1(U_1) \equiv \Delta^1_1(U_2) \). \( M_1, M_2 \) being pseudo-wellfounded, \( \mathbb{On}^{M_1} - I_1 \) and \( \mathbb{On}^{M_2} - I_2 \) each, if nonempty, has a minimum. Call \( m_1, m_2 \) the respective potential minima, and consider the cases:
Theorem 3.1, there is a transitive model of $\Sigma^1_2$ is realized in $M_2$. By hypothesis $U_2 \equiv_h U_1$ hence, by Proposition 3.3(1), $U_2$ is realized in $M_2$ (that’s $M_{U_2}$). This contradicts (2) of the same proposition.

The third case, symmetric of the last one, is equally impossible.

The remaining case: $I_1 = \bigcup M_2$ and $I_2 = \bigcup M_2$. Here $M_1 = \bigcup_{u \in I_1} M_1 \equiv M_2$, and $U_1$ being now the theory of $M_2$, is realized in $M_2$. By hypothesis $U_2 \equiv_h U_1$ hence, by Proposition 3.3(1), $U_2$ is realized in $M_2$ (that’s $M_{U_2}$). This contradicts (2) of the same proposition.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We may assume $\forall = \exists$. Fix $\nu < \omega^\text{CK}_1$.

Claim. There is a limit ordinal $\lambda$, such that: $\Sigma^{\lambda+1}_\omega$ exists in $L_\lambda$.

First no such $\lambda$ exists. It follows that for all admissible $\alpha > \omega$, $\square \equiv T\nu$. This entails that the $\Sigma^1_1$ set of reals, cofinal in the degrees: indeed, using Proposition 3.4, given $x \subseteq \omega$ there is an $\alpha > \omega$, admissible, such that $x \subseteq \omega$ and $M_{\square \equiv T\nu} \equiv \square \lambda$. Thus $x \subseteq T\nu$ whenever $\nu < \omega$.

Invoking now Weak-Turing-Det ($\Sigma^1_1$) and Proposition 2.2, Weak-Turing-Det ($\Sigma^1_1$) holds. Hence, there are distinct $U_1, U_2 \in S_\nu$ such that $U_1 \equiv \rho U_2$, contradicting the previous proposition. □

Let $\lambda$ be as claimed, and set $\mu = \Sigma^{\lambda+1}_\omega$. In $L_\lambda$, $\mu$ is a successor cardinal hence, by Proposition 3.8, $\bigcup \mu \equiv \neg ZF^{-}$. Further for all $\xi < \nu$, $\Sigma^{\lambda+1}_\xi \subseteq \mu$, and $\Sigma^{\lambda+1}_\xi$ is an $\mu$-cardinal (now in the usual sense), hence $\mu \equiv \neg ZF^{-} + "\Sigma^1_\nu"$ exists. □

Note the following byproduct of the previous proposition, and the proof just given (substituting $U_1 \equiv \rho U_2$ for $U_1 \equiv \rho U_2$ in the proof) — in contradistinction to Remark 2.3.

3.13. Theorem. Assume every $\Sigma^1_1$ set of reals, cofinal in the degrees, contains two Turing distinct reals $x, y$, such that $x \equiv \rho y$. For every $\nu < \omega^\text{CK}_1$, there is a transitive model: $M \models \neg ZF^{-} + "\Sigma^1_\nu"$ exists. □

An easy consequence of the main result: Weak-Turing-Det ($\Sigma^1_1$) implies full $\Sigma^1_1$ determinacy. The proof goes through Martin’s Borel determinacy theorem: no direct argument is known for this sort of implication — apparently first observed by Friedman for Turing-Det ($\Sigma^1_1$).

3.14. Theorem. For $2 \leq \rho < \omega^\text{CK}_1$, Weak-Turing-Det ($\Sigma^1_1$) implies Det ($\Sigma^1_1$).

Proof. Assume Weak-Turing-Det ($\Sigma^1_1$). Let $A \subseteq N$ be $\Sigma^1_1$, say $A \in \Sigma^0_\nu$ where $\nu < \omega^\text{CK}_1$. Applying Theorem 3.1, there is a transitive $M \models \neg ZF^{-} + "\Sigma^1_\nu"$ exists. Invoking (non-optimally) Martin’s main result from [Mar-1975] inside $M$, $\Sigma^0_\nu$ games are determined. The statement “the game $G_\omega (A)$ is determined” is $\Sigma^1_2$. By Mostowki’s absoluteness theorem, being true in $M$, it holds in the universe: $G_\omega (A)$ is indeed determined. □

4. $\Delta^1_1$ Determinacy and Properties of $\Sigma^1_1$ Sets

We proceed now to show that $\Delta^1_1$ determinacy imparts weak determinacy properties to the class $\Sigma^1_1$. In view of Theorem 3.14, there is no point, here, in working from weaker hypotheses.

4.1. Definition. The hyp-Turing cone with vertex $d \in D$ is the set of degrees

$$\text{Cone}_h (d) = \{ x \in D \mid d \leq_T x \ \& \ x \leq_h d \} = \text{Cone}(d) \cap \Delta^1_1(d).$$

Hyp-Turing-Det($\Gamma$) is the statement: Every cofinal set of degrees $A \in \Gamma$ contains a hyp-Turing cone.
4.2. **Theorem.** Assume Turing-Det($\Delta^1_1$). If $(S_k)_{k<\omega}$ is a $\Sigma^1_1$ sequence of sets of Turing degrees, each cofinal in $D$, then $\bigcap_k S_k \neq \emptyset$ — and, indeed, $\bigcap_k S_k$ contains a hyp-Turing cone.

**Proof.** Let the $S_k$’s be given as the sections of a $\Sigma^1_1$ relation $S \subseteq \omega \times N$ and assume $\bigcap_k S_k$ contains no hyp-Turing cone, that is:

$$\forall x \in N \exists y \leq_T x (x \leq_T y \& y \notin \bigcap_k S_k).$$

This is a statement $\Phi(S)$, where $\Phi(X)$ is a $\Pi^1_1$ on $\Sigma^1_1$ property. Reflection yields a $\Delta^1_1$ relation $D \supseteq S$ such that $\Phi(D)$. By shrinking $D$, if needed, we may ensure that its sections $D_k$ are Turing closed, preserving $\Phi(D)$. Now, $D_k \supseteq S_k$ and $\bigcap_k D_k$ contains no hyp-Turing cone. A contradiction ensues using Turing-Det($\Delta^1_1$) and Martin’s Lemma: each $D_k$, being cofinal in the degrees, contains a Turing cone, hence so does the intersection $\bigcap_k D_k$. \hfill $\square$

The converse is immediate: if Turing-Det($\Delta^1_1$) fails, using Martin’s Lemma there is a $\Delta^1_1$ set $A \subseteq D$, such that $A$ and $\neg A$ are both cofinal in $D$, and the $\Delta^1_1$ “sequence” $(A, \neg A)$ has empty intersection. Relativizing 4.2, one readily gets:

4.3. **Corollary.** Assume Borel Turing determinacy. If $(A_k)_{k<\omega}$ is a sequence of analytic sets of Turing degrees, each cofinal in $D$, then $\bigcap_k A_k$ is cofinal in $D$. \hfill $\square$

An interesting degenerate case of 4.2, where the sequence $(S_k)_{k<\omega}$ consists of a single $\Sigma^1_1$ term.

4.4. **Theorem.** Turing-Det($\Delta^1_1$) implies Hyp-Turing-Det($\Sigma^1_1$). \hfill $\square$

In view of Theorem 3.14, the implication is, of course, an equivalence. A similar result holds for full determinacy.

4.5. **Definition.** For a game $G_\omega(A)$, a strategy $\sigma$ for Player I is called a hyp-winning strategy if $\forall \tau \leq_T \sigma(\sigma \ast \tau \in A)$, i.e., applying $\sigma$, Player I wins against any $\Delta^1_1(\sigma)$ sequence of moves by Player II.

4.6. **Theorem.** Assume Det($\Delta^1_1$). For all $\Sigma^1_1$ sets $S$, one of the following holds for the game $G_\omega(S)$.

1. Player I has a hyp-winning strategy.
2. Player II has a winning strategy.

**Proof.** Let $S$ be $\Sigma^1_1$, and assume Player I has no hyp-winning strategy for $G_\omega(S)$: $\forall \sigma \exists \tau \leq_T \sigma(\sigma \ast \tau \notin S)$. As above, Reflection yields a $\Delta^1_1$ set $D \supseteq S$ such that Player I has no hyp-winning strategy for $G_\omega(D)$, hence no winning strategy. Invoking Det($\Delta^1_1$), Player II has a winning strategy for $G_\omega(D)$ which is, a fortiori, winning for $G_\omega(S)$. \hfill $\square$

**APPENDIX**

The point of the present section is to sketch a proof of Proposition 3.8 (5.3, below), without dissecting the $L$ construction — albeit with a recourse to admissible sets. Finer results are certainly known. $\Phi$ is the set of formulas, $\Phi \in L_{\omega+1}$. $|=_{\omega}$ is the satisfaction relation for $L_{\omega}$,

$$|=_{\omega}(\varphi, \bar{\delta}) \iff \varphi \in \Phi \& \bar{\delta} \in L^{<\omega}_{\omega} \& L_{\omega} \models \varphi[\bar{\delta}].$$

Apart from the classic Condensation Lemma (see 1.3), we shall need the following familiar result.

For a limit ordinal $\lambda >\omega$, and $\beta < \lambda$, $|=_{L_\beta} \in L_{\omega}$. See [VanW-20xx, §7.1].

**Notation.** $X \gg^1 Y$ abbreviates $\exists f \in L_\lambda(f: X \rightarrow Y)$, where ‘$\gg$’ stands for surjective map.

Recall: in the present context, “$\mu$ is an $L_{\omega}$-cardinal” means “there is no $\xi < \mu$ such that $\xi \gg^1 \mu$”.

5.1. **Lemma.** Let $\lambda > \omega$ be a limit ordinal. For $0 < \alpha \leq \gamma < \lambda$, if $\| \beta = H^\| \gamma(\alpha)$, then $\alpha^{<\omega} \gg^1 \beta$.

**Proof.** Observe that $\| \beta = H^\| \beta(\alpha)$, and $\beta \leq \gamma < \lambda$. In $L_{\beta}$, every $\xi \in \beta$ is the unique solution of some formula $\varphi(v, \bar{\eta})$, with parameters $\bar{\eta} \in \alpha^{<\omega}$. Thus, from the fact that $|=_{L_\beta} \in L_{\omega}$ one readily derives $\Phi \times \alpha^{<\omega} \gg^1 \beta$. Using an injection $\Phi \times \alpha^{<\omega} \rightarrow \alpha^{<\omega}$, in $L_{\omega}$, one gets $\alpha^{<\omega} \gg^1 \beta$. \hfill $\square$
5.2. **Proposition.** Let $\lambda > \omega$ be a limit ordinal, and $\mu < \lambda$ an $\mathbf{L}_\lambda$-cardinal, $\mu > \omega$.

1. $\mu$ is admissible.
2. For $\alpha < \mu$ and $\alpha \leq \gamma < \lambda$, if $\mathbf{L}_\beta = \mathbf{H}^{\lambda^+}(\alpha)$, then $\beta < \mu$. (A downward Löwenheim-Skolem property.)

**Proof.** We check (1) and (2) simultaneously, by induction on $\mu$. Set $\bar{\mu} = \min\{\mu \in \nu (\nu^{<\lambda} \geq \mu)\}$. We claim that $\bar{\mu} = \mu$. Easily, $\bar{\mu}$ is an $\mathbf{L}_\lambda$-cardinal and $\bar{\mu} > \omega$. If $\mu$ is the first $\mathbf{L}_\lambda$-cardinal $> \omega$, then $\bar{\mu} = \mu$. Else, if $\bar{\mu} < \mu$, then by the induction hypothesis $\bar{\mu}$ is admissible, thus there is an $\mathbf{L}_\mu$-definable bijection $\mathbf{L}_\mu \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^{\lambda^+}(\alpha)$. Hence $\bar{\mu} \geq \mathbf{L}_\mu \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^{\lambda^+}(\alpha)$, and since $\mathbf{L}_\mu \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^{\lambda^+}(\alpha)$, $\bar{\mu} \geq \mu$, contradicting the fact that $\mu$ is an $\mathbf{L}_\lambda$-cardinal.

Now (2) holds for $\mu$. Indeed, if $0 < \alpha < \mu$, and $\alpha \leq \gamma < \lambda$, and $\mathbf{L}_\beta = \mathbf{H}^{\lambda^+}(\alpha)$, then by the previous lemma, $\alpha^{<\lambda} \geq \beta$. Hence, since $\alpha < \mu = \bar{\alpha}$, $\beta < \mu$.

To complete the proof that $\mu$ is admissible, only $\Delta_0$ COLLECTION needs checking.

Say $\mathbf{L}_\mu \models \forall x \in a \exists y \varphi(x, y, \bar{\mu})$, where $\varphi$ is a $\Delta_0$ formula, and $a, \bar{\mu} \in \mathbf{L}_\mu$. Pick $\alpha < \mu$ with $a, \bar{\mu} \in \mathbf{L}_\alpha$, and set $\mathbf{L}_\beta = \mathbf{H}^{\lambda^+}(\alpha)$. $\beta \geq \alpha$, and $\mathbf{L}_\beta \models \forall x \in a \exists y \varphi(x, y, \bar{\mu})$. Applying (2), $\beta < \mu$ and $b = \text{def} \mathbf{L}_\beta \in \mathbf{L}_\mu$. By $\Delta_0$ absoluteness, $\mathbf{L}_\mu \models \forall x \in a \exists y \in b \varphi(x, y, \bar{\mu})$. □

5.3. **Proposition (3.8).** For $\lambda$ a limit ordinal, $\mathbf{L}_\lambda \models \text{"\mu > \omega is a successor cardinal"} \Rightarrow \mathbf{L}_\mu \models \text{ZFC}^-$. 

**Proof.** Let $\pi$ be the cardinal predecessor of $\mu$ in $\mathbf{L}_\lambda$. We argue that $\pi$ is the largest cardinal in $\mathbf{L}_\mu$. Indeed, for $\pi \leq \eta < \mu$, pick $\gamma < \lambda$ such that $\exists f \in \mathbf{L}_\gamma(f : \pi \rightarrow \eta)$, and set $\mathbf{L}_\beta = \mathbf{H}^{\gamma}(\eta + 1)$. We get $\exists f \in \mathbf{L}_\beta(f : \pi \rightarrow \eta)$ and, invoking Proposition 5.2(2), $\beta < \mu$.

Next, check that $\mu$ is regular inside $\mathbf{L}_\lambda$. The standard ZFC proof for the regularity of infinite successor cardinals goes through here: for each nonzero $\eta < \mu$, using the wellordering $<_{\mathbf{L}_\mu}$, select $f_\eta \in \mathbf{L}_\mu$, $f_\eta : \pi \rightarrow \eta$, and note that the sequence $(f_\eta)_{0 < \eta < \mu}$ is in $\mathbf{L}_{\mu+1} \subseteq \mathbf{L}_\lambda$, etc.

Finally, to show that $\mathbf{L}_\mu \models \text{ZFC}^-$. Since by 5.2(1) $\mu$ is admissible, using the definable bijection $\mu \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_\mu$, it suffices to verify REPLACEMENT for ordinal class-functions.

Let therefore $F : \mu \rightarrow \mu$ be definable over $\mathbf{L}_\mu$, from parameters $\bar{\mu}$. Given $a \in \mathbf{L}_\mu$, $a \subseteq \mu$, by regularity of $\mu$ in $\mathbf{L}_\mu$, $F[a]$ is bounded in $\mu$. Pick $\alpha < \mu$, with $F[a] \subseteq \alpha$ and $a, \bar{\mu} \in \mathbf{L}_\alpha$. Set $\mathbf{L}_\beta = \mathbf{H}^{\lambda^+}(\alpha)$, applying Proposition 5.2(2), $\beta < \mu$. Since $F[a] \in \mathbf{L}_{\mu+1}$, $F[a] \in \mathbf{L}_{\beta+1} \subseteq \mathbf{L}_\mu$. □
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